



Monroe Elementary

2236 E. Eleventh St. • Stockton, CA 95206 • (209) 933-7250 • Grades K-8

Mary Lou Rios, Principal
mlrios@stocktonusd.net

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**

Principal's Message

Monroe enjoys a rich history of academic and cultural excellence that is the result of a collegial partnership between the school staff and parents who provide a diversity of experiences for the students.

As the principal of Monroe K-8 School, my leadership is filled with exciting challenges that not only align with the district's initiatives, but will refine our school wide focus towards becoming a high-performing school. Our school is a K-8 school with full-day kindergarten and Preschool classes. Our goal is to provide an academically rigorous learning environment with mastery of the Common Core grade level standards in reading, writing, and mathematics which forms the foundation of the instructional program for all of our students. We continue to maximize our instructional minutes through targeted instruction and implementation of research-based instructional strategies. Monroe Teachers continue to grow professionally as they attend on-going Professional Learning Community site team meetings, teacher collaboration, district staff development and receive in class support from the Instructional Specialist, Assistant Principal and Principal. Common Formative assessments, benchmark tests and the Diagnostic Reading Assessment are given to students throughout the year to monitor their academic progress, and the data is used to academically group students and drive teachers' instruction to meet the needs of our Monroe students. The Administrator and Monroe's MTSS Team provide a safe and orderly campus where your student may focus his/her energy on learning. We will also provide instructional support to our staff in order for them to have what they need to teach effectively. All students have the opportunity to meet their maximum potential with the guidance and support of Monroe School's fully trained teachers and support staff. Monroe's K-8 School is currently AVID certified to support student learning and close the achievement gap by preparing all students for college readiness and success in a global society.

Monroe continues to build a strong collaboration and partnerships with our parents and families of the students we teach. Parents involvement and participation is needed and valued. Communication is a vital component to the success of our students. Information can be found on our website, bulletins, weekly communicator folders with notices, parent messenger and marquee. Monroe looks forward to working with you to create new opportunities and new accomplishments for our students this year.

Together we will promote a powerful, cohesive partnership which actively involves faculty, students, parents, and the community.

Mary Lou Rios, PRINCIPAL

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	71
Grade 1	61
Grade 2	59
Grade 3	61
Grade 4	63
Grade 5	64
Grade 6	64
Grade 7	63
Grade 8	32
Total Enrollment	538

2015-16 Student Enrollment by Group	
Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	9.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.7
Asian	10.8
Filipino	1.7
Hispanic or Latino	74.3
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0
White	1.5
Two or More Races	0.9
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	93.3
English Learners	45.2
Students with Disabilities	7.6
Foster Youth	1.1

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			
Monroe Elementary	14-15	15-16	16-17
With Full Credential	18	19	20
Without Full Credential	0	1	3
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	0	0	2
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			
Monroe Elementary	14-15	15-16	16-17
Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

* "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	100.0	0.0
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	<p>ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS K-12 Teacher developed Units of Study aligned to Common Core State Standards Adopted in 2014</p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0</p>
Mathematics	<p>K-8 Math, Algebra I & Geometry Teacher developed Units of Study aligned to Common Core State Standards Adopted in 2014</p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0</p>
Science	<p>FOSS (Full Option Science System) Adopted in 2007</p> <p>CK-12 Earth Science Adopted in 2016</p> <p>CK-12 Life Science Adopted in 2016</p> <p>CK-12 Physical Science Adopted in 2016</p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0</p>
History-Social Science	<p>K-5 Scott Foresman Adopted in 2006</p> <p>6-8 Glencoe: Discovering Our Past Adopted in 2006</p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0</p>

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

Age of buildings

Each school site has classrooms, a multipurpose room, a library and an administration building. The number of classrooms at each school site varies, depending on enrollment and available space. Several sites have portable class rooms to accommodate increased enrollment.

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.

The custodians will check all common areas for cleanliness and vandalism.

The common areas will be cleaned daily by the school custodians, and maintained by students through site expectations.

Noon duty supervisors will assist in the preparation and cleaning of the cafeteria.

The Campus Safety Assistant (CSA) will assist in the maintenance of behavior and number of infractions in the hallways, restrooms, and playground.

Staff assigned for yard and after school duty will assist in enforcing rules and procedures on the playground and in common areas.

Students and staff will take responsibility for maintaining safe, clean, and litter/graffiti-free common areas.

Daily communication between the Principal and Head Custodian to ensure the site physical plant is maintained appropriately. Any deficiency noted on the site inspection will be put into a work order, with attention to the

Risk Management Department.

Monroe has an annual visit from the San Joaquin County Office of Education to conduct Williams Act visit monitoring curriculum and the physical environment for compliance purpose.

The campus will be secured daily, with one main entrance which is monitored by office staff.

Check-in procedures for all visitors will be in place, complete with sign in logs, visitor badges, and Megan's

Law clearance for volunteers.

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: 6/7/2016				
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: boys&girls restroom by café doors need to be painted, girls restroom by rm-16 paint peeling on ceiling,crack wall tile. kitchen/ Multi/purpose: loose ceiling tile. P 21: rips on walls,missing outlet cover. P 31: rips on walls,carpet torn,outside northwall rotten. rm 15: walls need to be painted, loose ceiling rm 17: missing base board,walls and doors and cabinets need to be painted,missing conduit on south walls. rm 2: hole on west wall,counter top needs to be glue, loor tile seperating. rm 5: loose ceiling tile, floor tile separating. rm 9: walls need to be painted.
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	X			
Electrical: Electrical		X		P 21: rips on walls,missing outlet cover. rm 17: missing base board,walls and doors and cabinets need to be painted,missing conduit on south walls.
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	X			rm 17: missing base board,walls and doors and cabinets need to be painted,missing conduit on south walls.
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	X			

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year) Year and month in which data were collected: 6/7/2016					
System Inspected	Repair Status				Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor		
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs		X			P 31: rips on walls, carpet torn, outside northwall rotten. rm 2: hole on west wall, counter top needs to be glue, loor tile seperating. rm 5: loose ceiling tile, floor tile separating.
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences		X			overall: walkways and playground asphalt has cracks
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	15	17	24	25	44	48
Math	11	14	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	18	21	27	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	22.6	22.6	30.6
7	17.7	30.6	22.6

* 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	98	96	98.0	27.1
Male	44	43	97.7	30.2
Female	54	53	98.2	24.5
Asian	12	12	100.0	41.7
Hispanic or Latino	74	72	97.3	25.0
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	52	50	96.2	28.0
English Learners	25	25	100.0	

* 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	62	60	96.8	5.0
	4	64	62	96.9	9.7
	5	66	63	95.5	15.9
	6	64	61	95.3	21.3
	7	63	63	100.0	22.2
	8	32	32	100.0	37.5
Male	3	36	34	94.4	5.9
	4	34	33	97.1	6.1
	5	34	32	94.1	12.5
	6	34	32	94.1	9.4
	7	34	34	100.0	17.6
Female	3	26	26	100.0	3.9
	4	30	29	96.7	13.8
	5	32	31	96.9	19.4
	6	30	29	96.7	34.5
	7	29	29	100.0	27.6
	8	22	22	100.0	36.4
Hispanic or Latino	3	43	42	97.7	2.4
	4	54	53	98.2	5.7
	5	50	47	94.0	14.9
	6	49	47	95.9	25.5
	7	44	44	100.0	22.7
	8	24	24	100.0	41.7

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
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	3	41	40	97.6	7.5
	4	38	37	97.4	10.8
	5	37	35	94.6	17.1
	6	44	41	93.2	19.5
	7	40	40	100.0	20.0
	8	15	15	100.0	33.3
English Learners	3	22	20	90.9	
	4	25	25	100.0	
	5	19	18	94.7	
	6	18	17	94.4	5.9
	7	19	19	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	62	62	100.0	8.1
	4	64	62	96.9	21.0
	5	66	64	97.0	14.3
	6	64	61	95.3	11.5
	7	63	63	100.0	17.5
	8	63	63	100.0	17.5
Male	3	36	36	100.0	5.6
	4	34	33	97.1	24.2
	5	34	33	97.1	12.5
	6	34	32	94.1	9.4
	7	34	34	100.0	17.6
	8	34	34	100.0	17.6
Female	3	26	26	100.0	11.5
	4	30	29	96.7	17.2
	5	32	31	96.9	16.1
	6	30	29	96.7	13.8
	7	29	29	100.0	17.2
	8	29	29	100.0	17.2

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	43	43	100.0	9.3
	4	54	53	98.2	17.0
	5	50	48	96.0	14.9
	6	49	47	95.9	10.6
	7	44	44	100.0	15.9
	8	44	44	100.0	15.9
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	3	41	41	100.0	7.3
	4	38	37	97.4	21.6
	5	37	35	94.6	14.3
	6	44	41	93.2	7.3
	7	40	40	100.0	17.5
	8	40	40	100.0	17.5
English Learners	3	22	22	100.0	4.5
	4	25	25	100.0	4.0
	5	19	19	100.0	
	6	18	17	94.4	
	7	19	19	100.0	
	8	19	19	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)

Parents receive notification on student progress through weekly reports from classroom Dojo website, quarterly progress reports and quarterly standardized report cards. Standards and research-based instruction information is provided to parents during Back-to-School-Night, ELPIC meetings, Parent Coffee Connection meetings, and Parent Conferences or Workshops. Students are included during meetings by presenting class projects, skits, songs for parents to demonstrate the on-going learning in the classroom and increase parent participation during parent meetings. Themed-event nights: As Literacy Night and Science and Math Night and community sponsored events are also used as incentive to get parents more involved at Monroe. Monroe's Renaissance Awards Assemblies are held quarterly to celebrate student achievement. Announcements and important information are communicated via School Messenger, an automated phone dialer system, weekly communicator with notices and Principal's Monthly Newsletter. Home contact and home visits are made by the counselor, teachers, administrators, office staff, and specialists.

Monroe' teachers offer workshop classes for parents. Encourages and supports district parent training which empowers parents with the skills to create a home environment with structure and discipline that promotes learning. Also provides parents with skills, resources, and books for building Family Literacy.

Title I Parent Education is facilitated by the Instructional Specialist. Through the Parent Coffee Connection, which is held once a quarter educates parents in academic, behavior, and social development. Parent Coffee Connection is provided to parents in both English and Spanish. Community agencies and other family resources provide information and training. The Parent Involvement Policy is located in the Analysis of Current Instruction section of the Single Plan for Student Achievement. A parent/student/teacher three-way compact is sent home at the beginning of each year for parents and students to sign and return. Parents and community members who wish to become a part of the school community and participate should call the school's office.

Parents and community members who wish to become a part of the school community and participate are encouraged to 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

Monroe updated its REMS Safety Plan August 2016 to adjust to the reduction in support staff. Monroe 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, either 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, which was reviewed on 5/13/16 by the School Site Council, helps to provide a secure, peaceful and clean environment for the school community. The school's Disaster Preparedness Plan identifies procedures to follow during emergencies and natural disasters. Emergency drills are conducted on a regular basis.

Every effort is made to ensure students are monitored while on campus throughout the school day. Yard supervisors, teachers, site administrators and school staff provide supervision for students before and during school. The playground is safe for all students. All visitors must sign in at the office 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	9.6	4.8	9.3
Expulsions Rate	0.0	0.0	0.0
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	1997-1998	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	0.33
Social Worker	0.09
Nurse	0.20
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	0.50
Resource Specialist	0.60
Other	0.8
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	20	24	3	2	0		3	3			0
1	30	25	30		2	0	3	2	2			0
2	28	26	30		1	0	3	2	2			0
3	31	32	30			0	3	2	2		1	0
4	29	29	32			0	3	3	2			0
5	30	28	32			0	3	3	2			0
6	22	19	32	1	3	0		3	2	1		0

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	25	23	23				1	1	1			
Mathematics	24						2					
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 2014-15 and through 2015-16, 2016-17 the related CAASP state assessment to be implemented yearly in the spring of 2015, 2016 & 2017.

In building our Professional Learning Community, A total of 5 staff members have been trained in PLC June of 2015, with 6 additional staff attending PLC training in June of 2016.

To support Monroe teachers 6 staff members were sent to RTI training in 2016 to support teachers in the classroom with Tier 1 & 2 students and provide student intervention from the RTI teacher & Resource for Tier 3 students.

Professional development in the core standards and units of instruction was initially provided through 2 full days off site professional development training sessions to support Common Formative Assessments with ALS in 16-17. Two full day sessions were provided in 15-16 on PLC. A 2 hour session on RTI (Response to intervention) in 16-17 to support teachers with Tier 1,2 & 3 students.

On-going teacher support is provided through site-based Instructional Coach, staff PLC collaboration meetings, CAT(Collaborative Action Team) grade & vertical data team meetings and academic meetings 3 times a year, along with learning walks to reflect on teacher practices 3 times a year.

Monroe teachers will continue developing it's Professional Learning Community (PLC) to fully implement Common Core Units of Study, AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination). Implementation of MTSS with PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Support) and RTI (Response To Intervention) Team monitoring student growth with MAP, CFA, summative assessments and UOS Pre / Posttest.

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	5505.82	525.20	4980.62	69193.13
District	♦	♦	6920.96	\$65,674
State	♦	♦	\$5,677	\$75,837
Percent Difference: School Site/District			-28.0	-10.5
Percent Difference: School Site/ State			-19.9	-18.8

* Cells with ♦ do not require data.