



SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION

Agenda Item# 9.1

Meeting Date: September 15, 2011

Subject: 2010-11 Achievement Results and Priority Schools Report

- Information Item Only
- Approval on Consent Agenda
- Conference (for discussion only)
- Conference/First Reading (Action Anticipated: _____)
- Conference/Action
- Action
- Public Hearing

Division: Accountability Office

Recommendation: Receive information

Background/Rationale:

The California Standards Tests (CST's) are designed to assess students' achievement of content standards in English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies. The Academic Performance Index (API) and Adequate Yearly Progress are state and federal accountability metrics that measure school and district progress. Reports on CST's, API, AYP and Program Improvement status will be presented. In addition an update on the progress of the six Superintendent Priority Schools will be provided.

Financial Considerations: N/A

Documents Attached:

1. Executive Summary
2. 2011-12 Achievement Results

Estimated Time of Presentation: 45 minutes

Submitted by: Mary C. Shelton, Chief Accountability Officer

Approved by: Jonathan Raymond, Superintendent

Board of Educa

2010-11 Achievemen
September 15, 2011

I. Overview of 2010

California schools are
models based on the
California Standards
Modified Assessment
The Standards based
achievement
science &
Grades 4
(IEP) and
proficiency
their ach
with sign
leaves
School E
the Acad
improvement
federal a

These two
performance
difficult
the No Child
in English
these are
must be
same target
target for
every m

The Special
needs pop
been in F
During the
some new
physical
development
process

Board

2010-11
September



we give
Board e
aem e
agenda r
ealaf c

II. Drivir

Pillar I (C
ejes
(Organiz :
as Incu k

Board of Education Executive Summary

2010-11 Achievement Results and Priority Schools September 15, 2011

On the Academic Performance Index (API) for Sacramento County, growth by 8 points is the target for all schools and districts. Of the 100 schools that achieved an API of 800 or higher, 50 schools achieved an API of 800 or higher. Fifty-one of the schools were in the API target range and 37 schools were in the API target range. The only subgroup to decline in

adequate yearly progress (AYP) was mathematics. Percent Proficient API, at 50 criteria and the district did not make approximately 67% of all students in reading and math. None of the similar targets for AYP. Sixteen of our 28 schools that made all of their

Three schools that made their target improvement goals: Fayer Keith Elementary, Kemble Elementary, and District schools in PI 51 school

The Priority Schools with one exception, Hiram Johnson, posting the largest increase of 44 points. Fayer Keith and Will C. Wood Middle dropped by proficiency. One of the goals of the plan. At Fern Bacon, all numerically significant. At Hiram Johnson, African American students respectively while the school in

All of the Priority Schools with one exception, leading the way with a 1.81% increase. Bacon with 1.27%, Fayer Keith and Jedediah Smith showed a decrease

At four of the six schools, performance in 2009-10 was 503 in 2010-11. Ferris

drop in suspensions.
increase in student

In interviewing principals
well as by studying
across all six schools

- 1) Data Inquiry
to using the c
challenges.
- 2) The change in
charts from n
also evident in
in practices u
determine le:
expectations D6& E Á©w0 ' B g%aE Áá i r3
ttsqu-
s
f
3) T
le
“
t
l
p
w
4) C
t
ir
w
5) T
d
a
o
6) A
ir
n
p

Board of Education Executive Summary

2010-11 Achievement Results and Priority Schools Rep
September 15, 2011

VII. Lessons Learned/Next Steps:

Priority Schools:

- ¾ Continue the work of Design Teams at Hiram Johnson High School, Ross Park Middle School
- ¾ Direct instructional support of coaches to get deep facilitation
- ¾ Release the Data Inquiry cycle to make opportunities reach explicitly
- ¾ Continue to increase partnerships at organizations

All Schools:

- ¾ Increase professional development strategies, differentiation, and inclusion
- ¾ Increase teacher leadership
- ¾ Provide more direct training for teachers
- ¾ Provide more Principal training to further
- ¾ Focus on student literacy at all grade levels


Sacramento City Unified School District
Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) - California Standards Test (CST) and California Modified Assessment (CMA)
District Summary

Content	Metric Description	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
CST&CMA Language Arts Proficiency	Percentage of students scoring proficient/advanced on the Grades 2-11 CST&CMA English Language Arts	43%	46%	48%	48%
CST&CMA Math Proficiency	Percentage of students scoring proficient/advanced on the Grades 2-7 and end-of-course CST&CMA mathematics assessments	42%	45%	46%	48%
CST&CMA Science Proficiency	Percentage of students scoring proficient/advanced on the Grades 5, 8 & 10 and end-of-course CST&CMA science assessments	35%	37%	40%	43%
CST&CMA Social Science Proficiency	Percentage of students scoring proficient/advanced on the Grades 8 & 11 and end-of-course CST&CMA history/social science assessments	33%	38%	40%	43%
Percentage of students scoring at or above proficient on CST&CMA English Language Arts by Subgroup:					
	Hispanic or Latino	33%	37%	41%	40%
	American Indian	39%	48%	37%	38%
	Asian	48%	51%	52%	52%
	Pacific Islander	33%	38%	37%	36%
	Filipino	60%	62%	66%	65%
	African American	32%	35%	34%	35%
	White	61%	64%	66%	66%
	Two or More Races			58%	59%
	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	34%	37%	40%	40%
	Students with Disabilities	14%	21%	23%	25%
	English Learners	16%	18%	19%	21%
Percentage of students scoring at or above proficient on CST&CMA Mathematics by Subgroup:					
	Hispanic or Latino	35%	38%	40%	42%
	American Indian	35%	41%	35%	37%
	Asian				



Sacramento City Unified School District
Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) - California Standards Test (CST) and California Modified Assessment (CMA)
District Summary

Content	Metric Description	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
CST&CMA Science Proficiency by Subgroup	Percentage of students scoring at or above proficient on CST&CMA Science by Subgroup:				
	Hispanic or Latino	24%	27%	33%	35%
	American Indian	35%	39%	39%	39%
	Asian	42%	45%	45%	49%
	Pacific Islander	20%	23%	21%	27%
	Filipino	45%	47%	53%	53%
	African American	23%	23%	24%	28%
	White	51%	54%	59%	60%
	Two or More Races			47%	51%
	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	27%	28%	33%	36%
	Students with Disabilities	10%	15%	18%	23%
	English Learners	9%	8%	11%	14%
CST History/Social Science Proficiency by Subgroup	Percentage of students scoring at or above proficient on CST History/Social Science by Subgroup:				
	Hispanic or Latino	21%	27%	30%	34%
	American Indian	31%	46%	32%	33%
	Asian	39%	47%	48%	51%
	Pacific Islander	22%	32%	24%	31%
	Filipino	38%	44%	49%	52%
	African American	19%	23%	23%	26%
	White	52%	56%	58%	59%
	Two or More Races			46%	51%
	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	23%	28%	31%	35%
	Students with Disabilities	7%	8%	7%	8%
	English Learners	7%	9%	9%	11%



CST and CMA English-Language Arts 2011 School Comparison - Percentage of Students by Performance Level

School	2010-11 Status	2010 At and Above Proficient	2011 At and Above Proficient	Change	2011 Far Below Basic	2011 Below Basic	2011 Basic	2011 Proficient	2011 Advanced
Albert Einstein Middle (769)	PI Yr 2	54.7	51.6	-3.1	6.4	12.2	29.8	31.3	20.3
California Middle (643)	PI Yr 5	48.4	54	5.6	4.4	12.3	29.4	27.1	26.9
Fern Bacon Middle (598)	PI Yr 5	30	34.2	4.2	11.9	17.6	36.2	26.2	8.1
Kit Carson Middle (340)	PI Yr 3	36.1	27.4	-8.7	17.6	23.2	31.8	17.4	10
Rosa Parks Middle (443)	PI Yr 5	25.1	24.7	-0.4	20.2	24.7	30.4	20.2	4.5
Sam Brannan Middle (655)	PI Yr 3	54	51.2	-2.8	6.5	13.5	28.8	27.2	24
Sutter Middle (1249)		77.4	76	-1.4	2.1	5.3	16.6	27.8	48.2
Will C. Wood Middle (700)	PI Yr 5	38.1	35.6	-2.5	11.9	18.4	34.1	26.4	9.1
Middle SchoolsTotals (5397)		50	49.7	-0.3	8.3	13.9	28	26.5	23.2

School	2010-11 Status	2010 At and Above Proficient	2011 At and Above Proficient	Change	2011 Far Below Basic	2011 Below Basic	2011 Basic	2011 Proficient	2011 Advanced
American Legion (110)	PI Yr 4	8.1	0	-8.1	48.5	25.2	26.2	0	0
C. K. McClatchy High (1601)	PI Yr 1	54.4	53.3	-1.1	10.9	13.1	22.8	22.7	30.6
Capital City School (570)	PI Yr 2	17.3	17.3	0	22.9	28.9	30.9	12.2	5.1
George Washington Carver (205)		51.3	56.4	5.1	6.9	10.8	26	23.5	32.8
Health Professions High (303)		37.6	31.4	-6.2	14.5	20.6	33.4	23.6	7.8
Hiram W. Johnson High (1247)	PI Yr 5	23.4	28.6	5.2	13.6	20.2	37.6	22	6.6
John F. Kennedy High (1471)	PI Yr 1	59.3	53.9	-5.4	7.1	12	26.9	28.5	25.4
Luther Burbank High (1300)	PI Yr 2	26.6	26.3	-0.3	12.7	22.2	38.7	20.3	6.1
New Technology High (233)		40.4	44.1	3.7	9.3	12.8	33.9	30.8	13.2
Non Public School (113)		9.3	8.4	-0.9	40	36.8	14.7	3.2	5.3
Rosemont High (1107)	PI Yr 2	44.1	46.7	2.6	9.2	14.1	29.9	26.1	20.6
School of Engineering and Sciences (321)		60.7	58.9	-1.8	6.5	10.6	24	33.6	25.2
The Met High School (205)		47.4	52.7	5.3	5	14.9	27.4	29.9	22.9
West Campus High (651)		88.8	86.8	-2	0.2	0.9	12.1	34.4	52.4
High SchoolsTotals (9437)		43.1	44.1	1	11.1	15.9	28.9	24.1	20

CAHSEE results are used to determine AMOs for high schools

RED Below AMO target

GREEN Above AMO target

YELLOW Positive Change

Data Source: STAR Datafiles



CST and CMA Mathematics 2011 School Comparison - Percentage of Students by Performance Level

School	2010-11 Status	2010 At and Above Proficient	2011 At and Above Proficient	Change	2011 Far Below Basic	2011 Below Basic	2011 Basic	2011 Proficient	2011 Advanced
Albert Einstein Middle (769)	PI Yr 2	49.6	48.4	-1.2	5.1	17.7	28.9	32.4	16
California Middle (641)	PI Yr 5	54.1	62.8	8.7	6.4	15.3	15.5	32.9	29.9
Fern Bacon Middle (598)	PI Yr 5	25.8	35.1	9.3	9.2	24.4	31.3	30.1	5
Kit Carson Middle (338)	PI Yr 3	23.2	23.1	-0.1	15.1	31.7	30.2	18.9	4.1
Rosa Parks Middle (434)	PI Yr 5	28.4	27.6	-0.8	16.6	27.9	27.9	23.3	4.4
Sam Brannan Middle (654)	PI Yr 3	52.5	47.9	-4.6	7.5	18.9	25.7	34.4	13.5
Sutter Middle (1247)		65.7	66.4	0.7	2.7	10	20.9	32.7	33.6
Will C. Wood Middle (700)	PI Yr 5	40	39.7	-0.3	8.6	24.6	27.1	31.4	8.3
Middle SchoolsTotals (5381)		46.3	48.3	2	7.5	19.1	25.1	30.8	17.5

School	2010-11 Status	2010 At and Above Proficient	2011 At and Above Proficient	Change	2011 Far Below Basic	2011 Below Basic	2011 Basic	2011 Proficient	2011 Advanced
American Legion (35)	PI Yr 4	3.9	0	-3.9	45.7	42.9	11.4	0	0
C. K. McClatchy High (1549)	PI Yr 1	24	25.9	1.9	17.7	31.4	25.1	19.8	6
Capital City School (252)	PI Yr 2	11.7	9.1	-2.6	30.6	38.1	22.2	7.1	2
George Washington Carver (203)		15.8	18.7	2.9	17.7	36.5	27.1	17.7	1
Health Professions High (294)		5.7	9.4	3.7	25.3	44.1	21.2	8.3	1
Hiram W. Johnson High (1131)	PI Yr 5	10.7	14.2	3.5	21	38.7	26.1	12.5	1.7
John F. Kennedy High (1418)	PI Yr 1	26.8	27.4	0.6	13.3	30.9	28.3	20.3	7.1
Luther Burbank High (1260)	PI Yr 2	12.8	15.4	2.6	21.5	38.6	24.5	13.5	1.9
New Technology High (224)		7.1	7.2	0.1	23.1	46.6	23.1	6.3	0.9
Non Public School (87)		3	4.9	1.9	48.8	40.2	6.1	4.9	0
Rosemont High (1053)	PI Yr 2	18.5	26.8	8.3	14.7	31.6	26.9	20.4	6.4
School of Engineering and Sciences (320)		43.9	32.5	-11.4	7.5	33.8	26.3	24.1	8.4
The Met High School (203)		2.6	6	3.4	27.4	46.3	20.4	5.5	0.5
West Campus High (650)		50	45.7	-4.3	2.2	16.3	35.8	34.5	11.2
High SchoolsTotals (8679)		20.3	22.5	2.2	17.5	33.9	26.2	17.7	4.8

CAHSEE results are used to determine AMOs for high schools

- RED Below AMO target
- GREEN Above AMO target
- YELLOW Positive Change

Data Source: STAR Datafiles

Academic Performance Index (API) Growth by District and Schools
Two-Year Comparison

LEA/School	API				Met Growth Target			API				Met Growth Target		
	2010 Growth	2009 Base	2009-10 Growth Target	2009-10 Growth	Schoolwide	All Subgroups	Both Schoolwide and Subgroups	2011 Growth	2010 Base	2010-11 Growth Target	2010-11 Growth	Schoolwide	All Subgroups	Both Schoolwide and Subgroups



Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) by District and Schools
Two-Year Comparison

		Year 1					Year 2								
		All	ELA	Math	API	Grad. Rate	All	ELA	Math	API	Grad. Rate				
SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED	32 of 50	No	No	No	Yes	No	Year 3	30 of 50	No	No	No	Yes	No	Year 3	
Elementary Schools															
A. M. Winn Elementary	21 of 27	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Year 2	18 of 25	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Year 3	
Abraham Lincoln Elementary	25 of 25	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Not in PI	14 of 25	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Not in PI	
Alice Birney Waldorf-Inspired K-8	13 of 13	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Not in PI	9 of 17	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Not in PI	
Aspire Capitol Heights Academy	13 of 13	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Not in PI	17 of 17	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Not in PI	
Bowling Green Elementary	19 of 21	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	Year 4	13 of 21	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Year 5	
Bret Harte Elementary	11 of 21	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Not in PI	18 of 23	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Year 1	
Caleb Greenwood	17 of 21	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Not Title 1	113 of 21	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Not Title 1	
California Montessori Project-Capitol Ca	9 of 9	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Not Title 1	6 of 9	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Not Title 1	
Camellia Elementary	21 of 21	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Not in PI	20 of 21	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	Not in PI
Caroline Wenzel Elementary	24 of 29	No	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Year 2	22 of 29	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Year 2
Cesar Chavez Intermediate	25 of 25	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Not in PI	24 of 25	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Not in PI
Clayton B. Wire Elementary	21 of 21	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Year 1	10 of 21	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Year 3
Collis P. Huntington Elementary	9 of 17	No	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Year 3	13 of 17	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	Year 4
Crocker/Riverside Elementary	17 of 17	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Not Title 1	17 of 17	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Not Title 1
David Lubin Elementary	19 of 19	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Not in PI	15 of 17	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Not Title 1
Earl Warren Elementary	17 of 21	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Not in PI	17 of 21	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	Year 1
Edward Kemble Elementary	19 of 19	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Year 1	11 of 25	Earl Wangton Elementary				9 of 17	

SCUSD

Academic Performance Index (API) Growth
Two Year Comparison by Schoolwide and Subgroups
Fr. Keith B. Kenny

Groups	2010 Growth					2011 Growth				
	2010 Growth	2009 Base	2009 Growth Target	2009 Growth	Met Students Growth Target	2010 Base	2010 Growth Target	2010 Growth	Met Student Groups Growth Target	
Schoolwide	714	630	9	84	Yes	714	5	33	Yes	
Black or African American	686	618	9	68	Yes	686	6	27	Yes	
American Indian or Alaska Native										
Asian										
Filipino						816				
Hispanic or Latino	727					727				
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander										
White										
Two or More Races						831				
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	714	618	9	96	Yes	714	5	33	Yes	
English Learners						790				
Students with Disabilities						660				

Academic Performance Index (API) Growth
Two Year Comparison by Schoolwide and Subgroups
Jedediah Smith

Groups

Schoolwide



Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Percent Proficient in English Language Arts and Mathematics
 Two Year Comparison by Schoolwide and Subgroups

Fr. Keith B. Kenny

GROUPS	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient		Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient		Alternative Method
			Met 2010	Met 2011				Met 2010	Met 2011	
Schoolwide	160	51	31.9	40.6	SH	143	58	40.6	Yes	SH
Black or African American	75	20	26.7	32.3	SH	65	21	32.3	Yes	SH
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	1	1	1	r r	1	1	1	r r	r r
Asian	9	1	1	50	r r	14	7	50	r r	r r
Filipino	1	1	1	1	r r	2	1	1	r r	r r
Hispanic or Latino	58	22	37.9	45.5	SH	44	20	45.5	r r	r r
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	1	1	1	r r	0	1	1	r r	r r
White	5	1	1	1	r r	4	1	1	r r	r r
Two or More Races	11	4	36.4	61.5	r r	13	8	61.5	r r	r r
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	160	51	31.9	40.6	SH	143	58	40.6	Yes	SH
English Learners	29	9	31	46.7	r r	30	14	46.7	r r	r r
Students with Disabilities	13	4	30.8	27.8	r r	18	5	27.8	r r	r r

Target 68.5%
 Met all percent proficient rate criteria?

GROUPS	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient		Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient		Alternative Method
			Met 2010	Met 2011				Met 2010	Met 2011	
Schoolwide	159	63	39.6	49	SH	143	70	49	Yes	SH
Black or African American	75	25	33.3	44.6	SH	65	29	44.6	Yes	SH
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	1	1	1	r r	1	1	1	r r	r r
Asian	9	1	1	64.3	r r	14	9	64.3	r r	r r
Filipino	1	1	1	1	r r	2	1	1	r r	r r
Hispanic or Latino	57	25	43.9	50	SH	44	22	50	r r	r r
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	1	1	1	r r	0	1	1	r r	r r
White	5	1	1	1	r r	4	1	1	r r	r r
Two or More Races	11	4	36.4	46.2	r r	13	6	46.2	r r	r r
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	159	63	39.6	49	SH	143	70	49	Yes	SH
English Learners	29	16	55.2	63.3	r r	30	19	63.3	r r	r r
Students with Disabilities	13	4	30.8	44.4	r r	18	8	44.4	r r	r r

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Percent Proficient in English Language Arts and Mathematics
Two Year Comparison by Schoolwide and Subgroups

Jedediah Smith

GROUPS	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient		Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient		Alternative Method	Met 2011 AYP Criteria
			Met 2010	2010				Met 2011	2011		
Schoolwide	162	42	25.9	28.3	r	152	43	28.3	r	No	r
Black or African American	85	18	21.2	26.8	r	82	22	26.8	r	Yes	SH
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	r	r	r	2	r	r	r	r	r
Asian	22	9	40.9	44.4	r	18	8	44.4	r	r	r
Filipino	0	0	r	r	r	1	r	r	r	r	r
Hispanic or Latino	30	9	30	30	r	30	9	30	r	r	r
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	9	5	r	16.7	r	12	2	16.7	r	r	r
White	13	5	38.5	r	r	3	r	r	r	r	r
Two or More Races	2	2	r	r	r	4	r	r	r	r	r
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	162	42	25.9	27.8	r	151	42	27.8	r	No	r
English Learners	43	15	34.9	40	r	35	14	40	r	r	r
Students with Disabilities	36	9	25	26.8	r	41	11	26.8	r	r	r

GROUPS	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient		Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient		Alternative Method	Met 2011 AYP Criteria
			Met 2010	2010				Met 2011	2011		
Schoolwide	162	71	43.8	44.4	r	153	68	44.4	r	No	r
Black or African American	85	34	40	42.2	r	83	35	42.2	r	Yes	SH
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	r	r	r	2	r	r	r	r	r
Asian	22	14	63.6	72.2	r	18	13	72.2	r	r	r
Filipino	0	0	r	r	r	1	r	r	r	r	r
Hispanic or Latino	30	14	46.7	40	r	30	12	40	r	r	r
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	9	9	r	50	r	12	6	50	r	r	r

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Percent Proficient in English Language Arts and Mathematics
 Two Year Comparison by Schoolwide and Subgroups
 Rosa Parks



GROUPS	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2010 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2011 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
Schoolwide	443	116	26.2	No		412	111	26.9	No	
Black or African American	96	21	21.9	No		88	16	18.2	No	
American Indian or Alaska Native	1		r		r	0	r	r		r
Asian	123	31	25.2	No		109	32	29.4	Yes	SH
Filipino	3	1	33.3	Yes		1	1	100	Yes	
Hispanic or Latino	172	46	26.7	No		164	45	27.4	No	r
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander										



Filipino 1/TT1 1 Tf 2.5806 0 TD <0003>Tj /TT2 1 Tf -3.8059 -1.3151 nn4 6 0 TD <0003>Tj /on2261 0 C62 1 0 174(Filic4slander<000

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Percent Proficient in English Language Arts and Mathematics
 Two Year Comparison by Schoolwide and Subgroups
 Will C. Wood

2010 AYP							2011 AYP			
English Language Arts							English Language Arts			
Target 56.8%							Target 67.6%			
Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No							Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No			
GROUPS	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2010 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2011 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
Schoolwide	663	264	39.8	No		636	231	36.3	No	
Black or African American	80	22	27.5	r		67	15	22.4	r	
American Indian or Alaska Native	8		r		r	9	r	r		r
Asian	258	127	49.2	Yes	SH	229	117	51.1	No	
Filipino	4		r		r	3	r	r		r
Hispanic or Latino	271	98	36.2	Yes	SH	274	80	29.2	No	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	4		r		r	7	r	r		r
White	31	11	35.5	r		33	12	36.4	r	
Two or More Races	7		r		r	14	2	14.3	r	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	663	264	39.8	No		636	231	36.3	No	
English Learners	406	137	33.7	Yes	SH	417	150	36	No	
Students with Disabilities	69	11	15.9	r		72	13	18.1	r	

Mathematics							Mathematics			
Target 58.0%							Target 68.5%			
Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No							Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No			
GROUPS	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2010 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2011 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
Schoolwide	663	277	41.8	No		636	255	40.1	No	
Black or African American	80	16	20	r		67	16	23.9	r	
American Indian or Alaska Native	8		r		r	9	r	r		r
Asian	258	153	59.3	Yes		229	127	55.5	No	
Filipino	4		r		r	3	r	r		r
Hispanic or Latino	271	92	33.9	No		274	94	34.3	No	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	4		r		r	7	r	r		r
White	31	10	32.3			33	10	30.3	r	
Two or More Races	7		r		r	14	3	21.4	r	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	663	277	41.8	No		636	255	40.1	No	
English Learners	406	169	41.6	No		417	179	42.9	No	
Students with Disabilities	69	6	8.7	r		72	12	16.7	r	

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Percent Proficient in English Language Arts and Mathematics
 Two Year Comparison by Schoolwide and Subgroups

Hiram Johnson



GROUPS	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Alternative Method	Met 2011 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
Schoolwide	421	131	31.1	No	405	151	37.3	SH	Yes	SH
Black or African American	49	6	12.2	r	49	9	18.4	r	r	r
American Indian or Alaskan	1%	4	18.4							

Black

Black or African American: 12.2% (2010) vs 18.4% (2011)

