

Los Alisos Intermediate School

25171 Moor Ave. • Mission Viejo CA, 92691 • (949) 830-9700 • Grades 7-8

Bill Hinds, Principal
Bill.Hinds@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

The faculty and staff of Los Alisos Intermediate School are committed to providing students the finest educational experience possible. Our school philosophy is a careful blend of tradition and innovation. We emphasize giving our students a firm foundation in basic skills, and we value the importance of teaching the life skills necessary for successful living in the 21st century. We encourage our students to work collaboratively, communicate effectively, think critically and develop creative solutions to the challenges they face on the path to college and career readiness. Our school goals reflect this two-dimensional philosophy, encompassing traditional approaches in programs and classroom activities and success-oriented innovations that have proven to be effective at the middle school level.

We are firmly committed to academic excellence, with an emphasis on technological implementation. All classrooms have fully integrated presentation systems and an access ratio of 1:1 for Chromebooks and the suite of Google Applications. At Los Alisos, there is a heavy emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), including two elective offerings in addition to regular curriculum. Teachers take roll and present material using iPads that interface with their desktop computers and our wireless network. Our two-year comprehensive honors program, Model United Nations, Two-Way Immersion Program, and Knowledge Master's Organization all benefit from enhanced access to technology.

Over the past four years, Los Alisos Intermediate School has moved from Program Improvement status to California Distinguished School recognition, and we continue to innovate in the effort to refine our craft from year to year.

Bill Hinds, 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) 830-9700.

| 2013-14 Student Enrollment by Grade Level | |
|---|--------------------|
| Grade Level | Number of Students |
| Gr. 7 | 474 |
| Gr. 8 | 422 |
| Total | 896 |

| 2013-14 Student Enrollment by Group | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Group | Percent of Total Enrollment |
| Black or African American | 1.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0.2 |
| Asian | 4.6 |
| Filipino | 4.7 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 53.3 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 0.0 |
| White | 31.8 |
| Two or More Races | 3.8 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 55.8 |
| English Learners | 22.9 |
| Students with Disabilities | 11.2 |

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 | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Los Alisos Intermediate School | 12-13 | 13-14 | 14-15 |
| Fully Credentialed | | 37 | 40 |
| 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 | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Los Alisos Intermediate 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>Holt Literature and Language Arts Adopted 2004</p> <p>Scholastic Read 180 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>Big Ideas Math Course 2 by Big Ideas Learning Adopted 2014</p> <p>Glencoe Math Accelerated by McGraw-Hill Adopted 2014</p> <p>California Math Course 3 by McGraw-Hill Adopted 2014</p> <p>Algebra 1: Analyze, Connect, Explore California by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Adopted 2014</p> <p>Glencoe Geometry, Calif. Edition Adopted 2005</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>Prentice Hall CA Science Explorer: Focus/Life Science Adopted 2008</p> <p>Prentice Hall CA Science Explorer: Focus/Physical Sci. 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>World His., Med./Early Mod./Holt, Rinehart & Winston Adopted 2007</p> <p>U.S. History, Ind. to 1914 by Holt, Rinehart & Winston Adopted 2007</p> |

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

Our facilities, which were completely modernized last year, are in excellent condition. They consist of eight permanent wings and eight portables. We are able to accommodate approximately 1,250 students in 45 classrooms. We also have five computer labs, two locker rooms, two home economics labs, an art room, an instrumental music room, a choral music room, a large multipurpose room, and a gymnasium. Over the winter of 2011-12 our student restrooms were completely renovated.

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: 10-1-14

| 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] | [] | [] | | Carpet seams are showing. Will be repaired when carpet is replaced |
| Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation | [X] | [] | [] | | |
| Electrical: Electrical | [X] | [] | [] | | |
| Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains | [X] | [] | [] | | Drinking fountain has low water pressure, to be adjusted by plumber. One Sloan valve leak, to be repaired by plumber |
| 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 | 74 | 78 | 77 | 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 | 67 | 71 | 67 | 71 | 74 | 71 | 54 | 56 | 55 |
| Math | 63 | 69 | 67 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 49 | 50 | 50 |
| HSS | 64 | 70 | 69 | 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 | 8 | 9 | 8 |
| Similar Schools | 8 | 9 | 10 |

* 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 |
| 7 | 19.6 | 27.3 | 27.1 |

* 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 | 77 |
| Male | 80 |
| Female | 75 |
| Black or African American | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | |
| Asian | 93 |
| Filipino | 70 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 67 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | |
| White | 92 |
| Two or More Races | 95 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 67 |
| English Learners | 36 |
| Students with Disabilities | 50 |
| 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 | 21 | 24 | -13 |
| Black or African American | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | |
| Asian | | | |
| Filipino | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 31 | 35 | -8 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 35 | 11 | -16 |
| Two or More Races | | | |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 24 | 43 | -2 |
| English Learners | 29 | 30 | -33 |
| 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

Parent involvement is an important feature of our school and usually occurs through the PTSO or School Site Council (SSC). The SSC, which includes parent members, makes decisions about our school improvement plan and approves related budget expenditures. Our English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC) helps our Spanish-speaking parents feel welcome at our school and provides them with vital school information essential for student success. We have extensive parent outreach programs such as Grupo Crecer, Disciplina Positiva, and Parent Project, designed specifically to help parents navigate through intermediate school. These programs focus on empowering parents with knowledge and strategies that make both them and their children successful. Approximately 80 percent of our parents join the PTSO, which supports Los Alisos in many ways.

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

Los Alisos is a safe, closed campus with a minimum number of distractions each year. Teachers and administrators monitor the campus from 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., and a campus supervisor is on site each day. We have a fully developed emergency preparedness plan that we revise yearly as necessary. Each classroom also has an effective intercom system, a telephone, and email access. Los Alisos uses an effective parent/community electronic alert system in the event of a major emergency.

Suspensions and Expulsions

| School | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 |
|------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Suspensions Rate | 10.8 | 9.3 | 5.9 |
| Expulsions Rate | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.8 |
| 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 | Not in PI | 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 | 1.0 |
| Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development) | |
| Library Media Teacher (Librarian) | .49 |
| 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 |
| English | 27.6 | 28 | 27 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 12 | 14 |
| Math | 30.6 | 29 | 29 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 14 | 12 | 14 | 11 | 14 |
| Science | 30.5 | 31 | 30 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 12 | 17 | 13 | 14 | 10 |
| SS | 32.2 | 29 | 32 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 18 | 16 | 21 |

* 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 | \$5,255 | \$382 | \$4,873 | \$92,431 |
| District | ♦ | ♦ | \$4,644 | \$77,428 |
| State | ♦ | ♦ | \$4,690 | \$70,720 |
| Percent Difference: School Site/District | | | -4% | 5% |
| Percent Difference: School Site/ State | | | -10% | -13% |

Types of Services Funded at Los Alisos Intermediate 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 Los Alisos Intermediate School

Our SSC updates our school improvement and professional development plans yearly. The SSC also approves the expenditure of funds to support curriculum and staff development activities. In 2013-14 we devoted much of our site-level staff development days to improving reading and core skills in all curricular areas, improving test-taking skills, aligning curriculum with California Content Standards, and integrating technology into teacher and student projects and presentations. We also put significant effort into enhancing our professional learning community project.