

Rancho Santa Margarita Intermediate School

21931 Alma Aldea • Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688 • (949) 459-8253 • Grades 7-8

Dr. Rick Jameson, Principal
jamesonr@svusd.org
rsmintermediate.com

2014-15 School Accountability Report Card Published During the 2015-16 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

Suzie Swartz
Ginny Faye Aitkens
Dolores Winchell
Dennis Walsh
Amanda Morrell

District Administration

Dr. Clint Harwick
Superintendent
Dr. Terry Stanfill
Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources
Geri Partida
Assistant Superintendent, Business
Laura Ott
Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services
Tammy Blakely
Assistant to the Superintendent/Director, Pupil Services
Dr. Rocky Murray
Director, Secondary Education
Dr. Terry Petersen
Director, Elementary Education
Dr. Diane Lohrman
Director, Special Education/SELPA

School Description

Rancho Santa Margarita Intermediate School (RSM) is a comprehensive intermediate school serving seventh and eighth grade students. We serve the communities of Rancho Santa Margarita, Trabuco Canyon, and Foothill Ranch.

At RSM our mission is to focus on learning for all. Our staff works collaboratively to give our students a rich and meaningful educational experience that fosters a lifelong love of learning. Our students work hard, set and reach goals, develop successful interpersonal and workplace skills, and leave here better prepared for life's challenges.

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, the county, and the state. 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.

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 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 at (949) 459-8253 or the district office.

2014-15 Student Enrollment by Grade Level	
Grade Level	Number of Students
Grade 7	659
Grade 8	694
Total Enrollment	1,353

2014-15 Student Enrollment by Group	
Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	1.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2
Asian	8.4
Filipino	2.7
Hispanic or Latino	18.8
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.2
White	60.7
Two or More Races	6.7
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	13.5
English Learners	5.7
Students with Disabilities	10.1

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			
Rancho Santa Margarita Intermediate School	13-14	14-15	15-16
With Full Credential	54	56	54
Without Full Credential	0	0	0
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	0	0	0
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	13-14	14-15	15-16
With Full Credential	♦	♦	1195
Without Full Credential	♦	♦	3
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	♦	♦	0

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions at this School			
Rancho Santa Margarita	13-14	14-15	15-16
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

2014-15 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	100.0	0.0
High-Poverty Schools	100.0	0.0
Low-Poverty Schools	100.0	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 2015-16)

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: October 2015	
Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/Year of Adoption
Reading/Language Arts	<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>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0</p>
Mathematics	<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>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0</p>
Science	<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>The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0</p>
History-Social Science	<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> <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)

Our school dates from 1993. We have seven permanent structures. Included in this configuration are ten science labs, one art room, five vocational education classes, a 300-seat theater with a band room, and athletic facilities that include an indoor gymnasium, a 400-meter track, and four soccer/softball fields. Measure B bonds enabled us to renovate our fields, add video security, and provide additional shade structures to our campus for 2005–2006. In 2006–2007, we built a larger facility to house our burgeoning instrumental program and a fitness room for PE in time for the start of school in 2007–2008. In 2008–2009, we replaced fencing around the school. The school will be painted in the summer of 2015.

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: 11-2-15					
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/broken 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				
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 State priority: Pupil Achievement (Priority 4):

- Statewide assessments (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress [CAASPP], Science California Standards Tests); 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

2014-15 CAASPP Results for All Students			
Subject	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standards (grades 3-8 and 11)		
	School	District	State
ELA	66	61	44
Math	55	47	33

* 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		
	12-13	13-14	14-15	12-13	13-14	14-15	12-13	13-14	14-15
Science	88	91	90	81	80	79	59	60	56

* Results are for 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.

Grade Level	2014-15 Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	4 of 6	5 of 6	6 of 6
7	9.90	19.80	61.20

* 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.

2014-15 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	79
All Student at the School	90
Male	91
Female	87
Black or African American	--
American Indian or Alaska Native	--
Asian	96
Filipino	94
Hispanic or Latino	78
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	--
White	91
Two or More Races	100
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	73
English Learners	39
Students with Disabilities	74
Foster Youth	--

* 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 2014-15 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 Not Met	Standard Nearly Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
All Students	7	660	648	98.2	12	22	43	23
	8	687	673	98.0	11	23	47	18
Male	7	660	311	47.1	16	23	40	21
	8	687	386	56.2	12	27	45	15
Female	7	660	337	51.1	8	22	46	24
	8	687	287	41.8	8	19	50	23
Black or African American	7	660	9	1.4	--	--	--	--
	8	687	12	1.7	17	33	50	0
American Indian or Alaska Native	7	660	2	0.3	--	--	--	--
	8	687	1	0.1	--	--	--	--
Asian	7	660	55	8.3	5	16	31	47
	8	687	56	8.2	7	7	41	45
Filipino	7	660	17	2.6	29	12	29	29
	8	687	20	2.9	15	35	45	5
Hispanic or Latino	7	660	121	18.3	26	34	31	9
	8	687	124	18.0	25	31	33	10

School Year 2014-15 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 Not Met	Standard Nearly Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	7	660	2	0.3	--	--	--	--
	8	687	1	0.1	--	--	--	--
White	7	660	385	58.3	6	20	51	23
	8	687	418	60.8	7	23	51	18
Two or More Races	7	660	49	7.4	16	14	39	31
	8	687	40	5.8	8	13	58	23
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	7	660	98	14.8	28	36	33	4
	8	687	84	12.2	30	27	38	4
Students with Disabilities	7	660	65	9.8	52	31	12	5
	8	687	65	9.5	54	28	15	3
Foster Youth	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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 students that did not receive a score; 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 students with scores.

School Year 2014-15 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 Not Met	Standard Nearly Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
All Students	7	660	650	98.5	16	27	25	33
	8	687	675	98.3	21	26	23	30
Male	7	660	312	47.3	13	25	27	35
	8	687	387	56.3	21	26	21	31
Female	7	660	338	51.2	18	28	23	32
	8	687	288	41.9	20	26	25	29
Black or African American	7	660	9	1.4	--	--	--	--
	8	687	12	1.7	42	33	8	17
American Indian or Alaska Native	7	660	2	0.3	--	--	--	--
	8	687	1	0.1	--	--	--	--
Asian	7	660	56	8.5	4	16	20	61
	8	687	57	8.3	5	12	12	70
Filipino	7	660	17	2.6	18	18	24	41
	8	687	20	2.9	30	30	30	10
Hispanic or Latino	7	660	122	18.5	37	31	16	16
	8	687	125	18.2	46	26	17	10

School Year 2014-15 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 Not Met	Standard Nearly Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	7	660	2	0.3	--	--	--	--
	8	687	1	0.1	--	--	--	--
White	7	660	385	58.3	11	27	28	35
	8	687	418	60.8	15	28	25	31
Two or More Races	7	660	49	7.4	10	20	35	35
	8	687	40	5.8	10	18	30	40
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	7	660	99	15.0	37	31	19	12
	8	687	84	12.2	46	27	14	11
Students with Disabilities	7	660	65	9.8	62	22	12	5
	8	687	65	9.5	68	18	3	9
Foster Youth	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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 students that did not receive a score; 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 students with 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

Formal opportunities for parent involvement include volunteering (in the office, in classrooms, in the library, or by assisting with student activities or events), by serving on an official school committee, such as our School Site Council (SSC) or English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC), or by joining RSM's Student-Teacher-Parent-Organization (STPO) or Music Boosters Organization. Informal opportunities include attending school events, such as Back-to-School Night, Open House, and parent education nights or student recognition ceremonies, as well as constructively communicating with teachers, supporting and complying with school and district policies, and staying abreast of school activities by reading our weekly newsletter and staff communications on student progress. The contact person for parent involvement is Jane Pinniger, Office Manager.

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 comprehensive safety plan in the fall of each year. This plan ensures a safe and orderly school environment and outlines school rules and procedures, crime and disaster procedures, and policies about acceptance or dismissal of students. In addition to practicing regular drills, including an evacuation drill on the first day of school, we maintain emergency supplies and train our staff in emergency procedures. Two part-time campus supervisors monitor the campus daily.

Suspensions and Expulsions			
School	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Suspensions Rate	3.53	2.62	2.25
Expulsions Rate	0.06	0.14	0.36
District	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Suspensions Rate	2.89	1.89	1.70
Expulsions Rate	0.11	0.18	0.15
State	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Suspensions Rate	5.07	4.36	3.80
Expulsions Rate	0.13	0.10	0.09

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.

2014-15 Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria			
AYP Criteria	School	District	State
English Language Arts			
Met Participation Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics			
Met Participation Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient	N/A	N/A	N/A
Made AYP Overall	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Attendance Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Graduation Rate	N/A	Yes	Yes

2015-16 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		6
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement		66.7

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)												
Average Class Size				Number of Classrooms*								
				1-22			23-32			33+		
Subject	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
English	27	26	27	16	16	11	16	18	26	27	22	14
Math	31	30	25	7	7	1	15	22		28	18	1
Science	34	33	31	2	2	2	6	16	23	36	25	19
SS	33	31	29	6	6	6		7	26	40	33	14

* 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.

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff at this School	
Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	
Academic Counselor	2
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	.49
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	
Psychologist	.6
Social Worker	
Nurse	
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	.6
Resource Specialist	
Other	
Average Number of Students per Staff Member	
Academic Counselor	900

* 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.

Professional Development provided for Teachers

Staff development focuses on transitioning to the CA Common Core State Standards. Training and assistance has been developed, monitored, and funded by the school district, and includes contracting with the University of California, Irvine for Literacy training in English, history, and math. At the site level, we continue our own learning via Professional Learning Communities and the Data Teams process.

FY 2013-14 Teacher and Administrative Salaries		
Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$30,000	\$43,165
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$70,870	\$68,574
Highest Teacher Salary	\$95,849	\$89,146
Average Principal Salary (ES)	\$111,534	\$111,129
Average Principal Salary (MS)	\$120,491	\$116,569
Average Principal Salary (HS)	\$128,082	\$127,448
Superintendent Salary	\$279,692	\$234,382
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/.

Types of Services Funded

Saddleback Valley USD has identified Goals and Actions/Services to support students to be college and career ready and to demonstrate the 21st century skills of critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity.

Goal 1- Improve literacy in all content areas.

Goal 2- Improve student proficiency in all subject areas: English/Language Arts, mathematics, social sciences, science, visual and performing arts, health, physical education, world languages, and career technical education.

Goal 3- Improve access to, enrollment in and completion of a rigorous course of study.

Goal 4- Increase student engagement and parent involvement.

The District has implemented the following Actions and Services to support each Goal identified above:

- * Develop and implement school site literacy goals for all students and specific goals for students in significant subgroups.
- * Expand literacy intervention programs including prevention and early systematic intervention, appropriate materials, professional development and extended learning time options; provide focused support for students in grades 4-12 at the Intermediate Level of Proficiency at all school sites.
- * Provide appropriate, current instructional materials.
- * Provide staffing to support classrooms with Literacy Coaches/Academic Coach and ELD Coach.
- * Support continued implementation of strategies for Designated and Integrated ELD.
- * Expand intervention programs for at-risk students to prepare them for "a-g" courses.
- * Expand Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID).
- * Increase the number of "a-g" approved courses and Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate courses.
- * Expand Counseling Services.
- * Provide parent education regarding course pathways, graduation requirements, post-secondary opportunities, current academic standards; support parent participation and involvement in parent and advisory groups.

FY 2013-14 Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries				
Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Restricted	Unrestricted	
School Site	4776.85	47.50	\$4,622	\$96,656
District	◆	◆	4729.90	\$78,959
State	◆	◆	\$5,348	\$72,971
Percent Difference: School Site/District			-2.3	24.8
Percent Difference: School Site/ State			-1.4	36.7

* Cells with ◆ do not require data.