

Portola Hills Elementary School

19422 Saddleback Ranch Road • Trabuco Canyon CA, 92679 • (949) 459-9370 • Grades K-6

Mary Anderson, Principal
Mary.Anderson@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

Portola Hills Elementary School is preparing students for their future. Our balanced programs build skills in critical thinking, problem solving, creativity, and collaboration. We provide students with the technical and communication skills and the positive values that will allow them to be productive and successful citizens. We challenge and empower our students to strive for excellence and to improve their own lives and the lives of others.

In order to attain these goals, we will provide instruction based on Common Core State Standards in all subjects. We also focus on technology and arts instruction. We are continuing our dance program for all students and we have many classrooms that are equipped with SMART Boards and have over 165 Chromebooks for student use. We will assess student progress regularly, using a variety of assessment tools. The Portola Hills staff is committed to providing an outstanding educational program that meets the individual needs of students.

Mary Anderson, 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) 459-9370.

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Grade Level	
Grade Level	Number of Students
Kinder.	100
Gr. 1	111
Gr. 2	123
Gr. 3	110
Gr. 4	116
Gr. 5	114
Gr. 6	103
Total	777

2013-14 Student Enrollment by Group	
Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	1.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.1
Asian	8.8
Filipino	1.8
Hispanic or Latino	15.1
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.0
White	63.8
Two or More Races	8.2
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	8.5
English Learners	5.4
Students with Disabilities	17.1

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			
Portola Hills Elementary School	12-13	13-14	14-15
Fully Credentialed		30	31
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			
Portola Hills 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)

Our school was built in 1992. Our permanent and portable structures are configured to provide traditional classroom settings. Three portables house childcare and preschool programs. A security alarm system protects our site. All playground equipment meets state safety codes. We regularly upgrade our facilities as needed and maintain our buildings and campus well. A new rest room for students and staff was built near the field. This not only provides for the needs of students and staff during the school day, but it also is used by community organizations after school and on weekends. Renovation of the field was completed in the 2011–2012 school year. Pending projects include purchasing and installing more SMART Boards in classrooms and razing and removing Building E.

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: 10-13-14

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]	[]	[]	
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	[X]	[]	[]	Stained/missing ceiling tiles, to be replaced by custodian.
Electrical: Electrical	[X]	[]	[]	Burnt out light bulbs, to be replaced by custodian
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	[X]	[]	[]	Sink and drinking fountain not working, to be repaired by plumber.
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	[X]	[]	[]	Missing fire extinguishers, to be replaced by custodian.
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	[X]	[]	[]	
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	[X]	[]	[]	Doors need painting, to be repainted by painter.
Overall Rating	Exemplary	Good	Fair	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	92	85	92	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	84	87	87	71	74	71	54	56	55
Math	84	87	87	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	10	10	10
Similar Schools	8	8	7

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

2013-14 Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards

Grade Level	2013-14 Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	4 of 6	5 of 6	6 of 6
5	13.0	28.7	46.3

* 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	92	
Male	96	
Female	89	
Black or African American		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian		
Filipino		
Hispanic or Latino	72	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander		
White	96	
Two or More Races		
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	83	
English Learners		
Students with Disabilities	76	
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	6	5	-4
Black or African American			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Filipino			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			
White	6	3	-7
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

Portola Hills is fortunate to have strong community support. Our PTA sponsors fund-raisers to provide additional learning opportunities, including a resident artist in dance; the Art Masters program; additional classroom materials; computer software and hardware; and financial support for staff in the computer lab, and the health office. Equally valuable is the time our parents contribute as classroom volunteers and chaperones for field trips. Volunteers assist our teachers and staff to help enrich students' classroom experiences, and they support family- and school-related programs and special projects. The PTA also provides family fun nights on a regular basis. The contact person for parent involvement is Jill Nogle, and she can be contacted through the PTA website at: www.portolahillspta.org.

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

We review our School Safety Plan each year with staff, the PTA, and the SSC. The plan assesses the status of our environment, school rules, policies relating to suspension and expulsion, sexual harassment procedures, child-abuse reporting, and school disaster procedures. We practice monthly fire drills and twice yearly disaster and lock down drills. We have provided students and staff with an extensive store of emergency supplies and equipment as well as enough food and water to shelter students for up to 72 hours.

Suspensions and Expulsions

School	11-12	12-13	13-14
Suspensions Rate	0.2	0.4	0.8
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)	
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.	22.8	19	25	2	3	1	3	3	3	0		
Gr. 1	31	30	22	0		2	4	4	3	0		
Gr. 2	28.8	26	15	0		5	4	4	3	0		
Gr. 3	28.3	29	18	0		3	4	4	3	0		
Gr. 4	33.3	26	23	0	2	2	0			3	2	3
Gr. 5	32.4	25	23	0	2	2	3			2	2	3
Gr. 6	35	30	26	0	1	1	0			3	3	3

* 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	\$4,233	\$73	\$4,160	\$85,191
District	♦	♦	\$4,644	\$77,428
State	♦	♦	\$4,690	\$70,720
Percent Difference: School Site/District			-23%	-2%
Percent Difference: School Site/ State			-28%	-19%

Types of Services Funded at Portola Hills 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 Portola Hills Elementary School

One teacher at each grade level participated in Arts Advantage, which provided three days of fine arts training. All teachers had the opportunity to receive training in using data to drive instruction. Teachers received several training sessions in using SMART Boards and related technology. All teachers were trained in English Language instructional techniques. Teachers meet regularly in grade-level teams to review student work, plan instruction, and review teaching strategies. Our focus areas are instruction, music, and technology.