

Linda Vista Elementary School

25222 Pericia Drive • Mission Viejo CA, 92691 • (949) 830-0970 • Grades K-6

Suzanne McMasters, Principal
Suzanne.McMasters@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

Supported by the partnerships of school, home, and community, Linda Vista Elementary School promotes excellence and a commitment to learning within a safe and nurturing environment that empowers every child to succeed and reach his full potential. At Linda Vista, we strive to promote the growth of the whole child by building relationships, focusing on rigorous standards-based instruction, providing professional development for staff and encouraging parent involvement.

Everything we teach is important and enriching to our students, but we give our greatest focus to the foundational skills of reading, writing, and mathematics. In 2013–2014, the staff worked to understand and use the new Common Core State Standards and supported students in meeting and exceeding our school wide writing goals.

Along with these skills, we emphasize character traits such as trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship through our school wide positive behavior system, Ropes, and student council, which foster student leadership. Linda Vista is the honored recipient of the Orange County Department of Education's Outstanding PAL program. We pride ourselves in preparing Linda Vista's students to succeed in tomorrow's world.

Suzanne McMasters, 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) 830-0970.

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Grade Level	
Grade Level	Number of Students
Kinder.	55
Gr. 1	63
Gr. 2	54
Gr. 3	56
Gr. 4	70
Gr. 5	61
Gr. 6	64
Total	423

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Group	
Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	1.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0
Asian	0.7
Filipino	2.6
Hispanic or Latino	71.6
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.2
White	21.0
Two or More Races	2.1
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	76.6
English Learners	61.7
Students with Disabilities	18.0

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			
Linda Vista Elementary School	12-13	13-14	14-15
Fully Credentialed		17	16
Without Full Credential		0	0
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence		0	0
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	12-13	13-14	14-15
Fully Credentialed	♦	♦	
Without Full Credential	♦	♦	
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	♦	♦	

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions at this School			
Linda Vista Elementary School	12-13	13-14	14-15
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

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
This School	100.00	0.00
Districtwide		
All Schools	100.00	0.00
High-Poverty Schools	100.00	0.00
Low-Poverty Schools	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>Reading/Language Arts</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>Mathematics</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>Science</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>History-Social Science</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 & Winston Adopted 2007</p>

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

The Linda Vista campus dates from 1968 and has been well maintained over the years. The facilities consist of 23 permanent classrooms in three buildings and six portable classrooms. The district childcare center uses two additional portables. All playground equipment meets new state safety standards. We recently used bond funds to improve our facilities, grounds, and equipment, including a new multiuse building consisting of three classrooms.

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: 10-9-14

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]	[]	[]		Stained ceiling tiles, to be replaced by custodian.
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	[X]	[]	[]		
Electrical: Electrical	[X]	[]	[]		Burnt out light bulbs, to be replaced by custodian.
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	[X]	[]	[]		Missing soap dispensers, to be replaced by custodian.
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	[X]	[]	[]		
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	[X]	[]	[]		
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	[X]	[]	[]		
Overall Rating	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor	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	66	65	53	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	63	59	48	71	74	71	54	56	55
Math	59	60	50	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	6	5	3
Similar Schools	7	5	4

* 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	19.0	23.8	39.7

* 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.

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	53
Male	62
Female	42
Black or African American	
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian	
Filipino	
Hispanic or Latino	38
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	
White	88
Two or More Races	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	46
English Learners	10
Students with Disabilities	
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	-4	-20	-44
Black or African American			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Filipino			
Hispanic or Latino	0	-23	-42
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			
White	0	-12	-32
Two or More Races			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	0	-20	-34
English Learners	-4	-17	-29
Students with Disabilities	31	-34	-48

* "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

Linda Vista has an active and supportive parent community. Parents volunteer extensive hours through PTA activities and committees, classroom support, lunchtime activities, and afterschool activities. Parents who work during the school day help classroom teachers by doing classroom preparatory work during evenings or weekends. Parents participate in decision making as members of SSC, ELAC, and the PTA. To find out how you can participate in school activities, please contact our office at (949) 830-0970.

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

The safety of our students is integral to our culture and essential to promoting an optimal learning environment. Campus supervisors ensure that students behave safely and positively at recess. Our procedures include a strictly enforced visitor identification system, and detailed emergency procedures are outlined in our Safe Schools Plan, which we review and revise on an annual basis. Our plan is approved annually by our SSC. The safety plan is shared with staff, students, and the community through weekly call outs, staff meetings, and community meetings. Our emergency preparedness supplies and equipment are stored in a central location. We have two practice drills a year to reinforce the safety procedures in the event of a disaster.

Suspensions and Expulsions			
School	11-12	12-13	13-14
Suspensions Rate	1.5	1.0	1.3
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	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement	2009-2010	2013-2014
Year in Program Improvement	Year 4	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)	
Psychologist	
Social Worker	
Nurse	
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	
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.	26.5	31	18	0		1	2	2	2	0		
Gr. 1	21.7	18	21	1	1	1	2	2	2	0		
Gr. 2	30	18	18	0	2	1	3	1	2	0		
Gr. 3	30	20	14	0	2	2	2	2	2	0		
Gr. 4	26	19	23	1	1	1	0	2	2	2		
Gr. 5	30	21	20	0	1	1	2	2	2	0		
Gr. 6	24.5	24	21	1	1	1	3		2	0	2	

* 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/.

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

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Restricted	Unrestricted	
School Site	\$5,377	\$629	\$4,748	\$85,889
District	♦	♦	\$4,644	\$77,428
State	♦	♦	\$4,690	\$70,720
Percent Difference: School Site/District			-17%	4%
Percent Difference: School Site/ State			-22%	-14%

Types of Services Funded at Linda Vista 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 Linda Vista Elementary School

Staff development is designed to help teachers meet achievement goals. The SSC updates our Single Plan for Student Achievement annually and establishes goals for training and curriculum that support school, district, and state goals. Our focus for the 2013–2014 school year is to improve the achievement of significant subgroups in language arts and math. Participating in Charlotte Knox techniques in the 2012–2013 school year allowed our teachers to be more focused by creating SMART (strategic, measurable, attainable, results-bound, and timely) goals in writing. In addition, our CCSS training has provided a systematic approach to standards-based instruction.

Through our staff, grade-level, and leadership team meetings, Linda Vista teachers review student work, analyze test data, refine curriculum, plan instruction, and then review instructional strategies and student progress through their professional learning communities. These meetings focus on curriculum and instruction, including differentiation and backwards design, a technique in which the results are considered first and the steps to reach these results are designed from the end to the beginning of the lesson.