



Madison Elementary

2939 Mission Rd. • Stockton, CA 95204 • (209) 933-7240 • Grades K-8

Josh Schroeder, Principal

jschroeder@stocktonusd.net

<http://www.stocktonusd.net/Madison>

2015-16 School Accountability Report Card Published During the 2016-17 School Year



Stockton Unified School District

701 North Madison St.
Stockton, CA 95202-1634
(209) 933-7000
www.stocktonusd.net

District Governing Board

Gloria Allen
Andrea Burrise
Kathleen Garcia
Colleen Keenan
Maria Mendez
Angela Phillips
Steve Smith

District Administration

Eliseo Dávalos, Ph.D.
Superintendent
Mr. Thomas Anderson
**Assistant Superintendent,
Educational Services**

School Description

Madison Elementary School is a standards-based learning community of students, staff, and families. Our goal is to provide a safe, nurturing environment. We hold high expectations for all learners' growth and development that will empower them to become respectful, responsible and productive citizens.

We provide our learners with access and the ability to utilize technology and to broaden their knowledge and understanding of the world around them. Our goal is to provide students with research based instruction to help them master the rigorous California content standards. Administration and staff work to develop strategies to assist all learners to be achievers. We believe in students being proficient in various forms of communication.

We are building a learning community for the success of all students and to strengthen the home connection. With positive understanding of our cultural diversity, we are providing students with guidance in how to demonstrate and produce positive characteristics. We are preparing our students to be both academically and emotionally responsible to become lifelong learners.

Madison knows that when parents and the school work together as a team, children grow academically, emotionally, and socially. Student achievement goes up, and everyone is proud of the type of education their children receive. Madison's door is open to ideas, suggestions, and assistance in making it a place where all feel welcome and are a part of their children's education. Please join us in making this the school you wish your child to have.

About the SARC

By February 1 of each year, every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC). The SARC contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school. Under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) all local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to prepare a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), which describes how they intend to meet annual school-specific goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities. Additionally, data reported in an LCAP is to be consistent with data reported in the SARC.

- For more information about SARC requirements, see the California Department of Education (CDE) SARC Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/>.
- For more information about the LCFF or LCAP, see the CDE LCFF Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/>.
- For additional information about the school, parents/guardians and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.

2015-16 Student Enrollment by Grade Level	
Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	74
Grade 1	68
Grade 2	94
Grade 3	102
Grade 4	84
Grade 5	84
Grade 6	60
Grade 7	60
Grade 8	81
Total Enrollment	707

2015-16 Student Enrollment by Group	
Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	13.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1
Asian	5.8
Filipino	3.1
Hispanic or Latino	59.1
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.4
White	14
Two or More Races	2.7
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	69.2
English Learners	19.7
Students with Disabilities	17.7
Foster Youth	1

A. Conditions of Learning

State Priority: Basic

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Basic State Priority (Priority 1):

- Degree to which teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject area and for the pupils they are teaching;
- Pupils have access to standards-aligned instructional materials; and
- School facilities are maintained in good repair.

Teacher Credentials			
Madison Elementary	14-15	15-16	16-17
With Full Credential	30	26	27
Without Full Credential	2	7	7
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	0	0	0
Stockton Unified School District	14-15	15-16	16-17
With Full Credential	♦	♦	
Without Full Credential	♦	♦	
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	♦	♦	

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions at this School			
Madison Elementary	14-15	15-16	16-17
Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	1	1	1

* "Misassignments" refers to the number of positions filled by teachers who lack legal authorization to teach that grade level, subject area, student group, etc. Total Teacher Misassignments includes the number of Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners.

Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers

2015-16 Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers		
Location of Classes	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
This School	98.1	1.9
Districtwide		
All Schools	94.0	6.0
High-Poverty Schools	94.0	6.0
Low-Poverty Schools	0.0	0.0

* High-poverty schools are defined as those schools with student eligibility of approximately 40 percent or more in the free and reduced price meals program. Low-poverty schools are those with student eligibility of approximately 39 percent or less in the free and reduced price meals program.

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2016-17)

The main fact about textbooks that the Williams legislation calls for described whether schools have books in core classes for all students. The law also asks districts to reveal whether those books are what the California content standards calls for. This information is far more meaningful when along with the more detailed description of textbooks contained in our School Accountability Report Card (SARC). There you'll find the names of the textbooks used in our core classes, their dates of publication, the names of the firms that published them, and more

Textbooks and Instructional Materials Year and month in which data were collected: September 16, 2016	
Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/Year of Adoption
Reading/Language Arts	ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS K-12 Teacher developed Units of Study aligned to Common Core State Standards Adopted in 2014 The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0
Mathematics	K-8 Math, Algebra I & Geometry Teacher developed Units of Study aligned to Common Core State Standards Adopted in 2014 The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0
Science	FOSS (Full Option Science System) Adopted in 2007 CK-12 Earth Science Adopted in 2016 CK-12 Life Science Adopted in 2016 CK-12 Physical Science Adopted in 2016 The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0
History-Social Science	K-5 Scott Foresman Adopted in 2006 6-8 Glencoe: Discovering Our Past Adopted in 2006 The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

The main building of Madison School was originally built in 1950. Portable classrooms were added at various times to accommodate a growing enrollment. The school exterior was painted in 2008.

Maintenance and Repair

District maintenance staff ensures that the repairs necessary to keep the school in good repair and working order are completed in a timely manner. A work order process is used to ensure efficient service and that emergency repairs are given the highest priority.

Cleaning Process and Schedule

A scheduled maintenance program is administered by the district to ensure that all classrooms, restrooms, and facilities are well-maintained and in good repair. The principal works daily with the custodial staff to develop cleaning schedules to ensure a clean and safe school.

More facts about the condition of our school buildings are available in an online supplement to this report called for by the Williams legislation of 2004. What you will find is an assessment of more than a dozen aspects of our buildings: their structural integrity, electrical systems, heating and ventilation systems, and more. The important purpose of this assessment is to determine if our buildings and grounds are safe and in good repair. If anything needs to be repaired, this assessment identifies it and targets a date by which we commit to make those repairs. The guidelines for this assessment were written by the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) and were brought about by the Williams legislation. You can look at the six-page Facilities Inspection Tool used for the assessment on the Web site of the OPSC.

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)
Year and month in which data were collected: 6/15/2016

System Inspected	Repair Status				Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor		
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	X				
Interior: Interior Surfaces			X		boys/girls restrooms multipurpose: cracks on ceiling girls restroom,broken floor tile by door in boys restroom. Kitchen/Multi/Purpose: broken floor tile,loose and missing ceiling tile. overall: loose ceiling tile in hallways,ramps on portable need to be repainted trees in front of school need to be trimmed. p- 12-15: carpet torn. p- 1-3: broken floor tile,loose and missing ceiling tile. Overhang has wood rot and paint peeling. p-11: rips on walls. rm 12: rips on wlass,stained ceiling tile. rm 18: rips on walls rm 24: rips on walls
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	X				
Electrical: Electrical	X				
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	X				
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	X				
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs		X			overall: loose ceiling tile in hallways,ramps on portable need to be repainted trees in front of school need to be trimmed. p- 1-3: broken floor tile,loose and missing ceiling tile. Overhang has wood rot and paint peeling. rm 8: plaster around door trim broken.
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	X				
Overall Rating	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor	
			X		

B. Pupil Outcomes

State Priority: Pupil Achievement

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Pupil Achievement (Priority 4):

- Statewide assessments (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress [CAASPP] System, which includes the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for students in the general education population and the California Alternate Assessments [CAAs] for English language arts/literacy [ELA] and mathematics given in grades three through eight and grade eleven. The CAAs have replaced the California Alternate Performance Assessment [CAPA] for ELA and mathematics, which were eliminated in 2015. Only eligible students may participate in the administration of the CAAs. CAA items are aligned with alternate achievement standards, which are linked with the Common Core State Standards [CCSS] for students with significant cognitive disabilities); and
- The percentage of students who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and the California State University, or career technical education sequences or programs of study

2015-16 CAASPP Results for All Students						
Subject	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standards (grades 3-8 and 11)					
	School		District		State	
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
ELA	13	11	24	25	44	48
Math	9	10	18	21	34	36

* Percentages are not calculated when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

CAASPP Results for All Students - Three-Year Comparison									
Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	13-14	14-15	15-16	13-14	14-15	15-16	13-14	14-15	15-16
Science	25	24	24	31	29	30	60	56	54

* Science test results include California Standards Tests (CSTs), California Modified Assessment (CMA), and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) in grades five, eight, and ten. Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Grade Level	2015-16 Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	4 of 6	5 of 6	6 of 6
5	19.2	10.3	
7	23.3	13.3	6.7

* Percentages are not calculated when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

2015-16 CAASPP Results by Student Group Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)				
Group	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
	Enrolled	with Valid Scores	w/ Valid Scores	Proficient or Advanced
All Students	173	163	94.2	23.9
Male	90	81	90.0	25.9
Female	83	82	98.8	22.0
Black or African American	25	24	96.0	25.0
Asian	11	11	100.0	27.3
Hispanic or Latino	100	94	94.0	20.2
White	27	24	88.9	45.8
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	103	98	95.2	18.4
English Learners	19	17	89.5	5.9

* Science test results include CSTs, CMA, and CAPA in grades five, eight, and ten. The "Proficient or Advanced" is calculated by taking the total number of students who scored at Proficient or Advanced on the science assessment divided by the total number of students with valid scores. Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

School Year 2015-16 CAASPP Assessment Results - English Language Arts (ELA)
Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
All Students	3	103	100	97.1	1.0
	4	85	83	97.7	14.5
	5	87	84	96.5	19.3
	6	64	62	96.9	11.3
	7	62	61	98.4	16.4
	8	91	87	95.6	9.2
Male	3	56	55	98.2	1.8
	4	47	46	97.9	13.0
	5	45	42	93.3	14.6
	6	37	35	94.6	5.7
	7	28	28	100.0	14.3
	8	49	46	93.9	2.2
Female	3	47	45	95.7	
	4	38	37	97.4	16.2
	5	42	42	100.0	23.8
	6	27	27	100.0	18.5
	7	34	33	97.1	18.2
	8	42	41	97.6	17.1
Black or African American	3	16	15	93.8	
	5	14	14	100.0	7.1
	7	11	11	100.0	
	8	12	11	91.7	
Hispanic or Latino	3	62	60	96.8	
	4	52	51	98.1	17.6
	5	52	50	96.2	18.0
	6	35	33	94.3	6.1
	7	33	32	97.0	9.4
	8	51	49	96.1	4.1
White	4	15	14	93.3	7.1
	5	11	10	90.9	33.3
	6	11	11	100.0	9.1
	8	17	16	94.1	25.0
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	3	67	64	95.5	
	4	47	46	97.9	10.9
	5	50	49	98.0	16.7
	6	36	34	94.4	8.8
	7	34	33	97.1	12.1
	8	55	53	96.4	3.8

School Year 2015-16 CAASPP Assessment Results - English Language Arts (ELA)
Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
English Learners	3	18	18	100.0	
	4	15	15	100.0	
	5	11	11	100.0	

ELA test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The "Percent Met or Exceeded" is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments. Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy. The number of students tested includes all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using only students who received scores.

School Year 2015-16 CAASPP Assessment Results - Mathematics
Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
All Students	3	104	101	97.1	5.9
	4	85	84	98.8	16.7
	5	87	84	96.5	17.9
	6	64	63	98.4	8.1
	7	62	61	98.4	8.2
	8	62	61	98.4	8.2
Male	3	56	55	98.2	7.3
	4	47	47	100.0	19.1
	5	45	42	93.3	21.4
	6	37	36	97.3	5.7
	7	28	28	100.0	7.1
	8	28	28	100.0	7.1
Female	3	48	46	95.8	4.3
	4	38	37	97.4	13.5
	5	42	42	100.0	14.3
	6	27	27	100.0	11.1
	7	34	33	97.1	9.1
	8	34	33	97.1	9.1
Black or African American	3	16	15	93.8	6.7
	5	14	14	100.0	14.3
	7	11	11	100.0	9.1
	8	11	11	100.0	9.1

School Year 2015-16 CAASPP Assessment Results - Mathematics
Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
Hispanic or Latino	3	63	61	96.8	
	4	52	51	98.1	19.6
	5	52	50	96.2	18.0
	6	35	34	97.1	3.0
	7	33	32	97.0	3.1
	8	33	32	97.0	3.1
White	4	15	15	100.0	
	5	11	10	90.9	20.0
	6	11	11	100.0	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	3	68	65	95.6	3.1
	4	47	46	97.9	19.6
	5	50	49	98.0	18.4
	6	36	35	97.2	2.9
	7	34	33	97.1	9.1
	8	34	33	97.1	9.1
English Learners	3	19	19	100.0	
	4	15	15	100.0	
	5	11	11	100.0	

Mathematics test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The "Percent Met or Exceeded" is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments. Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy. The number of students tested includes all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using only students who received scores.

C. Engagement

State Priority: Parental Involvement

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Parental Involvement State Priority (Priority 3):

- Efforts the school district makes to seek parent input in making decisions for the school district and each schoolsite.

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2016-17)

Madison School recognizes that parents and the community play an important role in the success and education of their students. Partnerships are established with community businesses and organizations to increase parent participation. Several opportunities and programs are offered to encourage parent involvement.

- After School Programs
- Counseling services when available
- English Language Parent Involvement Committee (ELPIC)
- English Language Learner instruction and support (ELD)
- Parent/Student conferences when possible
- Parent/Teacher organizations (PTSA)
- School Site Council (SSC)

Madison believes that the parents and guardians can support the learning environment of the school and their students by:

- Monitoring student attendance
- Monitoring completion of student homework
- Participating in the decision making process in school organizations and committees

- Planning and participating in activities at home that support classroom learning
- Volunteering in the classroom

Parents and community members who wish to become a part of the school community and participate should call the school's office.

State Priority: School Climate

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the School Climate State Priority (Priority 6):

- Pupil suspension rates;
- Pupil expulsion rates; and
- Other local measures on the sense of safety.

School Safety Plan

Our school places a strong emphasis on ensuring the safety of all students and staff members. The school's custodial team ensures the school facilities are in compliance with all federal and state health and safety regulations. Each year a deep cleaning process occurs during a close of school, during the summer or other extended breaks. In the event of a facility plant emergency, the principal notifies appropriate site and district personnel to resolve the emergency and safely secure or evacuate the students, based upon the site and district emergency preparedness plans. A site review with the district Internal Evaluation Instrument (IEI) occurs annually.

A comprehensive School Safety Plan helps to provide a secure, peaceful and clean environment for the school community. The school's Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools (REMS) Plan identifies procedures to follow during emergencies and natural disasters. Emergency drills are conducted on a regular basis. Our safety plan is reviewed and updated every year in Aug. This year our plan was updated on Aug 20, 2016.

Every effort is made to ensure students are monitored while on campus throughout the school day. Yard supervisors, security monitors, teachers, site administrators and school staff provide supervision for students before, during and after school. The playground is safe for all students. All visitors must sign in at the office, present photo identification and receive proper authorization to be on campus, and must display their passes at all times.

Suspensions and Expulsions			
School	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Suspensions Rate	13.6	20.0	19.2
Expulsions Rate	0.1	0.0	0.1
District	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Suspensions Rate	10.1	9.4	9.4
Expulsions Rate	0.1	0.1	0.1
State	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Suspensions Rate	4.4	3.8	3.7
Expulsions Rate	0.1	0.1	0.1

D. Other SARC Information

The information in this section is required to be in the SARC but is not included in the state priorities for LCFF.

2016-17 Federal Intervention Program		
Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status	In PI	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement	2003-2004	2004-2005
Year in Program Improvement	Year 5	Year 3
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	50	
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	86.2	

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff at this School	
Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	
Academic Counselor	0
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	1.0
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	0.04
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0
Psychologist	0.50
Social Worker	0.09
Nurse	0.20
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	0.50
Resource Specialist	0.60
Other	0.75
Average Number of Students per Staff Member	
Academic Counselor	0

* One Full Time Equivalent (FTE) equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time.

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)												
Grade	Average Class Size			Number of Classrooms*								
				1-20			21-32			33+		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
K	20	23	24	4	1	0	1	3	3			0
1	26	29	29	1		0	3	4	2			0
2	26	30	27	1		0	4	4	3			0
3	28	20	31	1	3	0	3	3	3			0
4	26	28	24	1		0		4	3	2		0
5	24	27	25	1	1	0	1	2	3	1		0
6	27	22	28	1	1	0	3	2	2			0
Other	12	12		2	2							

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)												
Subject	Average Class Size			Number of Classrooms*								
				1-22			23-32			33+		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
English												
Mathematics	30						1					
Science												
Social Science												

* Number of classes indicates how many classrooms fall into each size category (a range of total students per classroom). At the secondary school level, this information is reported by subject area rather than grade level.

Professional Development provided for Teachers

The primary staff development focus was on the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) Units of Study developed by SUSD teachers through the Rigorous Curriculum Design Process. The content was selected due to the full implementation of the CCSS in California in 2014-2015 and the related CAASPP state assessment to be implemented in spring of 2015. Data from the CAASPP is being analyzed and compared using the internal assessment system or measure called Measurement of Academic Process (MAP).

Professional development in the core standards and units of instruction was initially provided through full day off site professional development training sessions. Two full day sessions were provided in 2014-2015 and two are planned for 2015-2016. Additionally, onsite coaching is provided. For the 2016-2017 school year professional development is on a multi-tiered system of support. Additionally, there is a focus to ensure that new staff understand the complexities of the units of study and how to teach them. All staff is allotted 3 full days of professional development and support.

On-going teacher support is provided through site-based instructional coach, program specialist, instructional rounds, training and implantation of intervention programs, staff PLC collaboration meetings, data team meetings. Additional training is being provided by supporting staff where needed.

FY 2014-15 Teacher and Administrative Salaries		
Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$42,226	\$45,092
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$64,239	\$71,627
Highest Teacher Salary	\$80,927	\$93,288
Average Principal Salary (ES)	\$107,767	\$115,631
Average Principal Salary (MS)		\$120,915
Average Principal Salary (HS)	\$115,639	\$132,029
Superintendent Salary	\$230,000	\$249,537
Percent of District Budget		
Teacher Salaries	34%	37%
Administrative Salaries	5%	5%

* For detailed information on salaries, see the CDE Certificated Salaries & Benefits webpage at www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/.

Types of Services Funded

The following is a list of Federal and State funded programs that may be available to schools in the district:

- Title I Helping Disadvantaged Students Meet Standards
- Title I Homeless
- Title I Migrant Education
- Title II Improving Teacher Quality
- Title III Limited English Proficient Students
- Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA)
- Extended Day Programs
- English Language Acquisition Program (ELAP)

DataQuest

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE DataQuest Web page at <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/> that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district and the county. Specifically, DataQuest is a dynamic system that provides reports for accountability (e.g., test data, enrollment, high school graduates, dropouts, course enrollments, staffing, and data regarding English learners).

Internet Access

Internet access is available at public libraries and other locations that are publicly accessible (e.g., the California State Library). Access to the Internet at libraries and public locations is generally provided on a first-come, first-served basis. Other use restrictions may include the hours of operation, the length of time that a workstation may be used (depending on availability), the types of software programs available on a workstation, and the ability to print documents.

FY 2014-15 Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries				
Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Restricted	Unrestricted	
School Site	6664.14	2152.15	4511.98	64426.41
District	◆	◆	6920.96	\$65,674
State	◆	◆	\$5,677	\$75,837
Percent Difference: School Site/District			-34.8	-16.7
Percent Difference: School Site/ State			-33.7	-21.4

* Cells with ◆ do not require data.