

# Jefferson Elementary

## 2022-2023 School Accountability Report Card (Published During the 2023-2024 School Year)



### General Information about the School Accountability Report Card (SARC)

#### SARC Overview



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 and 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 and access to prior year reports, see the California Department of Education (CDE) SARC web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/>.
- For more information about the LCFF or the LCAP, see the CDE LCFF web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/>.
- For additional information about the school, parents/guardians 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 <https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/> that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district and the county. 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).

#### California School Dashboard



The California School Dashboard (Dashboard) <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> reflects California's new accountability and continuous improvement system and provides information about how LEAs and schools are meeting the needs of California's diverse student population. The Dashboard contains reports that display the performance of LEAs, schools, and student groups on a set of state and local measures to assist in identifying strengths, challenges, and areas in need of improvement.

#### 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.

## 2023-24 School Contact Information

<b>School Name</b>	Jefferson Elementary
<b>Street</b>	1660 East Sierra Way
<b>City, State, Zip</b>	Dinuba, CA 93618
<b>Phone Number</b>	(559) 595-7360
<b>Principal</b>	Robert Valenzuela
<b>Email Address</b>	rvalenzu@dinuba.k12.ca.us
<b>School Website</b>	<a href="https://www.dinuba.k12.ca.us/Domain/12">https://www.dinuba.k12.ca.us/Domain/12</a>
<b>County-District-School (CDS) Code</b>	54-75531-6053979

## 2023-24 District Contact Information

<b>District Name</b>	Dinuba Unified School District
<b>Phone Number</b>	(559) 595-7200
<b>Superintendent</b>	Joe Hernandez, Ed.D.
<b>Email Address</b>	jhernandez@dinuba.k12.ca.us
<b>District Website</b>	<a href="http://dusd.dinuba.k12.ca.us">http://dusd.dinuba.k12.ca.us</a>

## 2023-24 School Description and Mission Statement

A Message from the Principal:

Jefferson School represents a true professional learning community. The Jefferson staff works as a collective team to support student success and strives to make a positive impact on the community of Dinuba. Jefferson School has shown continuous improvement in student achievement through the transition to Common Core State Standards in ELA and Math. Jefferson staff believes that:

Through high quality mathematics instruction and assessment, DUSD students will have the mathematics content knowledge, conceptual understanding, and problem-solving ability to succeed in college and career. Additionally, through high quality English-Language Arts instruction and assessment, DUSD students will demonstrate 21st Century Skills and have the reading proficiency, writing fluency, and communication skills to succeed in college and career.

Jefferson School has a culture that focuses on student learning and development. The Jefferson School staff believes that all students can learn and as such every child should be provided with instruction and learning opportunities focused on attainment of grade level standards. Our district and site academic coaches continue to assist teachers in Math, English Language Arts, and English Language Development. Grade-level collaboration days make it possible for teams of teachers at each grade level to work with administration and academic coaches to improve teaching and learning at Jefferson Elementary. Staff training activities focus on: Common Core math strategies, key standards to be taught in language arts and math, instruction for English Learners, student engagement structures, and common assessments.

Jefferson has identified a few high leverage, key actions that will be taken to provide high-quality, rigorous ELA and Math instruction. They are:

## 2023-24 School Description and Mission Statement

Use student data to make instructional decisions that will improve students' achievement.

Focus on academic support for students who are at risk of failing. Use intervention materials to continue strategic and intensive interventions for targeted students during the school day.

Provide specific instruction for our English learners at the ability level appropriate for each student.

Continue providing preschool services to our community.

Use instructional technologies to enhance student learning and engagement.

Continue to develop our Professional Learning Community to focus on learning, results, and collaboration.

Provide more parent engagement opportunities.

The Jefferson staff understands the importance of community involvement. Teachers supervise students in community activities such as the Raisin Day parade, Christmas Parade, Cinco De Mayo Parade, Youth Night in the Park and our school carnival.

## About this School

### 2022-23 Student Enrollment by Grade Level

Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	89
Grade 1	67
Grade 2	72
Grade 3	85
Grade 4	74
Grade 5	100
Grade 6	74
<b>Total Enrollment</b>	<b>561</b>

## 2022-23 Student Enrollment by Student Group

Student Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Female	50.8%
Male	49.2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.5%
Asian	0.7%
Filipino	0.2%
Hispanic or Latino	96.4%
White	2.1%
English Learners	41.9%
Foster Youth	0.2%
Homeless	0.5%
Migrant	6.6%
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	81.1%
Students with Disabilities	5.2%

### 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

## 2020-21 Teacher Preparation and Placement

Authorization/Assignment	School Number	School Percent	District Number	District Percent	State Number	State Percent
<b>Fully (Preliminary or Clear) Credentialed for Subject and Student Placement (properly assigned)</b>	22.00	91.67	235.30	86.41	228366.10	83.12
<b>Intern Credential Holders Properly Assigned</b>	1.00	4.17	11.00	4.04	4205.90	1.53
<b>Teachers Without Credentials and Misassignments (“ineffective” under ESSA)</b>	1.00	4.17	6.90	2.54	11216.70	4.08
<b>Credentialed Teachers Assigned Out-of-Field (“out-of-field” under ESSA)</b>	0.00	0.00	8.80	3.24	12115.80	4.41
<b>Unknown</b>	0.00	0.00	10.20	3.76	18854.30	6.86
<b>Total Teaching Positions</b>	24.00	100.00	272.30	100.00	274759.10	100.00

Note: The data in this table is based on Full Time Equivalent (FTE) status. One FTE equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time. Additionally, an assignment is defined as a position that an educator is assigned based on setting, subject, and grade level. An authorization is defined as the services that an educator is authorized to provide to students.

## 2021-22 Teacher Preparation and Placement

Authorization/Assignment	School Number	School Percent	District Number	District Percent	State Number	State Percent
<b>Fully (Preliminary or Clear) Credentialed for Subject and Student Placement (properly assigned)</b>	23.00	95.83	225.00	80.95	234405.20	84.00
<b>Intern Credential Holders Properly Assigned</b>	1.00	4.17	13.10	4.71	4853.00	1.74
<b>Teachers Without Credentials and Misassignments (“ineffective” under ESSA)</b>	0.00	0.00	4.10	1.50	12001.50	4.30
<b>Credentialed Teachers Assigned Out-of-Field (“out-of-field” under ESSA)</b>	0.00	0.00	14.10	5.08	11953.10	4.28
<b>Unknown</b>	0.00	0.00	21.50	7.76	15831.90	5.67
<b>Total Teaching Positions</b>	24.00	100.00	277.90	100.00	279044.80	100.00

The CDE published the first year of available teacher data for the 2020-21 SARC in June 2022, and the CDE published the second year of data for the 2021-22 SARC in June 2023. The EC Section 33126(b)(5) requires the most recent three years of teacher data to be requested in the SARC, as data is available. The teacher data for the 2022-23 SARC will not be available prior to February 1, 2024, and therefore is not included in the template.

Note: The data in this table is based on Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) status. One FTE equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time. Additionally, an assignment is defined as a position that an educator is assigned based on setting, subject, and grade level. An authorization is defined as the services that an educator is authorized to provide to students.

## Teachers Without Credentials and Misassignments (considered “ineffective” under ESSA)

Authorization/Assignment	2020-21	2021-22
Permits and Waivers	1.00	0.00
Misassignments	0.00	0.00
Vacant Positions	0.00	0.00
<b>Total Teachers Without Credentials and Misassignments</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

The teacher data for the 2022-23 SARC will not be available prior to February 1, 2024, and therefore is not included in the template.

## Credentialed Teachers Assigned Out-of-Field (considered “out-of-field” under ESSA)

Indicator	2020-21	2021-22
Credentialed Teachers Authorized on a Permit or Waiver	0.00	0.00
Local Assignment Options	0.00	0.00
<b>Total Out-of-Field Teachers</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

The teacher data for the 2022-23 SARC will not be available prior to February 1, 2024, and therefore is not included in the template.

## Class Assignments

Indicator	2020-21	2021-22
<b>Misassignments for English Learners</b> (a percentage of all the classes with English learners taught by teachers that are misassigned)	0	0
<b>No credential, permit or authorization to teach</b> (a percentage of all the classes taught by teachers with no record of an authorization to teach)	8.3	0

The teacher data for the 2022-23 SARC will not be available prior to February 1, 2024, and therefore is not included in the template.

Note: For more information refer to the Updated Teacher Equity Definitions web page at

<https://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ee/teacherequitydefinitions.asp>.

## 2023-24 Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Other Instructional Materials

All adopted text books are aligned with state standards for each content area. There are sufficient copies of all text books for each child to have an individual copy of the text.

<b>Year and month in which the data were collected</b>	11/2021
--	---------

Subject	Textbooks and Other Instructional Materials/year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption ?	Percent Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy

<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>	All in good condition. HMH Into English is the adopted English Language Arts Curriculum. Adopted in 2023	Yes	0
<b>Mathematics</b>	All in good condition. Illustrated Mathematics is being used. Board Approved in 2021.	Yes	0
<b>Science</b>	All in good condition. TWIG Science is the adopted Science Curriculum. Adopted in 2019	Yes	0
<b>History-Social Science</b>	All in good condition. History Social Science - Studies Weekly is the adopted Social Science Curriculum for K-6. Adopted in 2020	Yes	0
<b>Foreign Language</b>	N/A		
<b>Health</b>	N/A		
<b>Visual and Performing Arts</b>	N/A		

## School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements

Dinuba Unified School District's maintenance department responds rapidly to work orders that are submitted. The issues listed on the FIT report were remedied quickly if possible and larger projects are scheduled when students are not in session and/or when funding is available. Several other items are currently being considered for improvement with modernization money: a secure entrance to the school site and air conditioning in the cafeteria.

**Year and month of the most recent FIT report**

11/8/2023

System Inspected	Rate Good	Rate Fair	Rate Poor	Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
<b>Systems:</b> Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	X			
<b>Interior:</b> Interior Surfaces	X			1: ceiling tiles stained, large built in cabinet doors don't stay closed (work orders submitted) 11: cabinet doors falling off, need to be replaced CAFETERIA: floor tiles lifting
<b>Cleanliness:</b> Overall Cleanliness, Pest/Vermin Infestation	X			
<b>Electrical</b>	X			
<b>Restrooms/Fountains:</b> Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	X			
<b>Safety:</b> Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	X			13: extensive amounts of paper covering walls
<b>Structural:</b> Structural Damage, Roofs	X			BOYS REST ROOM (NEAR 30): urinal leaking (work order submitted) dry rot on outside
<b>External:</b> Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	X			

## Overall Facility Rate

Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
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] System includes the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for students in the general education population and the California Alternate Assessments [CAAs] for English language arts/literacy [ELA] and mathematics given in grades three through eight and grade eleven. Only eligible students may participate in the administration of the CAAs. CAAs items are aligned with alternate achievement standards, which are linked with the Common Core State Standards [CCSS] for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities).

The CAASPP System encompasses the following assessments and student participation requirements:

1. **Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments and CAAs for ELA** in grades three through eight and grade eleven.
2. **Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments and CAAs for mathematics** in grades three through eight and grade eleven.
3. **California Science Test (CAST) and CAAs for Science** in grades five, eight, and once in high school (i.e., grade ten, eleven, or twelve).

#### College and Career Ready

The percentage of students 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.

## Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standard on CAASPP

This table displays CAASPP test results in ELA and mathematics for all students grades three through eight and grade eleven taking and completing a state-administered assessment.

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.

ELA and mathematics test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The “Percent Met or Exceeded” is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard (i.e., achieved Level 3-Alternate) on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

Subject	School 2021-22	School 2022-23	District 2021-22	District 2022-23	State 2021-22	State 2022-23
<b>English Language Arts/Literacy</b> (grades 3-8 and 11)	45	52	46	44	47	46
<b>Mathematics</b> (grades 3-8 and 11)	37	42	25	27	33	34



## 2022-23 CAASPP Test Results in ELA by Student Group

This table displays CAASPP test results in ELA by student group for students grades three through eight and grade eleven taking and completing a state-administered assessment.

ELA test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The “Percent Met or Exceeded” is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard (i.e., achieved Level 3-Alternate) on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

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 all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; 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 only students who received scores.

CAASPP Student Groups	CAASPP Total Enrollment	CAASPP Number Tested	CAASPP Percent Tested	CAASPP Percent Not Tested	CAASPP Percent Met or Exceeded
<b>All Students</b>	336	332	98.81	1.19	52.11
<b>Female</b>	165	164	99.39	0.61	57.93
<b>Male</b>	171	168	98.25	1.75	46.43
<b>American Indian or Alaska Native</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Asian</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Black or African American</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Filipino</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	318	314	98.74	1.26	52.55
<b>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Two or More Races</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>White</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>English Learners</b>	135	132	97.78	2.22	34.09
<b>Foster Youth</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Homeless</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Military</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</b>	232	231	99.57	0.43	48.05
<b>Students Receiving Migrant Education Services</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	21	20	95.24	4.76	5.00

## 2022-23 CAASPP Test Results in Math by Student Group

This table displays CAASPP test results in Math by student group for students grades three through eight and grade eleven taking and completing a state-administered assessment.

Mathematics test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The “Percent Met or Exceeded” is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard (i.e., achieved Level 3-Alternate) on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

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 all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; 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 only students who received scores.

CAASPP Student Groups	CAASPP Total Enrollment	CAASPP Number Tested	CAASPP Percent Tested	CAASPP Percent Not Tested	CAASPP Percent Met or Exceeded
<b>All Students</b>	336	335	99.70	0.30	41.92
<b>Female</b>	165	165	100.00	0.00	40.00
<b>Male</b>	171	170	99.42	0.58	43.79
<b>American Indian or Alaska Native</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Asian</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Black or African American</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Filipino</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	318	317	99.69	0.31	42.41
<b>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Two or More Races</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>White</b>	--	--	--	--	--
<b>English Learners</b>	135	135	100.00	0.00	20.74
<b>Foster Youth</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Homeless</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Military</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</b>	232	232	100.00	0.00	38.10
<b>Students Receiving Migrant Education Services</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	21	20	95.24	4.76	5.00

## CAASPP Test Results in Science for All Students

This table displays the percentage of all students grades five, eight, and High School meeting or exceeding the State Standard.

Science test results include the CAST and the CAA. The “Percent Met or Exceeded” is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the CAST plus the total number of students who met the standard (i.e., achieved Level 3-Alternate) on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

The number of students tested includes all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; 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 only students who received scores.

Subject	School 2021-22	School 2022-23	District 2021-22	District 2022-23	State 2021-22	State 2022-23
Science (grades 5, 8 and high school)	25.35	34.31	19.58	22.47	29.47	30.29

## 2022-23 CAASPP Test Results in Science by Student Group

This table displays CAASPP test results in Science by student group for students grades five, eight, and High School. 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.

Student Group	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Not Tested	Percent Met or Exceeded
All Students	103	102	99.03	0.97	34.31
Female	58	58	100.00	0.00	27.59
Male	45	44	97.78	2.22	43.18
American Indian or Alaska Native	--	--	--	--	--
Asian	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0	0	0
Filipino	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic or Latino	101	100	99.01	0.99	34.00
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0
Two or More Races	0	0	0	0	0
White	--	--	--	--	--
English Learners	39	39	100.00	0.00	5.13
Foster Youth	0	0	0	0	0
Homeless	0	0	0	0	0
Military	0	0	0	0	0
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	77	77	100.00	0.00	33.77
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	0	0	0	0	0
Students with Disabilities	--	--	--	--	--

## B. Pupil Outcomes

### State Priority: Other Pupil Outcomes

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Other Pupil Outcomes (Priority 8): Pupil outcomes in the subject area of physical education.

#### 2022-23 California Physical Fitness Test Results

This table displays the percentage of students participating in each of the five fitness components of the California Physical Fitness Test Results. The administration of the PFT during 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years, only participation results are required for these five fitness areas. Percentages are not calculated and double dashes (--) appear in the table 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	Component 1: Aerobic Capacity	Component 2: Abdominal Strength and Endurance	Component 3: Trunk Extensor and Strength and Flexibility	Component 4: Upper Body Strength and Endurance	Component 5: Flexibility
Grade 5	98	98	98	98	98

## 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 regarding the school district and at each school site.

#### 2023-24 Opportunities for Parental Involvement

Parent participation is of critical importance to the continued growth and well-being of our students. Parents are active on campus and support our programs through classroom volunteer efforts, the School Site Council (SSC), the English Learner Advisory Council (ELAC), and the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO). Our SSC, which includes parent members, approves our annual school plan. Annually, Jefferson invites parents to the Title I Parent Involvement Meeting to share with the parents and community how Jefferson is performing as a school. Jefferson's Parent Teacher Organization continues to maintain a strong presence on campus through the involvement of our school carnival and holiday activities. The purpose of the PTO is to provide support to students throughout their educational career at Jefferson. They help at school events and hold various activities throughout the year to involve students. The school is also fortunate to have a local church providing support to the students and staff. The Dinuba Mennonite Brethren Church has helped in a number of ways. They have supplied volunteers to help at school events, organized members to come weekly to read with students, and have even organized community work days where students, parents, school staff, and church members joined together to tackle some beautification projects on campus. If you would like more information about Parent Engagement Activities, please contact Brisia Navarro, Community Liaison at 559-595-7360.

## 2022-23 Chronic Absenteeism by Student Group

Student Group	Cumulative Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Eligible Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Count	Chronic Absenteeism Rate
All Students	593	588	145	24.7
Female	297	297	77	25.9
Male	296	291	68	23.4
Non-Binary	0	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	3	3	0	0.0
Asian	6	6	2	33.3
Black or African American	0	0	0	0.0
Filipino	1	1	0	0.0
Hispanic or Latino	566	561	135	24.1
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0.0
Two or More Races	0	0	0	0.0
White	17	17	8	47.1
English Learners	266	264	61	23.1
Foster Youth	2	2	1	50.0
Homeless	3	3	2	66.7
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	491	486	127	26.1
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	46	46	12	26.1
Students with Disabilities	42	40	14	35.0

### C. Engagement

#### 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

This table displays suspensions and expulsions data.

Rate	School 2020-21	School 2021-22	School 2022-23	District 2020-21	District 2021-22	District 2022-23	State 2020-21	State 2021-22	State 2022-23
Suspensions	0.00	1.60	0.84	0.04	3.13	3.37	0.20	3.17	3.60
Expulsions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.19	0.00	0.07	0.08

## 2022-23 Suspensions and Expulsions by Student Group

Student Group	Suspensions Rate	Expulsions Rate
All Students	0.84	0
Female	0.67	0
Male	1.01	0
Non-Binary		
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Asian	0	0
Black or African American	0	0
Filipino	0	0
Hispanic or Latino	0.71	0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0
Two or More Races	0	0
White	5.88	0
English Learners	1.13	0
Foster Youth	0	0
Homeless	0	0
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	0.81	0
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	2.17	0
Students with Disabilities	4.76	0

## 2023-24 School Safety Plan

The Jefferson Elementary community supports our efforts to ensure a safe campus. Staff members monitor our campus before and after school, and during recess. The goals of our school safety plan are to maintain a clean, safe, campus; to keep all students and staff emotionally and physically safe; to maintain strong school-home relationships with positive, consistent, and frequent formal and informal lines of communication; and to maximize instructional time by minimizing classroom disruptions. The school has implemented Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports to encourage students to make wise choices and perform up to their ability at school. The school website, social media platforms, and direct family communication provide information to students and parents. The Safe School Plan is updated and approved annually by the School Site Council. It was last reviewed and approved on February 21, 2023. Some of the areas of safety which remain a concern for parents and staff are busy intersections in front of the school as well as limited drop off locations. Several maintenance projects were completed to enhance the security of the school.

## D. Other SARC Information Information Required in the SARC

The information in this section is required to be in the SARC but is not included in the state priorities for LCFF.

## 2020-21 Elementary Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution

This table displays the 2020-21 average class size and class size distribution. The columns titled “Number of Classes” indicates how many classes fall into each size category (a range of total students per class). The “Other” category is for multi-grade level classes.

Grade Level	Average Class Size	Number of Classes with 1-20 Students	Number of Classes with 21-32 Students	Number of Classes with 33+ Students
K	21	1	3	
1	22		4	
2	27		3	
3	24		4	
4	27		3	
5	31		3	
6	30		3	

## 2021-22 Elementary Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution

This table displays the 2021-22 average class size and class size distribution. The columns titled “Number of Classes” indicates how many classes fall into each size category (a range of total students per class). The “Other” category is for multi-grade level classes.

Grade Level	Average Class Size	Number of Classes with 1-20 Students	Number of Classes with 21-32 Students	Number of Classes with 33+ Students
K	20	1	3	
1	23		3	
2	23		4	
3	25		3	
4	25		4	
5	24		3	
6	31		3	

## 2022-23 Elementary Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution

This table displays the 2022-23 average class size and class size distribution. The columns titled “Number of Classes” indicates how many classes fall into each size category (a range of total students per class). The “Other” category is for multi-grade level classes.

Grade Level	Average Class Size	Number of Classes with 1-20 Students	Number of Classes with 21-32 Students	Number of Classes with 33+ Students

## 2022-23 Ratio of Pupils to Academic Counselor

This table displays the ratio of pupils to 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.

Title	Ratio
Pupils to Academic Counselor	561

## 2022-23 Student Support Services Staff

This table displays the number of FTE support staff assigned to this school. 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.

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School
Counselor (Academic, Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	1
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	
Psychologist	
Social Worker	
Nurse	
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	
Resource Specialist (non-teaching)	
Other	5

## Fiscal Year 2021-22 Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries

This table displays the 2021-22 expenditures per pupil and average teacher salary for this school. Cells with N/A values do not require data.

Level	Total Expenditures Per Pupil	Expenditures Per Pupil (Restricted)	Expenditures Per Pupil (Unrestricted)	Average Teacher Salary
School Site	\$7,068	\$276	\$6,792	\$85,389
District	N/A	N/A	\$6,120	\$85,389
Percent Difference - School Site and District	N/A	N/A		
State	N/A	N/A	\$7,607	\$87,362
Percent Difference - School Site and State	N/A	N/A		

## Fiscal Year 2022-23 Types of Services Funded

Title I and LCAP funds are used to fund the use of Instructional Assistants to provide targeted intervention to students during the school day. LCAP funding has enabled the school to employ reading intervention teachers.



## Fiscal Year 2021-22 Teacher and Administrative Salaries

This table displays the 2021-22 Teacher and Administrative salaries. For detailed information on salaries, see the CDE Certification Salaries & Benefits web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/>.

Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts in Same Category
<b>Beginning Teacher Salary</b>	\$54,014	\$54,190
<b>Mid-Range Teacher Salary</b>	\$78,586	\$85,111
<b>Highest Teacher Salary</b>	\$105,086	\$104,999
<b>Average Principal Salary (Elementary)</b>	\$126,210	\$132,492
<b>Average Principal Salary (Middle)</b>	\$132,521	\$140,987
<b>Average Principal Salary (High)</b>	\$153,409	\$153,884
<b>Superintendent Salary</b>	\$215,000	\$255,503
<b>Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries</b>	27.19%	32.09%
<b>Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries</b>	4.76%	5.25%

## Professional Development

Staff development activities at Jefferson School are focused on providing good first teaching to all students, improving instruction for our English Learners, as well as increasing math and reading achievement. All teachers have been provided with learning opportunities to expand their knowledge of student engagement structures, Common Core instructional strategies in ELA as well as Math. Teachers are also provided lesson feedback and coaching by district coaches and administration. Teachers are also supported through district ELA and Math coaches who are available for in-class coaching and serve as resources for successful implementation of the district curriculum. Based on students' DRA2 and STAR Reading data, teachers have determined that literacy should be a major focus for professional growth. The staff has benefited from attending classes through TCOE and by participating in district provided professional learning opportunities.

This table displays the number of school days dedicated to staff development and continuous improvement.

Subject	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
<b>Number of school days dedicated to Staff Development and Continuous Improvement</b>	2	2	2

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

The Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) has been developed by the Office of Public School Construction to determine if a school facility is in “good repair” as defined by Education Code (EC) Section 17002(d)(1) and to rate the facility pursuant to EC Section 17002(d)(2). The tool is designed to identify areas of a school site that are in need of repair based upon a visual inspection of the site. In addition, the EC specifies the tool should not be used to require capital enhancements beyond the standards to which the facility was designed and constructed.

Good repair is defined to mean that the facility is maintained in a manner that ensures that it is clean, safe, and functional. As part of the school accountability report card, school districts and county offices of education are required to make specified assessments of school conditions including the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of school facilities and needed maintenance to ensure good repair. In addition, beginning with the 2005/2006 fiscal year, school districts and county offices of education must certify that a facility inspection system has been established to ensure that each of its facilities is maintained in good repair in order to participate in the School Facility Program and the Deferred Maintenance Program. This tool is intended to assist school districts and county offices of education in that determination.

County superintendents are required to annually visit the schools in the county of his or her office as determined by EC Section 1240. Further, EC Section 1240(c)(2)(I), states the priority objective of the visits made shall be to determine the status of the condition of a facility that poses an emergency or urgent threat to the health or safety of pupils or staff as defined in district policy, or as defined by EC Section 17592.72(c) and the accuracy of data reported on the school accountability report card with the respect to the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of school facilities, including good repair as required by EC Sections 17014, 17032.5, 17070.75, and 17089. This tool is also intended to assist county offices of education in performing these functions.

The EC also allows individual entities to adopt a local evaluation instrument to be used in lieu of the FIT provided the local instrument meets the criteria specified in EC Section 17002(d) and as implemented in the FIT. Any evaluation instrument adopted by the local educational agency for purpose of determining whether a school facility is maintained in good repair may include any number of additional items but must minimally include the criteria and rating scheme contained in the FIT.

**USER INSTRUCTIONS**

**The FIT is comprised of three parts as follows:**

**Part I, Good Repair Standard** outlines the school facility systems and components, as specified in EC Section 17002(d)(1), that should be considered in the inspection of a school facility to ensure it is maintained in a manner that assures it is clean, safe and functional. Each of the 15 sections in the Good Repair Standard provides a description of a minimum standard of good repair for various school facility categories. Each section also provides examples of clean, safe and functional conditions. The list of examples is not exhaustive. If an evaluator notes a condition that is not mentioned in the examples but constitutes a deficiency, the evaluator can note such deficiency in the applicable category as “other.”

Some of the conditions cited in the Good Repair Standard represent items that are critical to the health and safety of pupils and staff. Any deficiencies in these items require immediate attention and, if left unmitigated, could cause severe and immediate injury, illness or death of the occupants. They constitute extreme deficiencies and indicate that the particular building system evaluated failed to meet the standard of good repair at that school site. These critical conditions are identified with underlined text followed by an (X) on the Good Repair Standard. If the underlined statement is not true, then there is an extreme deficiency (to be marked as an “X” on the Evaluation Detail) resulting in a “poor” rating for the applicable category. It is important to note that the list of extreme deficiencies noted in the Good Repair Standard is not exhaustive. Any other deficiency not included in the criteria but meeting the definition above can be noted by the evaluator and generate a poor rating.

**Part II, Evaluation Detail** is a site inspection template to be used to evaluate the areas of a school on a category by category basis. The design of the inspection template allows for the determination of the scope of conditions across campus. In evaluating each area or space, the user should review each of the 15 categories identified in the Good Repair Standard and make a determination of whether a particular area is in good repair. Once the determination is made, it should be recorded on the Evaluation Detail, as follows:

<b>OK</b>	<b>No Deficiency - Good Repair:</b> Mark "OK" if all statements in the Good Repair Standard are true, and there is no indication of a deficiency in the specific category.
<b>D</b>	<b>Deficiency:</b> Mark “D” if one or more statement(s) in the Good Repair Standard for the specific category is not true, or if there is other clear evidence of the need for repair.
<b>X</b>	<b>Extreme Deficiency:</b> Indicate “X” if the area has a deficiency that is considered an “Extreme Deficiency” in the Good Repair Standard or there is a condition that qualifies as an extreme deficiency but is not noted in the Good Repair Standard.
<b>NA</b>	<b>Not Applicable:</b> If the Good Repair Standard category (building system or component) does not exist in the area evaluated, mark “NA”.

Below are suggested methods for evaluating various systems and areas:

- **Gas and Sewer** are major building systems that may span the entire school campus but may not be evident as applicable building systems in each classroom or common areas. However, because a deficiency in either of these systems could become evident and present a health and safety threat anywhere on campus, the user should not mark "NA" and should instead include an evaluation of these systems in each building space.
- **Roofs** can be easily evaluated for stand alone areas, such as portable classrooms. For permanent buildings containing several areas to be evaluated, roofs should be considered as parts of individual areas in order to accurately account for a scope of any roofing deficiency. For example, a 10 classroom building contains damaged gutters on one side of the building, spanning across five classrooms. Therefore, an evaluator should mark five classrooms as deficient in the roof category and the other five classrooms as in good repair, assuming there are no other visible deficiencies related to roofing.
- **Overall Cleanliness** is intended to be used to evaluate the cleanliness of each space. For example, a user should note a deficiency due to dirty surfaces in Overall Cleanliness, rather than **Interior Surfaces**. At the same time, the user should note such deficiency only in Overall Cleanliness in order to avoid accounting for such deficiency twice, i.e. in two sections.
- The tool is designed to evaluate stand-alone restrooms as separate areas. However, restrooms contained within other spaces, such as a kindergarten classroom or a library, can be evaluated as part of that area under Restrooms. If the area evaluated does not contain a restroom, Restrooms should be marked "NA."
- **Drinking fountains** can exist within individual classrooms or areas, right outside of classrooms or restrooms or other areas, or as stand alone fixtures on playgrounds and sports fields. If a drinking fountain or a set of fountains is located inside a building or immediately outside the area being evaluated, it should be included in the evaluation of that area under Drinking Fountains. If a fountain is located on the school grounds, it should be evaluated as part of that outside space. If there is no drinking fountain in the area evaluated, Drinking Fountains should be marked "NA."
- **Playgrounds/School Grounds**, should be evaluated as separate areas by dividing a campus into sections with defined borders. In this case, several sections of the good repair criteria would not apply to the evaluation, as they do not exist outside of physical building areas, such as **Structural Damage** and **Fire Safety**, for example.

**Part III** includes the **Category Totals and Ranking**, the **Overall Rating**, and a section for **Comments and Rating Explanation**.

Once the inspector completes the site inspection, he or she must total the number of areas evaluated. The inspector must also count all of the spaces deemed in good repair, deficient, extremely deficient, or not applicable under each of the 15 sections. Next, the evaluator must determine the condition of each section by taking the ratio of the number of areas deemed in good repair to the number of areas being evaluated (after subtracting non-applicable spaces from the total number of areas evaluated). If any of the 15 sections received a rating of extreme deficiency, the ratio (i.e., the percentage of good repair) for that section and the category the section is in should default to zero. The total percent per category (A through H) is determined by the total of all percentages of systems in good repair divided by the number of sections in that category. For example, to determine the total percent for the Structural category, add the percentages for the Structural Damage and Roof sections and divide the result by two.

Next, the overall school site score is determined by computing the average percentage rating of the eight categories (i.e., the total of all percentages divided by eight). Finally, the rater should determine the overall School Rating by applying the Percentage Range in the table provided in Part III to the average percentage calculated and taking into consideration the Rating Description provided in the same table.

\*Although the FIT is designed to evaluate each school site within a reasonable range of facility conditions, it is possible that an evaluator may identify critical facility conditions that result in an Overall School Rating that does not reflect the urgency and severity of those deficiencies and/or does not match the rating's Description in Part III. In such instances, the evaluator may reduce the resulting school score by one or more grade categories and describe the reasons for the reduction in the space provided for Comments and Rating Explanation.

When completing Part III of the FIT, the instructor should note the date and time of the inspection as well as weather conditions and any other pertinent inspection information in the specific areas provided and utilize the Comments and Rating Explanation Section if needed.

**PART I: GOOD REPAIR STANDARD**

(X): If underlined statement is not true, then this is an extreme deficiency (marked as an "X") on the Evaluation Detail resulting in a "poor" rating for the applicable category.

**Gas Leaks**

*Gas systems and pipes appear safe, functional, and free of leaks. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- a. There is no odor that would indicate a gas leak. (X)
- b. Gas pipes are not broken and appear to be in good working order. (X)
- c. Other

**Mechanical Systems**

*Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems (HVAC) as applicable are functional and unobstructed. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- a. The HVAC system is operable. (X)
- b. The facilities are ventilated (via mechanical or natural ventilation).
- c. The ventilation units are unobstructed and vents and grills are without evidence of excessive dirt or dust.
- d. There appears to be an adequate air supply to all classrooms, work spaces, and facilities (i.e. no strong odor is present, air is not stuffy)
- e. Interior temperatures appear to be maintained within normally accepted ranges.
- f. The ventilation units are not generating any excessive noise or vibrations.
- g. Other

**Sewer**

*Sewer line stoppage is not evident. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- a. There are no obvious signs of flooding caused by sewer line back-up in the facilities or on the school grounds. (X)
- b. The sanitary system controls odors as designed.
- c. Other

**Interior Surfaces (Floors, Ceilings, Walls, and Window Casings)**

*Interior surfaces appear to be clean, safe, and functional. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- a. Walls are free of hazards from tears and holes.
- b. Flooring is free of hazards from torn carpeting, missing floor tiles, holes.
- c. Ceiling is free of hazards from missing ceiling tiles and holes.
- d. There is no evidence of water damage (e.g. no condensation, dampness, staining, warping, peeling, mineral deposits, etc.)
- e. Other

**Overall Cleanliness**

*School grounds, buildings, common areas, and individual rooms appear to have been cleaned regularly. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- a. Area(s) evaluated is free of accumulated refuse, dirt, and grime.
- b. Area(s) evaluated is free of unabated graffiti.
- c. Restrooms, drinking fountains, and food preparation or serving areas appear to have been cleaned each day that school is in session.
- d. Other

**Pest/Vermin Infestation**

*Pest or vermin infestation are not evident. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- a. There is no evidence of a major pest or vermin infestation. (X)
- b. There are no holes in the walls, floors, or ceilings.
- c. Rodent droppings or insect skins are not evident.
- d. Odor caused by a pest or vermin infestation is not evident.
- e. There are no live rodents observed.
- f. Other

**Electrical (Interior and Exterior)**

*1. There is no evidence that any portion of the school has a power failure. (X)*

*2. Electrical systems, components, and equipment appear to be working properly. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- a. There are no exposed electrical wires. Electrical equipment is properly covered and secured from pupil access. (X)
- b. Outlets, access panels, switch plates, junction boxes and fixtures are properly covered and secured from pupil access.
- c. Other

*3. Lighting appears to be adequate and working properly, including exterior lights. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- a. Lighting appears to be adequate.
- b. Lighting is not flickering.
- c. There is no unusual hum or noise from the light fixtures.
- d. Other

**Restrooms**

*Restrooms in the vicinity of the area being evaluated appear to be accessible during school hours, clean, functional and in compliance with SB 892 (EC Section 35292.5). The following are examples of compliance with SB 892:*

- Restrooms are maintained and cleaned regularly.
- Restrooms are fully operational.
- Restrooms are stocked with toilet paper, soap, and paper towels.
- Restrooms are open during school hours.
- Other

**Sinks/Fountains (Inside and Outside)**

*Drinking fountains appear to be accessible and functioning as intended. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- Drinking fountains are accessible.
- Water pressure is adequate.
- A leak is not evident.
- There is no moss, mold, or excessive staining on the fixtures.
- The water is clear and without unusual taste or odor.
- Other

**Fire Safety**

*The fire equipment and emergency systems appear to be functioning properly. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- The fire sprinklers appear to be in working order (e.g., there are no missing or damaged sprinkler heads). (X)
- Emergency alarms appear to be functional. (X)
- Emergency exit signs function as designed, exits are unobstructed. (X)
- Fire extinguishers are current and placed in all required areas.
- Fire alarms pull stations are clearly visible.
- Other

**Hazardous Materials (Interior and Exterior)**

*There does not appear to be evidence of hazardous materials that may pose a threat to pupils or staff. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- Hazardous chemicals, chemical waste, and flammable materials are stored properly (e.g. locked and labeled properly). (X)
- Paint is not peeling, chipping, or cracking.
- There does not appear to be damaged tiles or other circumstances that may indicate asbestos exposure.
- Surfaces (including floors, ceilings, walls, window casings, HVAC grills) appear to be free of mildew, mold odor and visible mold.
- Other

**Structural Damage**

*There does not appear to be structural damage that has created or could create hazardous or uninhabitable conditions. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- Severe cracks are not evident. (X)
- Ceilings & floors are not sloping or sagging beyond their intended design. (X)
- Posts, beams, supports for portable classrooms, ramps, and other structural building members appear to be intact, secure and functional as designed. (X)
- There is no visible evidence of severe cracks, dry rot, mold, or damage that undermines the structural components. (X)
- Other

**Roofs (observed from the ground, inside/outside the building)**

*Roof systems appear to be functioning properly. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- Roofs, gutters, roof drains, and down spouts are free of visible damage.
- Roofs, gutters, roof drains, and down spouts are intact.
- Other

**Playground/School Grounds**

*The playground equipment and school grounds in the vicinity of the area being evaluated appear to be clean, safe, and functional. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- Significant cracks, trip hazards, holes and deterioration are not found.
- Open "S" hooks, protruding bolt ends, and sharp points/edges are not found in the playground equipment.
- Seating, tables, and equipment are functional and free of significant cracks.
- There are no signs of drainage problems, such as flooded areas, eroded soil, water damage to asphalt, or clogged storm drain inlets.
- Other

**Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences (Interior and exterior)**

*Conditions that pose a safety and/or security risk are not evident. Examples include but are not limited to the following:*

- There is no exposed broken glass accessible to pupils and staff. (X)
- Exterior doors and gates are functioning and do not pose a security risk. (X)
- Windows are intact and free of cracks.
- Windows are functional and open, close, and lock as designed, unless there is a valid reason they should not function as designed.
- Doors are intact.
- Doors are functional and open, close, and lock as designed, unless there is a valid reason they should not function as designed.
- Gates and fences appear to be functional.
- Gates and fences are intact and free of holes and other conditions that could present a safety hazard to pupils, staff, or others.
- Other

**PART II: EVALUATION DETAIL** Date of Inspection: 11/08/23 School Name: JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

CATEGORY AREA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	GAS LEAKS	MECH/HVAC	SEWER	INTERIOR SURFACES	OVERALL CLEANLINESS	PEST/VERMIN INFESTATION	ELECTRICAL	RESTROOM	SINKS/ FOUNTAINS	FIRE SAFETY	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	ROOFS	PLAYGROUND/S CHOOOL GROUNDS	WINDOWS/ DOORS/ GATES/FENCES
<b>ADMIN</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
<b>PRINCIPAL</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
<b>NURSE</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
<b>STAFF REST ROOM</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
<b>LEARNING DIRECTOR</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
<b>CUSTODIAN OFFICE</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
<b>CAFETERIA</b>	OK	OK	OK	D	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS: floor tiles lifting														
<b>1</b>	OK	OK	OK	D	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS: ceiling tiles stained, large built in cabinet doors don't stay closed (work orders submitted)														
<b>2</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
<b>3</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
<b>4</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS: ceiling tiles stained (work order submitted)														
<b>5</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
<b>6</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS: one sinks drinking fountain has a low flow, the other over sprays (work orders submitted)														

**PART II: EVALUATION DETAIL** Date of Inspection: 11/08/23 School Name: JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

CATEGORY AREA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	GAS LEAKS	MECH/HVAC	SEWER	INTERIOR SURFACES	OVERALL CLEANLINESS	PEST/VERMIN INFESTATION	ELECTRICAL	RESTROOM	SINKS/ FOUNTAINS	FIRE SAFETY	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	ROOFS	PLAYGROUND/S CHOOOL GROUNDS	WINDOWS/ DOORS/ GATES/FENCES
9	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	ceiling tiles stained, sink drains very slow (work orders submitted)													
8	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
7	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
GIRLS REST ROOM (NEAR 7)	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	low water flow in 3 sinks (work order submitted)													
BOYS REST ROOM (NEAR 7)	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
ALL GENDER REST ROOM (NEAR 7)	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
CAMPUS LIFE	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
10	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
11	OK	OK	OK	D	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	cabinet doors falling off, need to be replaced													
12	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
13	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	D	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	extensive amounts of paper covering walls													
14	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	stained ceiling tiles (work order submitted)													
20	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														

**PART II: EVALUATION DETAIL** Date of Inspection: 11/08/23 School Name: JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

CATEGORY AREA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	GAS LEAKS	MECH/HVAC	SEWER	INTERIOR SURFACES	OVERALL CLEANLINESS	PEST/VERMIN INFESTATION	ELECTRICAL	RESTROOM	SINKS/ FOUNTAINS	FIRE SAFETY	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	ROOFS	PLAYGROUND/S CHOOOL GROUNDS	WINDOWS/ DOORS/ GATES/FENCES
19	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
18	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
17	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
GIRLS REST ROOM (NEAR 16)	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
BOYS REST ROOM (NEAR 16)	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
16	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
15/ LOUNGE	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	light diffuser broken, one light bulb out (work order submitted)													
21/ LIBRARY	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
22/ LIBRARY	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
23	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
24	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
25	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
26	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														



**PART II: EVALUATION DETAIL** Date of Inspection: 11/08/23 School Name: JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

CATEGORY AREA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	GAS LEAKS	MECH/HVAC	SEWER	INTERIOR SURFACES	OVERALL CLEANLINESS	PEST/VERMIN INFESTATION	ELECTRICAL	RESTROOM	SINKS/ FOUNTAINS	FIRE SAFETY	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	ROOFS	PLAYGROUND/S CHOOOL GROUNDS	WINDOWS/ DOORS/ GATES/FENCES
27	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
35	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
34	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
33	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
32	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
31	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
30	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	missing window coverings (work order submitted)													
29	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
28	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
36	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
37	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
38	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
PLAY COURTS	OK	NA	OK	NA	OK	OK	NA	NA	NA	NA	OK	NA	NA	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														

**PART II: EVALUATION DETAIL** Date of Inspection: 11/08/23 School Name: JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

CATEGORY AREA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	GAS LEAKS	MECH/HVAC	SEWER	INTERIOR SURFACES	OVERALL CLEANLINESS	PEST/VERMIN INFESTATION	ELECTRICAL	RESTROOM	SINKS/ FOUNTAINS	FIRE SAFETY	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	ROOFS	PLAYGROUND/S CHOO L GROUND S	WINDOWS/ DOORS/ GATES/FENCES
<b>PLAY FIELDS</b>	OK	NA	OK	NA	OK	OK	NA	NA	NA	NA	OK	NA	NA	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
<b>PLAYGROUNDS</b>	OK	NA	OK	NA	OK	OK	NA	NA	NA	NA	OK	NA	NA	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
<b>PARKING LOTS</b>	OK	NA	OK	NA	OK	OK	NA	NA	NA	NA	OK	NA	NA	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
<b>GIRLS REST ROOM (NEAR 30)</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	tbar rusted, ceiling tiles needreplacing, dirty vent, broken light diffuser (work orders submitted)													
<b>BOYS REST ROOM (NEAR 30)</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	<b>D</b>	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	urinal leaking (work order submitted) dry rot on outside													
<b>UNISEX REST ROOM (NEAR 16)</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														
<b>UNISEX REST ROOM (NEAR ADMIN)</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:														

Marks: **OK** = Good Repair; **D** = Deficiency; **X** = Extreme Deficiency; **NA** = Not Applicable  
 Use additional Area Lines as necessary.

**D** **X**

SCHOOL DISTRICT/COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION <b>DINUBA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b>		COUNTY <b>TULARE</b>	
SCHOOL SITE <b>JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</b>		SCHOOL TYPE (GRADE LEVELS) <b>K THRU 6</b>	NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS ON SITE
INSPECTOR'S NAME <b>FRANCIS ALVAREZ</b>	INSPECTOR'S TITLE <b>FACILITIES TECHNICIAN</b>	NAME OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE ACCOMPANYING THE INSPECTOR(S) (IF APPLICABLE)	
TIME OF INSPECTION <b>7:15 AM</b>	WEATHER CONDITION AT TIME OF INSPECTION <b>COLD &amp; SUNNY</b>		

**PART III: CATEGORY TOTALS AND RANKING** (round all calculations to two decimal places)

TOTAL NUMBER OF AREAS EVALUATED	CATEGORY TOTALS	A. SYSTEMS			B. INTERIOR	C. CLEANLINESS		D. ELECTRICAL	E. RESTROOMS/FOUNTAINS		F. SAFETY		G. STRUCTURAL		H. EXTERNAL	
		GAS LEAKS	MECH/HVAC	SEWER	INTERIOR SURFACES	OVERALL CLEANLINESS	PEST/VERMIN INFESTATION	ELECTRICAL	RESTROOMS	SINKS/ FOUNTAINS	FIRE SAFETY	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	ROOFS	PLAYGROUND/ SCHOOL GROUNDS	WINDOWS/DOORS/ GATES/FENCES
↓	Number of "OK"s:	59	55	59	52	59	59	55	15	49	54	59	54	55	59	59
	Number of "D"s:	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
<b>59</b>	Number of "X"s:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Number of N/As:	0	4	0	4	0	0	4	44	10	4	0	4	4	0	0
Percent of System in Good Repair Number of "OK"s divided by (Total Areas - "NA"s")		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.55%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	98.18%	100.00%	98.18%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
<b>Total Percent per Category (average of above)*</b>		100.00%			94.55%	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%		99.09%		99.09%		100.00%	
<b>Rank (Circle one)</b> GOOD = 90%-100% FAIR = 75%-89.99% POOR = 0%-74.99%		GOOD			GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD		GOOD		GOOD		GOOD	

\*Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a "poor" ranking for that category and a zero for "Total Percent per Category".

<b>OVERALL RATING:</b>	<b>DETERMINE AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF 8 CATEGORIES ABOVE</b> →	<b>99.09%</b>	<b>SCHOOL RATING**</b> →	<b>EXEMPLARY</b>
------------------------	---	---------------	--------------------------	------------------

\*\*For School Rating, apply the Percentage Range below to the average percentage determined above, taking into account the rating Description below.

PERCENTAGE	DESCRIPTION	RATING
99%-100%	The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.	EXEMPLARY
90%-98.99%	The school is maintained in good repair with a number of non-critical deficiencies noted. These deficiencies are isolated, and/or resulting from minor wear and tear, and/or in the process of being mitigated.	GOOD
75%-89.99%	The school is not in good repair. Some deficiencies noted are critical and/or widespread. Repairs and/or additional maintenance are necessary in several areas of the school site.	FAIR
0%-74.99%	The school facilities are in poor condition. Deficiencies of various degrees have been noted throughout the site. Major repairs and maintenance are necessary throughout the campus.	POOR

**COMMENTS AND RATING EXPLANATION:** \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_