

School Accountability Report Card Reported for School Year 2008-09 Published During 2009-10

Executive Summary School Accountability Report Card, 2008-09

Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes School

Address: 16633 Elizabeth Lake Rd. , Lake Hughes CA 93532
Principal: Mrs. Diane Parkins

Phone: 661-724-1231
Grade Span: K - 8

This executive summary of the School Accountability Report Card (SARC) is intended to provide parents and community members with a quick snapshot of school accountability. The data presented in this report are reported for the 2008-09 school year, except the School Finances and School Completion data that are reported for the 2007-08 school year. For additional information about the school, parents and community members should review the entire SARC or contact the school principal or the district office.

About This School

Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes Union School, with a current enrollment of 335, serves students in kindergarten through eighth grades and is located in the foothills of Northern Los Angeles County between Palmdale and Gorman. It serves the communities of Lake Hughes, Elizabeth Lake, Green Valley and Pine Canyon.

The school is located on a hillside between Lake Hughes and Lake Elizabeth at 16633 Elizabeth Lake Road. The location is picturesque and affords a view that stretches from Sawmill Mountain in the west to Mount Baldy in the San Gabriel Mountains far to the East.

The school has 16 student classrooms with one additional instructional support teacher. The school has 80 laptop computers with wireless internet connections which are housed on mobile laptop carts and two computer labs. The school has undergone facilities improvements that include exterior painting, repaving, an entrance expansion and improved lighting. A new playground has been installed for early primary age students. All buildings on the campus have been made handicap accessible. The school offers a solid core instructional day supported by a Response to Instruction program, afternoon academic intervention and tutorial classes three days a week.

Student Enrollment

Group	Percent
African American	1.42 %
American Indian or Alaska Native	%
Asian	%
Filipino	%
Hispanic or Latino	11.61 %
Pacific Islander	%
White (not Hispanic)	76.77 %
Multiple or No Response	10.20 %
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	21.00 %
English Learners	2.00 %
Students with Disabilities	8.00 %
Total Number of Students	353

Teachers

Indicator	Teachers
Teachers with full credential	17
Teachers without full credential	0
Teachers Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	0
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	0

Student Performance

Subject	Students Proficient and Above on California Standards Tests
English-Language Arts	69.6%
Mathematics	62.3%
Science	71.8%
History-Social Science	52.1%

Academic Progress

Indicator	Result
2009 Growth API Score (from 2009 Growth API Report)	852
Statewide Rank (from 2008 Base API Report)	7
2009-10 Program Improvement Status (PI Year)	Not in PI

School Facilities

Summary of Most Recent Site Inspection

The school is well maintained by the custodial and maintenance staff. The school has a safety team that monitors conditions on campus and makes recommendations for improvements.

All students are housed in safe classroom environments. A site master plan was developed for future school improvement. The areas of greatest need for the school are improved parking and a multi-use room that can hold a larger audience than the current school cafeteria.

Repairs Needed

No major repairs were required.

Corrective Actions Taken or Planned

No corrective actions were required.

Curriculum and Instructional Materials

Core Curriculum Areas	Pupils Who Lack Textbooks and Instructional Materials
Reading/Language Arts	0%
Mathematics	0%
Science	0%
History-Social Science	0%
Foreign Language	NA
Health	NA

Visual and Performing Arts	NA
Science Laboratory Equipment (grades 9-12)	NA

School Finances

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil (Unrestricted Sources Only)
School Site	\$ 7,476
District	\$7,476
State	\$5,512

School Accountability Report Card Reported for School Year 2008-09 Published During 2009-10

The School Accountability Report Card (SARC), which is required by law to be published annually, contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school. More information about SARC requirements is available on the California Department of Education (CDE) [SARC](#) Web page. For additional information about the school, parents and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.

I. Data and Access

DataQuest

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE [DataQuest](#) Web page 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., Academic Performance Index [API], Adequate Yearly Progress [AYP]), test data, enrollment, 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 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

Contact Information (School Year 2009-10)

This section provides the schools contact information.

School		District	
School Name	Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes	District Name	Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes Union Elementary
Street	16633 Elizabeth Lake Rd.	Phone Number	661-724-1231
City, State, Zip	Lake Hughes , CA 93532	Web Site	www.heluesd.org
Phone Number	661-724-1231	Superintendent	Diane Parkins
Principal	Diane Parkins	E-mail Address	dparkins@lws.lacoe.edu
E-mail Address	dparkins@lws.lacoe.edu	CDS Code	19- 64626- 6014427

School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2008-09)

School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2008-09)

Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes Union School, with a current enrollment of 335, serves students in kindergarten through eighth grades and is located in the foothills of Northern Los Angeles County between Palmdale and Gorman. It serves the communities of Lake Hughes, Elizabeth Lake, Green Valley and Pine Canyon.

The school is located on a hillside between Lake Hughes and Lake Elizabeth at 16633 Elizabeth Lake Road. The location is picturesque and affords a view that stretches from Sawmill Mountain in the west to Mount Baldy in the San

Gabriel Mountains far to the East.

The school has 16 student classrooms with one additional instructional support teacher. The school has 80 laptop computers with wireless internet connections which are housed on mobile laptop carts and two computer labs. The school has undergone facilities improvements that include exterior painting, repaving, an entrance expansion and improved lighting. A new playground has been installed for early primary age students. All buildings on the campus have been made handicap accessible. The school offers a solid core instructional day supported by a Response to Instruction program, afternoon academic intervention and tutorial classes three days a week.

HUGHES-ELIZABETH LAKES STRATEGIC PLAN

VISION

Providing an excellent education in an atmosphere that supports students as they develop into outstanding members of the community.

MISSION

We at HELUS are dedicated to reaching the highest levels of achievement for all students. We will attain this goal through a total commitment to the ongoing success of each student and through open and honest communication within our school community.

Optimize Resources

- **Develop and fostering personnel**
- **Address district challenges proactively**
- **Improve “green” practices**
- **Use advanced technologies to create optimum learning environments and school business efficacy**
- **Spend wisely to support district goals**

Excel as a Community (students, staff, parents, board, community members) of Learners

- **Continue achievement on API and AYP**
- **Create lifelong thinkers, learners and leaders**
- **Build knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, talents and passions**
- **Facilitate ongoing communication between all community members**
- **Develop and encourage individual strengths**
- **Keep parents involved and informed**

Valuing Personnel and Community

- **Attracting and retaining highly qualified and dedicated employees**
- **Fostering positive, productive relationships**
- **Emphasizing shared decision-making**
- **Encouraging parent/community involvement and fostering support**

Create a Welcoming Environment

- **Maintain a clean/safe campus**
- **Honor the value and worth of all human beings**
- **Cultivate community involvement and collaboration**
- **Be prepared for unseen events and emergency situations**

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2008-09)

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2008-09)

Parents are an integral part of the school and vital for supporting student achievement. There are many ways parents can be involved at school: classroom volunteer, library volunteer, parent-teacher association member, community advisory council and school site council member. The school has a very active Parent Teacher Association. Any parent interested in participating can speak with his or her child’s teacher or the school office.

Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays the number of students enrolled in each grade level at the school.

Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	36
Grade 1	29
Grade 2	33
Grade 3	48
Grade 4	36
Grade 5	38
Grade 6	41
Grade 7	43
Grade 8	49
Ungraded Elementary	0
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0
Ungraded Secondary	0
Total Enrollment	353

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays the percent of students enrolled at the school who are identified as being in a particular group.

Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
African American	1.42 %
American Indian or Alaska Native	%
Asian	%
Filipino	%
Hispanic or Latino	11.61 %
Pacific Islander	%
White (not Hispanic)	76.77 %
Multiple or No Response	10.20 %
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	21.00 %
English Learners	2.00 %
Students with Disabilities	8.00 %

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)

This table displays by grade level the average class size and the number of classrooms that fall into each size category (a range of total students per classroom).

Grade Level	2006-07				2007-08				2008-09			
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms		
		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+
K	18.0	1			13.0	2			18.0	2		
1	17.0	1			20.0	1			17.0	1		
2	17.0	2			18.5	2			18.0	1		
3	17.0	2			16.5	2			19.0	2		
4	20.5	1	1		26.0		1		36.0			1
5	20.5	1	1		30.0		1		24.0		1	
6	25.0		2		24.5		2		28.0		1	
K-3	16.5	2			18.0	1			18.5	2		
3-4												
4-8					23.0		1		27.0		1	
Other												

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)

This table displays by subject area the average class size and the number of classrooms that fall into each size category (a range of total students per classroom).

Subject	2006-07				2007-08				2008-09			
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms		
		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+
English	22.8	2	2		19.3	4	2		19.2	4	2	
Mathematics	22.7	3	3		22.5	3	1		23.0	3	1	
Science	22.8	2	2		21.8	4	2		23.0	3	1	
Social Science	22.8	2	2		22.5	2	2		23.0	2	2	

III. School Climate

School Safety Plan (School Year 2008-09)

This section provides information about the school's comprehensive safety plan.

Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes Union School District has an active safety committee that meets monthly. Please see appendix V.

Suspensions and Expulsions

This table displays the rate of suspensions and expulsions (the total number of incidents divided by the total enrollment) at the school and district levels for the most recent three-year period.

Rate	School			District		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Suspensions	6.4	2.6	2.0	6.4	2.6	2.0
Expulsions	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0

IV. School Facilities

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (School Year 2009-10)

This section provides information about the condition of the school's grounds, buildings, and restrooms, and a description of any planned or recently completed facility improvements.

The school is well maintained by the custodial and maintenance staff. The school has a safety team that monitors conditions on campus and makes recommendations for improvements.

All students are housed in safe classroom environments. A site master plan was developed for future school improvement. The areas of greatest need for the school are improved parking and a multi-use room that can hold a larger audience than the current school cafeteria.

School Facility Good Repair Status (School Year 2009-10)

This table displays the results of the most recently completed school site inspection to determine the school facility's good repair status.

System Inspected	Repair Status				Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor	
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	N/A	X			
Interior: Interior Surfaces	N/A	X			
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	N/A	X			
Electrical: Electrical	N/A	X			
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	N/A	X			
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	N/A				

		X			
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	N/A	X			
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	N/A	X			
Overall Rating	Good			NA	

V. Teachers

Teacher Credentials

This table displays the number of teachers assigned to the school with a full credential, without a full credential, and those teaching outside of their subject area of competence. Detailed information about teacher qualifications can be found on the CDE [DataQuest](#) Web page.

Teachers	School			District
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09
With Full Credential	18	17	17	17
Without Full Credential	1	1	0	0
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence				0

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

This table displays the number of teacher misassignments (teachers assigned without proper legal authorization) and the number of vacant teacher positions (not filled by a single designated teacher assigned to teach the entire course at the beginning of the school year or semester). Note: Total Teacher Misassignments includes the number of Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners.

Indicator	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

Core Academic Classes Taught by No Child Left Behind Compliant Teachers (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays the percent of classes in core academic subjects taught by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) compliant and non-NCLB compliant teachers in the school, in all schools in the district, in high-poverty schools in the district, and in low-poverty schools in the district. High poverty schools are defined as those schools with student participation of approximately 75 percent or more in the free and reduced price meals program. Low poverty schools are those with student participation of approximately 25 percent or less in the free and reduced price meals program. More information on teacher qualifications required under NCLB can be found on the CDE [Improving Teacher and Principal Quality](#) Web page.

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by NCLB Compliant Teachers	Taught by Non-NCLB Compliant Teachers
This School	100.0	0.0
All Schools in District	100.0	0.0
High-Poverty Schools in District		
Low-Poverty Schools in District	100.0	0.0

VI. Support Staff

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays, in units of full-time equivalents (FTE), the number of academic counselors and other support staff who are assigned to the school and the average number of students per academic counselor. 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.

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor		
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)		N/A
Psychologist	0.70	N/A
Social Worker		N/A
Nurse	0.20	N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	0.40	N/A
Resource Specialist (non-teaching)	1	N/A
Other		

VII. Curriculum and Instructional Materials

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2009-10)

This table displays information about the quality, currency, and availability of the standards-aligned textbooks and other instructional materials used at the school, and information about the school's use of any supplemental curriculum or non-adopted textbooks or instructional materials.

Core Curriculum Area	Quality, Currency, and Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials	Percent of Pupils Who Lack Their Own Assigned Textbooks and Instructional Materials
Reading/Language Arts	Adequate	0
Mathematics	Adequate	0
Science	Adequate	0
History-Social Science	Adequate	0
Foreign Language	Adequate	0
Health	NA	NA
Visual and Performing Arts	NA	NA
Science Laboratory Equipment (grades 9-12)	Adequate	0

VIII. School Finances

Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2007-08)

This table displays a comparison of the school's per pupil expenditures from unrestricted (basic) sources with other schools in the district and throughout the state, and a comparison of the average teacher salary at the school site with average teacher salaries at the district and state levels. Detailed information regarding school expenditures can be found on the CDE [Current Expense of Education & Per-pupil Spending](#) Web page and teacher salaries can be found on the CDE [Certificated Salaries & Benefits](#) Web page.

Level	Total Expenditures Per Pupil	Expenditures Per Pupil (Supplemental / Restricted)	Expenditures Per Pupil (Basic / Unrestricted)	Average Teacher Salary
School Site	\$10,446	\$2,970	\$7,476	\$65,664
District	\$10,446	\$2,970	\$7,476	\$65,664
Percent Difference – School Site and District	0%	0%	0%	0%
State	N/A	N/A	\$5,512	\$56,284
Percent Difference – School Site and State	N/A	N/A	\$1,964	\$9,380

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2008-09)

This section provides information about the programs and supplemental services that are available at the school and funded through either categorical or other sources.

The school offers a solid core instructional day supported by a Response to Instruction intervention program, afternoon academic intervention and tutorial classes three days a week. Special Education services for speech and language and learning disabled students are offered at the school site. Gifted and talented students needs are met through differentiation in the classroom, Response to Instruction as well as an afterschool program.

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2007-08)

This table displays district salaries for teachers, principals, and superintendents, and compares these figures to the state averages for districts of the same type and size. The table also displays teacher and administrative salaries as a percent of a district's budget, and compares these figures to the state averages for districts of the same type and size based on the salary schedule. Detailed information regarding salaries may be found on the CDE [Certificated Salaries & Benefits](#) Web page.

Category	District Amount	State Average For Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$37,567	\$38,481
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$66,309	\$55,789
Highest Teacher Salary	\$76,455	\$70,849
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	70,925	\$88,862
Average Principal Salary (Middle)		\$94,015
Average Principal Salary (High)		\$97,594
Superintendent Salary	\$33,825	\$112,750
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	34.90 %	37.20 %
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	5.80 %	6.60 %

IX. Student Performance

Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

The Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program consists of several key components, including the California Standards Tests (CSTs); the California Modified Assessment (CMA), and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). The CSTs show how well students are doing in relation to the state content standards. The CSTs include English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics in grades two through eleven; science in grades five, eight, and nine through eleven; and history-social science in grades eight, and ten through eleven. The CAPA includes ELA, mathematics, and science in grades two through eleven, and for science for grades five, eight, and ten. The CAPA is given to those students with significant cognitive disabilities whose disabilities prevent them from taking either the CSTs with accommodations or modifications or the CMA with accommodations. The CMA includes ELA and mathematics for grades three through eight and science in grade five and is an alternate assessment that is based on modified achievement standards. The CMA is designed to assess those students whose disabilities preclude them from achieving grade-level proficiency on an assessment of the California content standards with or without accommodations. Student scores are reported as performance levels. Detailed information

regarding the STAR Program results for each grade and performance level, including the percent of students not tested, can be found on the CDE [Standardized Testing and Reporting \(STAR\) Results](#) Web site. Program information regarding the STAR Program can be found in the [Explaining 2008 STAR Program Summary Results to the Public guide](#). 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. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

Standardized Testing and Reporting Results for All Students – Three-Year Comparison

This table displays the percent of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards).

Subject	School			District			State		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
English-Language Arts	56	59	70	56	59	70	43	46	50
Mathematics	52	54	62	52	54	62	40	43	46
Science	46	56	72	46	56	72	38	46	50
History-Social Science	34	45	52	34	45	52	33	36	41

Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or less because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or privacy protection. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

Standardized Testing and Reporting Results by Student Group (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays the percent of students, by group, achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards) for the most recent testing period.

Group	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced			
	English-Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	History-Social Science
African American	*	*		
American Indian or Alaska Native				
Asian				
Filipino				
Hispanic or Latino	72	56	*	*
Pacific Islander				
White (not Hispanic)	70	63	75	57
Male	64	62	69	47
Female	77	63	76	62
Economically Disadvantaged	55	56	53	*
English Learners	*	*		
Students with Disabilities	23	50	*	*
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services				

Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or less because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or privacy protection. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2008-09)

The California Physical Fitness Test is administered to students in grades five, seven, and nine only. This table displays by grade level the percent of students meeting fitness standards for the most recent testing period. Detailed information regarding this test, and comparisons of a school's test results to the district and state levels, may be found on the CDE [Physical Fitness Testing \(PFT\)](#) Web page. Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or privacy protection. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Healthy Fitness Zones		
	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards
5	16.2	29.7	43.2
7	24.4	46.7	17.8
9	0.0	0.0	0.0

X. Accountability

Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of the academic performance and progress of schools in California. API scores range from 200 to 1,000, with a statewide target of 800. Detailed information about the API can be found on the CDE [Academic Performance Index \(API\)](#) Web page.

Academic Performance Index Ranks – Three-Year Comparison

This table displays the school's statewide and similar schools API ranks. The statewide API rank ranges from one to ten. A statewide rank of one means that the school has an API score in the lowest ten percent of all schools in the state, while a statewide rank of ten means that the school has an API score in the highest ten percent of all schools in the state. The similar schools API rank reflects how a school compares to 100 statistically matched "similar schools." A similar schools rank of one means that the school's academic performance is comparable to the lowest performing ten schools of the 100 similar schools, while a similar schools rank of ten means that the school's academic performance is better than at least 90 of the 100 similar schools.

API Rank	2006	2007	2008
Statewide	7	7	7
Similar Schools	4	2	5

"N/A"

means a number is not applicable or not available due to missing data.

"B"

means this is either an LEA or an Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) school. Schools participating in the ASAM do not currently receive growth, target information, or statewide or similar schools rankings on this report in recognition of their markedly different educational missions and populations served. ASAM schools are covered under the Alternative Accountability system as required by Education Code Section 52052 and not the API accountability system. However, API information is needed to comply with the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law. Growth, target and rank information are not applicable to LEAs.

"C"

means this is a special education school. Statewide and similar schools ranks are not applicable to special education schools.

" * "

means this API is calculated for a small school or a small LEA, defined as having between 11 and 99 valid STAR Program test scores included in the API. APIs based on small numbers of students are less reliable and therefore should be carefully interpreted. Similar schools ranks are not calculated for small schools.

Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group – Three-Year Comparison

This table displays, by student group, the actual API changes in points added or lost for the past three years, and the most recent API score. Note: "N/A" means that the student group is not numerically significant.

Group	Actual API Change			Growth API Score
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009
All Students at the School	-9	27	30	852
African American				
American Indian or Alaska Native				
Asian				
Filipino				
Hispanic or Latino				
Pacific Islander				
White (not Hispanic)	-1	21	28	858
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			45	802
English Learners				
Students with Disabilities				

"N/A" means a number is not applicable or not available due to missing data.

*** means this API is calculated for a small school, defined as having between 11 and 99 valid Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program test scores included in the API. The API is asterisked if the school was small either in 2008 or 2009. APIs based on small numbers of students are less reliable and therefore should be carefully interpreted.

Adequate Yearly Progress

The federal NCLB Act requires that all schools and districts meet the following Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) criteria:

- Participation rate on the state's standards-based assessments in ELA and mathematics
- Percent proficient on the state's standards-based assessments in ELA and mathematics
- API as an additional indicator
- Graduation rate (for secondary schools)

Detailed information about AYP, including participation rates and percent proficient results by student group, can be found on the CDE [Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\) Web page](#).

Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays an indication of whether the school and the district made AYP overall and whether the school and the district met each of the AYP criteria.

AYP Criteria	School	District
Overall	Yes	Yes
Participation Rate - English-Language Arts	Yes	Yes
Participation Rate - Mathematics	Yes	Yes
Percent Proficient - English-Language Arts	Yes	Yes
Percent Proficient - Mathematics	Yes	Yes
API	Yes	Yes
Graduation Rate	N/A	N/A

"Yes" Met 2009 AYP Criteria

"No" Did not Meet 2009 AYP Criteria

Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2009-10)

Schools and districts receiving federal Title I funding enter Program Improvement (PI) if they do not make AYP for two consecutive years in the same content area (ELA or mathematics) or on the same indicator (API or graduation rate). After entering PI, schools and districts advance to the next level of intervention with each additional year that they do not make AYP. Detailed information about PI identification can be found on the CDE [Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\)](#) Web page.

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status	Not in PI	Not In PI
First Year of Program Improvement		
Year in Program Improvement		
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	

XII. Instructional Planning and Scheduling

Professional Development

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

Three full staff days are devoted to staff development each year. In addition to these three days one staff meeting each month is devoted to staff development. During the 2008/2008 school year certificated staff and instructional assistants were trained in implementing Thinking Maps and Response to Instruction. All staff members are also provided with opportunities to attend conferences and workshops tailored to their special needs throughout the school year.

Appendix V

Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes School

Comprehensive School Safety Plan

EC 32280

Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes School District

Sandra Lyon, Superintendent/Principal

16633 Elizabeth Lake Road

Lake Hughes, CA 93532

(661) 724-1231

slyon@lws.lacoe.edu

Plan reviewed 2/21/08

HUGHES-ELIZABETH LAKES
COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL SAFETY PLAN

2007-2008 Safety Committee Members:

Doug Larsen, Maintenance Lead _____

Wendy Perry, Teacher _____

Lisa Flum, Teacher _____

Theresa Hambro, Teacher _____

Doris Karabinus,
Community Representative _____

Ruby Thompson,

Director of Business and Operations _____

Sandra Lyon,

Superintendent/Principal _____

Loren Worthington

Los Angeles County Sheriff _____

HUGHES-ELIZABETH LAKES

COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL SAFETY PLAN

Assessment of Crime

Crime Reports

In the previous year, 2006-2007, one crime report was filed for an attempted break-in in one of the middle school classrooms. The break-in attempt occurred over a weekend. In the current school year, 2007-2008, there have been 0 crime reports made.

Suspensions/Expulsions

In the 2006-2007 school year, 23 students were suspended for a total of 87 days and one of those students was expelled. In the 2007-2008 school year, 3 students have been suspended for a total of 5 days.

HUGHES-ELIZABETH LAKES

COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL SAFETY PLAN

2007-2008

Safety Committee Members:

Doug Larsen, Maintenance Lead

Wendy Perry, Teacher

Lisa Flum, Teacher

Theresa Hambro, Teacher

Doris Karabinus, Community Representative

Ruby Thompson, Director of Business and Operations

Sandra Lyon, Superintendent/Principal

Vision: Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes School is a positive, safe learning community, where students feel connected and valued and where high academic achievement and life-long learning is a goal for all.

Mission: At our school, high levels of academic achievement for all students will be attained through a commitment to creating a community built on trust, honest communication and long-term dedication to the ongoing success of each student.

Data Sources Used to Construct the Safe School Plan

The Safety Committee consulted our data on attendance, suspensions/expulsions, API, the school improvement plan and our California Healthy Kids Survey.

Attendance is an ongoing area of concern. Last year's P-1 showed 95.8 percent attendance while P-2 dropped to 92.8 percent. Periods of low attendance have been attributed to flu seasons and the custodial staff continues to implement aggressive cleaning policies to ensure that transmission of viruses is as limited as possible. Additionally attendance incentives and awards are given out monthly and each semester. Local businesses are partnering with us to give students bowling and meal certificates and PTA purchased perfect attendance bracelets.

The Safety Team examined last year's and this year's data on student suspensions and expulsions. In the 2006-2007 school year, 23 students were suspended for a total of 87 days and one of those students was expelled. In the 2007-2008 school year, 3 students have been suspended for a total of 5 days. Successful implementation of classroom management plans by teachers, the implementation of a systematic merit system in the middle school and careful articulation of school and classroom expectations may have contributed to the reduction in suspensions.

Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes School's API was 800 for 2007 and 809 and AYP was met in both years. The school takes pride in its high-achieving status and completed the California Distinguished School Application this year. The API score reflects the solid core program we have at HELUS and the commitment to standards-based instruction. The drop in nine points is a concern of which the staff is well aware. The staff at HELUS is committed to pursuing staff development that will assist instructional staff in providing the best instruction to all students.

Last year SSC members rewrote the Single Plan for Student Achievement and wrote goals for student achievement in each subject area and a goal for school climate and environment. At the beginning of each school year, the SSC will examine student achievement data and other sources of information as it updates the plan and crafts a budget to support student learning. The Safety Committee took the School Improvement plan into consideration as it discussed the Safety Plan.

The committee also considered data from the California Healthy Kids Survey which was administered in the Spring of 2006. The committee considered the data about drug, alcohol and tobacco use and exposure as well as student responses about school safety. The data showed that nearly 1/5th of the 7th graders at that time had experimented with alcohol, drugs or tobacco and that 31% reported being harassed at school while 40% reported being in a fight. A startling 27% reported carrying a weapon on school property and 29% reported being afraid of being beaten up on campus. The committee will be awaiting the results of this year's CHKS to see if the negative behaviors have diminished.

Finally, the Safety Committee saw fit to create surveys to administer to staff, parents and 6-8th grade students that pertained to school safety. The results were used to determine where we are as a campus in 2007-2008 and establish goals for the two components. The Safety Committee noted that results for parents and students differ greatly. For example, whereas parents feel the rules are clear and posted and carried out effectively, students did not feel the same and a surprising number reported not feeling that people care for each other at our site. Students also reported, at all three grade levels, in significant numbers, that they were called names or felt rejected in the past month. These data were extremely useful in crafting our objectives for the Safe School Plan. Meanwhile staff surveys indicated concerns about whether or not local police know enough about our campus to assist during emergencies, about the security of windows and doors to classrooms and storage of school files and records.

Areas of Pride and Strength

After reviewing our data, the committee recognizes that there are areas of pride and strength for HELUS in both components.

Component 1—People and Programs

- Positive Rewards Program—recognition of students “caught” doing something good who receive pencils, recognition and the chance for a prize drawn at the end of each month
- Attendance Incentive awards—recognition at the classroom and school level of perfect attendance, made possible by partnerships with local businesses and the PTA
- Implementation of All Stars in the middle school this year, to address CHKS results
- Implementation of merit system in middle school
- Staff development in the area of differentiation to support all learners
- Counseling from school psychologist for individuals and groups

Component 2—The Physical Environment

- Yellow vests for all duty aides
- Monthly fire/earthquake drills
- Well-maintained campus and facilities
- Proactive custodial/maintenance staff

Areas for Improvement

Analysis of the data made it quite clear to the Safety Committee that while there were many strengths, there were also clearly areas that needed improvement. Based on the results of the data, the review matrix and our resources, the major areas of desired change are:

1. Decrease bullying behaviors and give students strategies for coping with unkind students and improve student connectedness to the school and each other.
2. Improve adult consistency in addressing discipline issues.
3. Practice a variety of drills and have clear crisis management plans in place that parents are aware of and understand.
4. Make sure all staff, parents and students understand how visitors to campus are addressed.

Our overall goals for the 2008-2009 school year are:

Component 1

By June 30, 2009, a school-wide program will be in place to address bullying behaviors and foster a positive school climate for students.

Component 2

By June 30, 2009, a complete plan for emergency procedures will be in place for a crisis or disaster and all stakeholders will understand their roles and responsibilities.

Goal 1: By June 30, 2009, a school-wide program will be in place to address bullying behaviors and foster a positive school climate for students

Objective 1.1: By the beginning of the 2008-2009 school year, the school will have purchased and begin implementing a school-wide program to create a caring, cooperative environment.

Related Activities: The Leadership Team and SSC will collaborate on a review of research-based materials and then select one to implement.

Resources Needed: School Safety and Violence Prevention Act Funds; approximately \$3200.00. Training and planning time will also be allocated.

Person(s) Responsible: Mrs. Lyon, Mrs. Lewis

Timeline for implementation: By October 1, 2008

Objective 1.2: By the end of the 2008-2009 school year, 70 percent of all 6th, 7th and 8th grade students surveyed will report that “All students are respected at this school” and 70 percent of all students will report that they have not been “called names or put down” or “rejected” by other students.

Related Activities: The school-wide program chosen by SSC and Leadership Team will be implemented

Resources Needed: Staff development time; materials listed above; Survey after implementation

Person(s) Responsible: Classroom teachers, Mrs. Lyon, Mrs. Maple

Timeline for implementation: By June 15, 2009

Objective 1.3: Teachers and staff will be trained in program and consistent discipline procedures.

Related Activities: Staff development on new program; training for duty aides

Resources Needed: School Safety and Violence Prevention Funding to pay duty aides to attend training, approximately \$200.00

Person(s) Responsible: Classroom teachers, Mrs. Lyon, Mrs. Maple

Timeline for implementation: By October 31, 2008

Goal 2: By June 30, 2009, a complete plan for emergency procedures will be in place for a crisis or disaster and all stakeholders will understand their roles and responsibilities.

Objective 2.1: At the first staff meeting of the 08-09 school year, roles and responsibilities for disasters will be established and a drill will be conducted before the end of the school year that addresses the SEMS criteria

Related Activities: Development of roles and responsibilities; assigning of roles and responsibilities; coordination with local agencies

Resources Needed: School Safety and Violence Prevention Funding to purchase any emergency materials needed; collaboration with Community Safety Committee/Red Cross

Person(s) Responsible: Safety Committee and Mrs. Karabinus, community representative

Timeline for implementation: By June 2009

Objective 2.2: By the end of September, all parents, staff and students will be apprised of the appropriate procedures for addressing unknown visitors to campus

Related Activities: Staff meetings; Back-to-School Night; handbook development; student assemblies

Resources Needed: Safety and Violence Prevention Act Funds for duplicating, parent information night

Person(s) Responsible: Mrs. Lyon, Mrs. Maple

Timeline for implementation: September 30, 2008

Objective 2-3: Speakers will be installed/repared so students/staff outside of classrooms can hear all-call announcements

Related Activities: Purchase/repair of speakers

Resources Needed: Deferred maintenance fund, unknown pending bid

Person(s) Responsible: Doug Larsen, Ruby Thompson

Timeline for implementation: By December 31, 2008

The Safety Committee will meet throughout the 2008-2009 school year to measure progress toward these goals and will report their findings back to the SSC, staff and community. Goals and Objectives will subsequently be adjusted each year as necessary.