

# Foothill Ranch Elementary School

1 Torino • Foothill Ranch CA, 92610 • (949) 470-4885 • Grades K-6

Ed MacNevin, Principal  
Ed.MacNevin@svusd.org

## 2013-14 School Accountability Report Card Published During the 2014-15 School Year



### Saddleback Valley Unified School District

25631 Peter A. Hartman Way  
Mission Viejo CA, 92691  
(949) 586-1234  
www.svusd.org

#### District Governing Board

Suzy Swartz

Ginny Faye Aitkens

Dolores Winchell

Dennis Walsh

Don Sedgwick

#### District Administration

Dr. Clint Harwick  
**Superintendent**

Terry Stanfill  
**Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources**

Geri Partida  
**Assistant Superintendent, Business**

Dr. Kathy Dick  
**Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services**

Tammy Blakely  
**Assistant to the Superintendent/Director, Pupil Services**

Laura Ott  
**Director, Secondary Education**

Terry Petersen  
**Director, Elementary Education**

Diane Lohrman  
**Director, Special Education/SELPA**

### School Description

Foothill Ranch Elementary (FRE) School is committed to providing a nurturing and safe environment in which children develop a lifelong love of learning. We provide abundant and diverse opportunities for students to develop intellectually, emotionally, physically, and socially. As a Professional Development Site for California State University, Fullerton (CSUF), we have a strong commitment to meeting the needs of each student and to collaborating closely with CSUF in training student teachers.

In our efforts to provide a challenging learning environment for each student, we are continuing to provide ongoing assessments during the learning process (formative assessments), which drive our daily lesson planning. Our professional grade-level learning communities allow our teachers to plan together on a weekly basis.

Teachers integrate cutting-edge technology in both creating and delivering their daily lessons. Teachers received SMART Boards in each classroom. Our Bobcat Network News has provided us with high-quality communication and has been a great avenue to honor students for their achievements during the year.

Ed MacNevin, PRINCIPAL

## About the SARC

Every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC), by February 1 of each year. 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 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/>.
- View this SARC online at the school and/or LEA Web sites.
- 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 and community members should contact the school at (949) 470-4885.

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Grade Level	
Grade Level	Number of Students
Kinder.	156
Gr. 1	141
Gr. 2	134
Gr. 3	151
Gr. 4	166
Gr. 5	181
Gr. 6	160
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,089</b>

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Group	
Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	1.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.3
Asian	18.2
Filipino	3.0
Hispanic or Latino	13.6
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.1
White	53.9
Two or More Races	8.6
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	10.4
English Learners	8.9
Students with Disabilities	11.5

## 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			
Foothill Ranch Elementary School	12-13	13-14	14-15
<b>Fully Credentialed</b>		40	41
<b>Without Full Credential</b>		0	0
<b>Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence</b>		0	0
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	12-13	13-14	14-15
<b>Fully Credentialed</b>	♦	♦	
<b>Without Full Credential</b>	♦	♦	
<b>Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence</b>	♦	♦	

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions at this School			
Foothill Ranch Elementary	12-13	13-14	14-15
<b>Teachers of English Learners</b>	0	0	0
<b>Total Teacher Misassignments</b>	0	0	0
<b>Vacant Teacher Positions</b>	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

2013-14 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
<b>This School</b>	100.00	0.00
Districtwide		
<b>All Schools</b>	100.00	0.00
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	100.00	0.00
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	100.00	0.00

\* 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 2014-15)**

We choose textbooks and instructional materials that are aligned to state-adopted content standards consistent with state-adopted curriculum framework content and cycles. This report includes a list of some of the textbooks and instructional materials we use at our school. We have also reported additional facts about our textbooks called for by the Williams legislation of 2004. This report shows whether each student in each core course had sufficient textbooks or instructional materials that are consistent with the content and cycles of the state-adopted curriculum frameworks for those subjects.

**Textbooks and Instructional Materials**

**Year and month in which data were collected: November 2014**

Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/Year of Adoption
<p><b>Reading/Language Arts</b></p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption:      Yes</p> <p>Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook:      0</p>	<p>High Point Basics Student Book Adopted 2004</p> <p>HM Reading: A Legacy of Literature Adopted 2004</p> <p>Holt Literature and Language Arts Adopted 2004</p>
<p><b>Mathematics</b></p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption:      Yes</p> <p>Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook:      0</p>	<p>Math Expressions by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Adopted 2014</p> <p>Go Math by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Adopted 2014</p>
<p><b>Science</b></p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption:      Yes</p> <p>Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook:      0</p>	<p>Scott Foresman California Science K-5 Adopted 2008</p> <p>Prentice Hall CA Science Explorer Focus/Earth Science Adopted 2008</p>
<p><b>History-Social Science</b></p> <p>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption:      Yes</p> <p>Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook:      0</p>	<p>Reflections by Harcourt Adopted 2007</p> <p>World History, Ancient Civil./Holt, Rinehart &amp; Winston Adopted 2007</p>

### School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

Our facilities are in excellent condition. We have two instructional labs for technology. We have improved the line-up area at our portable buildings, which will improve supervision. We have a comprehensive disaster plan and a well-rehearsed fire drill line-up system.

A new security system includes strategically placed cameras, and an alarm system protects our extensive onsite technology and classroom buildings. All playground equipment meets new state safety standards.

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: 9-24-14

System Inspected	Repair Status				Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor		
<b>Systems:</b> Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	[X]	[ ]	[ ]		
<b>Interior:</b> Interior Surfaces	[X]	[ ]	[ ]		Broken ceiling tiles, to be replaced by custodian
<b>Cleanliness:</b> Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	[X]	[ ]	[ ]		
<b>Electrical:</b> Electrical	[X]	[ ]	[ ]		Burnt out light bulbs, to be replaced by custodian.
<b>Restrooms/Fountains:</b> Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	[X]	[ ]	[ ]		Broken soap dispenser, to be replaced by custodian. Urinal and toilet not flushing properly, to be repaired by plumber.
<b>Safety:</b> Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	[X]	[ ]	[ ]		
<b>Structural:</b> Structural Damage, Roofs	[X]	[ ]	[ ]		
<b>External:</b> Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	[X]	[ ]	[ ]		
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	Our school meets most or all of the standards for good repair, established by the Office of Public School Construction. If we have any deficiencies, they are not significant. We scored between 99 and 100 percent on the 15 categories of our evaluation.
	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	

## B. Pupil Outcomes

### State Priority: Pupil Achievement

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

- Statewide assessments (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress and its successor the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program);
- The Academic Performance Index; and
- The percentage of pupils 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.

#### 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		
	11-12	12-13	13-14	11-12	12-13	13-14	11-12	12-13	13-14
Science	96	94	93	79	81	81	60	59	60

\* Science (grades 5, 8, and 10) assessments include California Standards Tests (CSTs), California Modified Assessment (CMA), and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). 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.

#### STAR 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		
	10-11	11-12	12-13	10-11	11-12	12-13	10-11	11-12	12-13
ELA	80	80	79	71	74	71	54	56	55
Math	83	80	82	65	65	65	49	50	50
HSS				69	71	71	48	49	49

\* STAR Program was last administered in 2012-13. 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.

#### Academic Performance Index Ranks - Three-Year Comparison

API Rank	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Statewide	9	9	9
Similar Schools	4	2	3

\* For 2014 and subsequent years, the statewide and similar schools ranks will no longer be produced.

#### Grade Level

Grade Level	2013-14 Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	4 of 6	5 of 6	6 of 6
5	11.5	22.0	56.6

\* 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.

#### 2013-14 CAASPP Results by Student Group

Group	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced
	Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)
All Students in the LEA	81
All Student at the School	93
Male	95
Female	91
Black or African American	
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian	97
Filipino	
Hispanic or Latino	89
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	
White	93
Two or More Races	90
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	85
English Learners	
Students with Disabilities	100
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	

\* CAASPP includes science assessments (CSTs, CMA, and CAPA) in grades 5, 8, and 10. 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.

#### API Growth by Student Group – Three-Year Comparison

Group	Actual API Change		
	10-11	11-12	12-13
All Students at the School	0	0	-1
Black or African American			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian	18	4	-9
Filipino			
Hispanic or Latino	24	-21	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			
White	-1	-1	0
Two or More Races			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			
English Learners			
Students with Disabilities			

\* "N/D" means that no data were available to the CDE or LEA to report. "B" means the school did not have a valid API Base and there is no Growth or target information. "C" means the school had significant demographic changes and there is no Growth or target information

## 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

Parents serve on many important committees. New volunteers are always welcome! Our School Site Council approves our school's site plan and budget expenditures. Parents on our English Language Advisory Committee help staff make decisions that affect English Learners. Our parent organizations, the PTA, and the Foothill Kids Foundation have helped us provide new computers for our labs, LCD projectors for our teachers, books that correspond to various student reading levels, the Art Masters program, Accelerated Reader computerized comprehension tests, and many incentives for our student recognition program. They have also purchased tables, umbrellas, and library books.

### 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

District-approved safety guidelines are integrated into our school's discipline and character education plans. Our emergency committee oversees monthly safety drills and meets yearly to update our school safety plan. Monthly schoolwide broadcasts focus on safety. With Measure B funds, we have purchased safe and modern playground equipment. District maintenance and custodial staff inspect equipment regularly, and staff members supervise the playgrounds at recess.

Suspensions and Expulsions			
School	11-12	12-13	13-14
Suspensions Rate	1.6	1.3	1.2
Expulsions Rate	0.0	0.0	0.0
District	11-12	12-13	13-14
Suspensions Rate	3.3	2.9	1.9
Expulsions Rate	0.1	0.1	0.2
State	11-12	12-13	13-14
Suspensions Rate	5.7	5.1	4.4
Expulsions Rate	0.1	0.1	0.1

\* The rate of suspensions and expulsions is calculated by dividing the total number of incidents by the total enrollment x 100.

## 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.

2013-14 Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria		
AYP Criteria	School	District
Made AYP Overall		
Met Participation Rate: English-Language Arts		
Met Participation Rate: Mathematics		
Met Percent Proficient: English-Language Arts		
Met Percent Proficient: Mathematics		
Met API Criteria		

2014-15 Federal Intervention Program		
Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status		In PI
First Year of Program Improvement		2013-2014
Year in Program Improvement		Year 1
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement		7
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement		87.5

\* DW (determination waiver) indicates that the PI status of the school was carried over from the prior year in accordance with the flexibility granted through the federal waiver process.

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff at this School	
Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	
Academic Counselor	
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	1
Psychologist	1
Social Worker	
Nurse	1
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	2
Resource Specialist	
Other	
Average Number of Students per Staff Member	
Academic Counselor	

\* 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												
Average Class Size				Number of Classrooms*								
				1-20			21-32			33+		
Grade	12	13	14	12	13	14	12	13	14	12	13	14
Kinder.	30	32	26	0		2	4	4	2	0	1	2
Gr. 1	28.7	22	24	0	2	2	6	4	4	0		
Gr. 2	25.4	25	27	1	1	1	6	5	4	0		
Gr. 3	28.3	24	25	0	1	1	6	6	5	0		
Gr. 4	29.2	30	28	1	1	1	1		1	4	5	4
Gr. 5	32	27	30	0	2	1	4	1		2	3	5
Gr. 6	36	29	27	0	1	1	0	1	5	5	5	

\* 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.

FY 2012-13 Teacher and Administrative Salaries		
Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$30,000	\$41,761
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$69,313	\$66,895
Highest Teacher Salary	\$93,743	\$86,565
Average Principal Salary (ES)	\$112,050	\$108,011
Average Principal Salary (MS)	\$118,747	\$113,058
Average Principal Salary (HS)	\$127,831	\$123,217
Superintendent Salary	\$274,263	\$227,183
Percent of District Budget		
Teacher Salaries	45	38
Administrative Salaries	5	5

\* For detailed information on salaries, see the CDE Certificated Salaries & Benefits webpage at [www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/).

**FY 2012-13 Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries**

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Restricted	Unrestricted	
School Site	\$3,994	\$46	\$3,947	\$86,361
District	♦	♦	\$4,644	\$77,428
State	♦	♦	\$4,690	\$70,720
Percent Difference: School Site/District			-25%	4%
Percent Difference: School Site/ State			-29%	-13%

**Types of Services Funded at Foothill Ranch Elementary School**

The federal law known as No Child Left Behind requires that all schools and districts meet all three of the following criteria in order to attain Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):

- (a) a 95-percent participation rate on the state's tests
- (b) a CDE-mandated percentage of students scoring Proficient or higher on the state's English/language arts and mathematics tests
- (c) an API of at least 740 or growth of at least one point.

**Professional Development provided for Teachers at Foothill Ranch Elementary School**

Teachers receive training through the grade-level professional learning communities, offsite conferences, on-campus school release days, and during afterschool sessions. This year our teachers focused on reading, mathematics, and professional learning communities. Teachers meet in grade-level teams to review student work, plan instruction, and review teaching strategies. Staff development also takes place during biweekly grade-level meetings.