

SARC 2014-15

SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT CARD

PUBLISHED DURING 2015-16



A. J. Dorsa Elementary

Address: 1290 Bal Harbor Dr. San Jose, CA 95122-1902

Principal: Devorah Duncan, Principal

Phone: (408) 928-7400

Email: devorah.duncan@arUSD.org

Web Site:

CDS Code: 43693696046114



Alum Rock Union Elementary

Superintendent: Hilaria Bauer

Phone: (408) 928-6800

Email: hilaria.bauer@arUSD.org

Web Site: www.arUSD.org



I DATA AND ACCESS

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 and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.

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., state Academic Performance Index [API], federal Adequate Yearly Progress [AYP]), 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.

II ABOUT THIS SCHOOL

District Contact Information Most Recent Year

District Name: Alum Rock Union Elementary
 Phone Number: (408) 928-6800
 Superintendent: Hilaria Bauer
 E-mail Address: hilaria.bauer@arUSD.org
 Web Site: www.arUSD.org

School Contact Information Most Recent Year

School Name: A. J. Dorsa Elementary
 Street: 1290 Bal Harbor Dr.
 City, State, Zip: San Jose, CA 95122-1902
 Phone Number: (408) 928-7400
 Principal: Devorah Duncan, Principal
 E-mail Address: devorah.duncan@arUSD.org
 Web Site:
 County-District-School
 (CDS) Code: 43693696046114

School Description and Mission Statement – Most Recent Year

Welcome to A. J. Dorsa Elementary School! We are a Professional Learning Community comprised of caring educators, high quality staff, dedicated parent volunteer leaders and supporters from outside agencies and non-profit organizations. Dorsa is a Community School.

We believe in the power of teamwork. We embrace a collaborative effort and shared accountability for the success of all students. We have an Instructional Leadership Team that includes a leader from each grade level. This ILT meets at least twice a month to review data and make instructional decisions based upon needs and successes. Our teachers plan their lessons using a collaborative process called the “Results Oriented Cycle of Inquiry” through which they look at individual student progress markers (assessments) and then plan specific actions to address student needs at their levels.

In the 2014-2015 school year, we focused on closing the gaps with our lowest students and raising the achievement of our subgroups including students with disabilities and English Language Learners. Our CELDT and other academic results showed that we were very successful at helping our long-term English Language Learners. We also focused on building a strong culture of Positive Behavior Support, especially for our most “at-risk” students. We used relationships with mentors and leadership opportunities to motivate students to do their best. We also held team meetings with partner agencies who provide counseling to create a home and school plan for emotional supports. We know our systems work because we had very few students with suspensions and the overall atmosphere on campus is overwhelmingly positive. Staff surveys show that staff feel supported and value continuing their collaboration, at all levels. Parents and caregivers show a high satisfaction overall with Dorsa school. In summary, the students, staff and community at Dorsa all worked together to sustain our highly effective school through: 1. A Clear and Shared Focus 2. High Standards and Expectations for All Students 3. Effective School Leadership 4. High Levels of Collaboration and Communication 5. Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessments Aligned with State Standards 6. Frequent Monitoring of Learning and Teaching 7. Focused Professional Development 8. Supportive Learning Environment 9. High Levels of Family and Community Involvement

Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2014-15)

Grade Level	Number of Students
Transitional Kindergarten	0
Kindergarten	78
Grade 1	82
Grade 2	80
Grade 3	108
Grade 4	80
Grade 5	72
Total Enrollment	500

Student Enrollment by Student Group (School Year 2014-15)

Student Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	0.4%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	4.4%
Filipino	1.4%
Hispanic or Latino	91.6%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1%
White	0.2%
Two or More Races	1%
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	92%
English Learners	68.4%
Students with Disabilities	11%
Foster Youth	0.4%

A. CONDITIONS OF LEARNING

STATE PRIORITY: BASIC

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Basic (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

Teachers	School 2013-14	School 2014-15	School 2015-16	District 2015-16
With Full Credential	24	23	22	568
Without Full Credential	0	0	1	14
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence (with full credential)	0	0	0	0

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

Indicator	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments*	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

NOTE: "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 (School Year 2014-15)

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
This School	92%	8%
All Schools in District	94.37%	5.63%
High-Poverty Schools in District	94.37%	5.63%
Low-Poverty Schools in District	0%	0%

NOTE: 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 – Most Recent Year

This section describes whether the textbooks and instructional materials used at the school are from the most recent adoption; whether there are sufficient textbooks and instruction materials for each student; and information about the school's use of any supplemental curriculum or non-adopted textbooks or instructional materials.

Month and year in which data were collected: January 2016

Subject	Textbooks and instructional materials/year of adoption	From most recent adoption?	% Students lacking own assigned copy
Reading/Language Arts	2008	Yes	0%
Mathematics	2008	Yes	0%
Science	2006	Yes	0%
History-Social Science	2007	Yes	0%
Foreign Language	N/A	N/A	0%
Health	N/A	N/A	0%
Visual and Performing Arts	N/A	N/A	0%
Science Laboratory Equipment (grades 9-12)	N/A	N/A	0%

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements – Most Recent Year

The District makes every effort to ensure all schools are clean, safe, and functional. To assist in this effort, the District uses a facility survey instrument developed by the State of California Office of Public School Construction. The results of this survey are available at the school office and at the district office.

Dorsa School was built in 1961. School facilities are being renovated according to the Field Act requirements of the State Building Code with a focus on earthquake safety. In the event that asbestos and lead containing building materials are found, they are removed according to Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), State, and Local requirements. Deferred maintenance funds have been used to properly maintain and renovate district buildings. Needed repairs and maintenance projects are completed in a timely manner.

School facilities support and maintain a safe, clean and secure campus. Sufficient space for classroom, office, library, playground, staff space, and restroom facilities was allocated to support stakeholders' needs and the instructional program. The Alum Rock School District maintenance staff, in conjunction with day and night custodians, ensured that the school buildings and grounds were safe, clean, and in good repair. Rigorous daily custodial schedules ensured that classrooms, lavatories, serving kitchens, eating areas, offices, and playgrounds were clean for both student and staff use. Regular oversight by District maintenance and grounds crews focused on grass and landscaped areas, and that the school's buildings, grounds and play areas were safe for use.

Dorsa works with the Neighborhood Association to hold School Beautification Days throughout the year. The facilities were reviewed by County Williams Inspectors and a District Team in August of 2015. Overall the school was in good working order.

School Facility Good Repair Status – Most Recent Year

Using the most recent FIT data (or equivalent), provide the following:

- Determination of repair status for systems listed
- Description of any needed maintenance to ensure good repair
- The year and month in which the data were collected
- The Overall Rating

Month and year in which data were collected: January 2016

System Inspected	Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned			
	Good	Fair	Poor	
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	✓	-	-	
Interior: Interior Surfaces	✓	-	-	
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	✓	-	-	
Electrical: Electrical	✓	-	-	
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	-	✓	-	
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	✓	-	-	
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	✓	-	-	
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	✓	-	-	

Overall Facility Rate – Most Recent Year

Month and year in which data were collected: January 2016

	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
Overall Rating	-	✓	-	-

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.

**California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress Results for All Students –
(School Year 2014–15)**

Subject	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standards		
	School	District	State
English Language Arts/ Literacy (grades 3-8 and 11)	28%	33%	44%
Mathematics (grades 3-8 and 11)	16%	23%	33%

NOTE: 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.

CAASPP Assessment Results – English Language Arts (ELA)

Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven (School Year 2014–15)

ELA - Grade 3

Student Groups	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Achievement			
				Level 1*	Level 2*	Level 3*	Level 4*
All Students	105	104	99%	54%	22%	16%	8%
Male	105	60	57.1%	55%	27%	15%	3%
Female	105	44	41.9%	52%	16%	18%	14%
Black or African American	105	1	1%	–	–	–	–
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian	105	6	5.7%	–	–	–	–
Filipino	105	1	1%	–	–	–	–
Hispanic or Latino	105	93	88.6%	56%	24%	14%	6%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	105	1	1%	–	–	–	–
White							
Two or More Races	105	2	1.9%	–	–	–	–
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	105	95	90.5%	55%	21%	18%	6%
English Learners	105	80	76.2%	56%	25%	15%	4%
Students with Disabilities	105	23	21.9%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services							
Foster Youth	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

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.

NOTE: 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.

- * Level 1 = Standard not met
 Level 2 = Standard nearly met
 Level 3 = Standard met
 Level 4 = Standard exceeded

ELA - Grade 4

Student Groups	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Achievement			
				Level 1*	Level 2*	Level 3*	Level 4*
All Students	82	80	97.6%	64%	14%	14%	9%
Male	82	41	50%	66%	15%	17%	2%
Female	82	39	47.6%	62%	13%	10%	15%
Black or African American							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian	82	5	6.1%	—	—	—	—
Filipino							
Hispanic or Latino	82	73	89%	67%	15%	14%	4%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	82	1	1.2%	—	—	—	—
White							
Two or More Races	82	1	1.2%	—	—	—	—
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	82	74	90.2%	68%	12%	14%	7%
English Learners	82	38	46.3%	95%	5%	0%	0%
Students with Disabilities	82	15	18.3%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	82	2	2.4%	—	—	—	—
Foster Youth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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.

NOTE: 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.

- * Level 1 = Standard not met
- Level 2 = Standard nearly met
- Level 3 = Standard met
- Level 4 = Standard exceeded

ELA - Grade 5

Student Groups	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Achievement			
				Level 1*	Level 2*	Level 3*	Level 4*
All Students	76	75	98.7%	35%	27%	31%	8%
Male	76	36	47.4%	22%	36%	36%	6%
Female	76	39	51.3%	46%	18%	26%	10%
Black or African American							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Filipino	76	2	2.6%	–	–	–	–
Hispanic or Latino	76	70	92.1%	34%	27%	31%	7%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	76	1	1.3%	–	–	–	–
White							
Two or More Races	76	2	2.6%	–	–	–	–
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	76	68	89.5%	34%	28%	29%	9%
English Learners	76	32	42.1%	50%	44%	6%	0%
Students with Disabilities	76	7	9.2%	–	–	–	–
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	76	2	2.6%	–	–	–	–
Foster Youth	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

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.

NOTE: 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.

- * Level 1 = Standard not met
- Level 2 = Standard nearly met
- Level 3 = Standard met
- Level 4 = Standard exceeded

CAASPP Assessment Results –Mathematics

Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven (School Year 2014–15)

Mathematics - Grade 3

Student Groups	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Achievement			
				Level 1*	Level 2*	Level 3*	Level 4*
All Students	105	104	99%	41%	30%	25%	4%
Male	105	60	57.1%	38%	38%	23%	0%
Female	105	44	41.9%	45%	18%	27%	9%
Black or African American	105	1	1%	–	–	–	–
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian	105	6	5.7%	–	–	–	–
Filipino	105	1	1%	–	–	–	–
Hispanic or Latino	105	93	88.6%	44%	32%	20%	3%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	105	1	1%	–	–	–	–
White							
Two or More Races	105	2	1.9%	–	–	–	–
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	105	95	90.5%	43%	28%	25%	3%
English Learners	105	80	76.2%	41%	30%	25%	4%
Students with Disabilities	105	23	21.9%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services							
Foster Youth	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

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.

NOTE: 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.

- * Level 1 = Standard not met
 Level 2 = Standard nearly met
 Level 3 = Standard met
 Level 4 = Standard exceeded

Mathematics - Grade 4

Student Groups	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Achievement			
				Level 1*	Level 2*	Level 3*	Level 4*
All Students	82	80	97.6%	54%	35%	5%	6%
Male	82	41	50%	56%	37%	5%	2%
Female	82	39	47.6%	51%	33%	5%	10%
Black or African American							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian	82	5	6.1%	—	—	—	—
Filipino							
Hispanic or Latino	82	73	89%	56%	38%	3%	3%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	82	1	1.2%	—	—	—	—
White							
Two or More Races	82	1	1.2%	—	—	—	—
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	82	74	90.2%	55%	36%	4%	4%
English Learners	82	38	46.3%	74%	26%	0%	0%
Students with Disabilities	82	15	18.3%	93%	7%	0%	0%
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	82	2	2.4%	—	—	—	—
Foster Youth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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.

NOTE: 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.

- * Level 1 = Standard not met
- Level 2 = Standard nearly met
- Level 3 = Standard met
- Level 4 = Standard exceeded

Mathematics - Grade 5

Student Groups	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Achievement			
				Level 1*	Level 2*	Level 3*	Level 4*
All Students	76	75	98.7%	61%	35%	1%	3%
Male	76	36	47.4%	67%	31%	0%	3%
Female	76	39	51.3%	56%	38%	3%	3%
Black or African American							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Asian							
Filipino	76	2	2.6%	—	—	—	—
Hispanic or Latino	76	70	92.1%	63%	34%	1%	1%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	76	1	1.3%	—	—	—	—
White							
Two or More Races	76	2	2.6%	—	—	—	—
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	76	68	89.5%	63%	32%	1%	3%
English Learners	76	32	42.1%	88%	13%	0%	0%
Students with Disabilities	76	7	9.2%	—	—	—	—
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	76	2	2.6%	—	—	—	—
Foster Youth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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.

NOTE: 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.

- * Level 1 = Standard not met
- Level 2 = Standard nearly met
- Level 3 = Standard met
- Level 4 = Standard exceeded

California Standards Tests for All Students in Science – Three-Year Comparison

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)	42%	38%	44%	50%	52%	47%	59%	60%	56%

NOTE: 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.

California Standards Tests Results by Student Group in Science (School Year 2014-15)

Student Group	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced	Student Group	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced
All Students in the LEA	47%	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	—
All Students at the School	44%	White	
Male	40%	Two or More Races	—
Female	47%	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	43%
Black or African American		English Learners	19%
American Indian or Alaska Native		Students with Disabilities	—
Asian		Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	—
Filipino	—	Foster Youth	—
Hispanic or Latino	42%		

NOTE: 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.

STATE PRIORITY: OTHER PUPIL OUTCOME

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Other Pupil Outcomes (Priority 8):

- Pupil outcomes in the subject areas of English, mathematics, and physical education.

California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2014-15)

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Four of Six Fitness Standards	Percent of Students Meeting Five of Six Fitness Standards	Percent of Students Meeting Six of Six Fitness Standards
5	9.5%	28.4%	12.2%
7			
9			

NOTE: 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.

C. ENGAGEMENT

STATE PRIORITY: PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Parental Involvement (Priority 3):

- Efforts the school district makes to seek parent input in making decisions for the school district and each school site.

Opportunities for Parental Involvement - Most Recent Year

A. J. Dorsa School supported a Bilingual Community Liaison from site funds in 2014-2015, who served as a communication bridge between the school and the parents. She provided interpretations at all events as needed and worked with agencies to bring support services to the families. She helped bring parents to all meetings and events. There were many opportunities for parents to be informed, engaged and in partnerships. Some of those opportunities were:

- Student Study Team (SST) meetings to address student academic and behavioral needs, and Family Meetings with the Principal and Counselors, Parent-Teacher conferences
- Leadership development for parents to learn how to effectively run School Site Council (SSC) and English Learners Advisory Committee (ELAC)
- SSC and ELAC monthly meetings
- Family-to-Principal coffee meetings held monthly
- Family literacy, math, and science nights
- Parent volunteer programs
- Parent Teacher Association
- Numerous workshops put on in coordination with our partners
- Career fairs
- Back-to-School and open house events
- Winter and Spring Festivals
- Our Partners include: Neighborhood Association-The Hillview Association, United Way, HP, Grail Services, Alum Rock Counseling Services, Foothill Medical Clinic, BAWSI (San Jose State University), Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Assistance League, Rotary Club, LifeScan, Mini-Corps, and Family Giving Tree

STATE PRIORITY: SCHOOL CLIMATE

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: School Climate (Priority 6):

- Pupil suspension rates;
- Pupil expulsion rates; and
- Other local measures on the sense of safety.

Suspensions and Expulsions

Rate*	School			District			State		
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Suspensions	2.82	0.88	1.12	3.41	2.28	3.22	5.07	4.36	3.8
Expulsions	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.13	0.1	0.09

School Safety Plan – Most Recent Year

The Safety Plan was last revised and approved in October 2015 by our School Site Council. A.J. Dorsa Elementary School had a very detailed, comprehensive school safety plan that outlined protocols, systems, and procedures in the event of any/all emergencies. Safety Plan and drill procedures were reviewed during the year with all staff. Safety alerts were shared with all staff as needed throughout the school year. In addition, all required drills were calendared and completed, and the results are shared with the staff. Our Crisis Response Team at Dorsa included a First Aid Team, a Search and Rescue Team and other important Crisis Response Teams. We practiced our emergency drills on a regular basis and had sufficient supplies to sustain us during an extensive crisis situation.

At Dorsa School, we used a school wide positive behavior reinforcement system and consistent teaching of expected behaviors. The result was a safe and happy optimal learning environment. Our most challenging students were well supported and over time we saw dramatic improvements in their academic work as well as their behavior. Every teacher met with the Principal to develop personalized behavior support plans for their most challenging students. Our school-wide behavior system used positive rewards and was represented as the same system in every classroom so that there was consistency in our teachings. All classified staff were trained in this system and they promoted the same routines and rules.

On-going staff development was provided throughout the year, on the topics of behavior and emotional supports, safety and emergency response. All families were also provided with a home disaster plan which they could implement in cases of extreme emergencies.

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.

Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2014-15)

AYP Criteria	School	District	State
Made AYP Overall	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Participation Rate - English-Language Arts	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Participation Rate - Mathematics	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient - English-Language Arts	N/A	N/A	N/A
Met Percent Proficient - Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
Met Attendance Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Graduation Rate	N/A	N/A	Yes

Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2015-16)

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status	In PI	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement	2013-2014	2004-2005
Year in Program Improvement*	Year 1	Year 3
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	8
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	38.1%

NOTE: Cells with NA values do not require data.

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)

Grade Level	Avg. Class Size	2012-13 Number of Classes*			Avg. Class Size	2013-14 Number of Classes*			Avg. Class Size	2014-15 Number of Classes*		
		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+
K	21	3	1		18	4			20	3	1	
1	22		4		21	1	3		21	1	3	
2	18	5			23		4		20	4		
3	17	5			19	1	4		22	1	4	
4	32		3		26		3		32		2	
5	29		3		30		3		29		3	
Other												

* Number of classes indicates how many classes fall into each size category (a range of total students per class).

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2014-15)

Title	Number of FTE* Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor		
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)		N/A
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)		N/A
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0.5	N/A
Psychologist	0.4	N/A
Social Worker		N/A
Nurse	0.5	N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	1.4	N/A
Resource Specialist (non - teaching)	1	N/A
Other		N/A

NOTE: Cells with N/A values do not require data.

* 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.

Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2013-14)

Level	Total Expenditures Per Pupil	Expenditures Per Pupil (Supplemental / Restricted)	Expenditures Per Pupil (Basic / Unrestricted)	Average Teacher Salary
School Site	\$9,003	\$2,472	\$6,531	\$72,200
District	N/A	N/A	\$6,466	\$70,088
Percent Difference – School Site and District	N/A	N/A	1.01%	3.01%
State	N/A	N/A	\$5,348	\$72,993
Percent Difference – School Site and State	N/A	N/A	22.12%	-1.09%

NOTE: Cells with N/A values do not require data.

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2014-15)

Dorsa used categorical funds to provide for a full-time Community Liaison, who was in charge of implementing a comprehensive parent involvement plan and helping us to make the home to school connection. We also used these funds to provide for a Resource Teacher to support the development of literacy and math skills and to help teachers find resources to address unique student needs. The Resource Teacher also provided direct support to classes by pulling students out in small groups to work on specific skill gaps. The majority of our 2014-2015 allocated funds were used for these two positions. The remaining funds were spent on software and supplies for tutoring for our ELL students and to support our City Year Program. Donations to Dorsa were utilized to pay for classroom supplies, and to support additional release time for teachers to conduct grade level planning and interventions for students during and after the regular school day.

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2013-14)

Category	District Amount	State Average For Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$47,266	\$43,091
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$73,584	\$70,247
Highest Teacher Salary	\$85,887	\$89,152
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	\$108,978	\$112,492
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$114,421	\$116,021
Average Principal Salary (High)		\$117,511
Superintendent Salary	\$204,900	\$192,072
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	43%	41%
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	6%	6%

NOTE: For detailed information on salaries, see the CDE Certificated Salaries & Benefits Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/>.

Professional Development - Most Recent Three Years

This section provides information on the annual number of school days dedicated to staff development for the most recent three-year period.

The Dorsa Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) ensured that there was an alignment of staff development to state standards, needs of students based upon their assessments and overall school culture and safety. The members of this team included teacher representatives from each grade-level. The ILT created a annual plan and then a more detailed Cycle Action Plan (divided by trimesters) for the focus areas of our Professional Development Sessions which were conducted for one hour on Tuesdays. Follow up on each focus area was carried out through ILT planned Agendas for Grade-Level Collaborations. At Dorsa the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th grade teachers conducted Grade-Level Collaboration every other week for ninety minutes. The Kinder and 1st grades had Grade Level Collaboration time every other week for 60 minutes. The Professional Learning Plan gave detailed learning objectives for the Tuesdays [Staff Meeting Dates] and ILT meetings which took place bimonthly planned the agendas for the Grade-Level Collaborations. The Principal then monitored the implementation of these selected areas of focus in individual classrooms and by looking at grade-level trends through monthly walkthroughs, with specific areas of focus for each month. The Principal also met with each teacher or Grade Level Reps to review and analyze grade-level data quarterly.

Dorsa Elementary faculty members actively participate in highly structured collaboration and data analysis days every six weeks. During these meetings, teachers bring student data to be analyzed. Based on analysis, an action plan is formed where teachers select specific teaching strategies to implement as well as decide on evidence of student work to bring for the next cycle. Furthermore, teachers have developed grade-level assessments to monitor the academic progress of all students, as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of their grade-level interventions. All these efforts are assisted by the site funded Resource Teacher who works directly with teachers modeling lessons, and releasing teachers to conduct peer observations. The Principal and the Resource Teacher helped teachers conduct detailed analysis of their students data. All teachers at Dorsa attended staff development in the areas of writing instruction and scaffolding support for ELLS, data analysis and positive behavior support systems, to learn how to better use effective instructional strategies.

The Principal met with parents and teachers of at-risk students to create individualized intervention plans for academic and behavioral support. The Principal also coached several teachers on classroom management for high risk students with special challenges. All teachers established their professional goals and their optimal working conditions. These goals and conditions were the basis for on-going professional development work that was facilitated by the Principal for each teacher and other full-time staff members. Additionally several teacher leaders participated in District and County trainings and subsequently presented what they had learned at staff meetings and in their Grade-Level Collaboration sessions.

The overall impact of this collaborative Professional Development structure was powerful. Teachers were fully engaged in working together and in leading the work to increase teaching skills in a variety of areas. In the 2014-2015 school year the ILT decided to create a lower grade and an upper grade cohort in order to focus on different priority areas. The K-2 Cohort created a Cycle Action Plan for increasing student performance in Reading Fluency. The 3-5th Cohort chose to focus on Writing Constructive Responses [writing with evidence based statements]. The Cycle Action Plans for each Cohort were then aligned with the Professional Development Plan. The outcome of this work was immediately positive. The Cohorts continued in the 2015 - 2016 school year. In the 2015-2016 school year, Dorsa CELDT scores were very impressive. Although Dorsa has the most Limited English Proficient Students in the District, an unusually large ratio of Special Education students (over 11%), in addition to numerous foster care youth, we were able to become the second highest school in the District, on CELDT AMAO 1. The evidence for this success is directly connected to the Professional Development work that has been accomplished in the last three years.