


SARC



OUR  
MESSAGE



OUR  
TEACHERS

OUR  
SCHOOL

# Stoneman Elementary School

2014-15  
School Accountability Report Card  
Published in 2015-16

Shelley Velasco  
Principal  
svelasco@pittsburg.k12.ca.us

2929 Loveridge Road  
Pittsburg, CA 94565

Grades: K-5  
Phone: (925) 473-2430  
www.pittsburg.k12.ca.us/stoneman

CDS Code: 07-61788-6109383

Para español, visita:  
www.pittsburg.k12.ca.us

SARC



## School Mission Statement

At Stoneman Elementary School, we create an environment in our classrooms that engages students in academic work that results in a high level of achievement. Data shows that with our support and help, students can master challenging curricula, and we expect them to do so. We work collaboratively with colleagues, students, parents and the community at large to achieve this shared educational purpose.

## Principal's Message

Stoneman Elementary School is a learning institution where students succeed, families are welcome and professionals thrive. Instruction focuses on the goal that all students will be successful in meeting end-of-the year state standards and district benchmarks. Teachers utilize differentiated instructional techniques to address learning styles and strengths, as well as challenge students to reach their potential. While the new California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) results are not positive statewide, within the district Stoneman continues to be among the top scoring schools. Stoneman continues to be one of two schools that is a school of choice in the district.

After-school programs are offered for students in need of additional assistance with homework as well as a safe place for students after school. In order to support success for students, especially in the acquisition of reading skills, intervention services are available for all grade levels. Mental-health support is provided through the psychologist and Lincoln Child Center. Students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) receive assistance through a Learning Center model.

Stoneman celebrates its diversity and partnerships with the parent community.

## Parental Involvement

Collaborative efforts from parents, teachers, administrators and the community at large are required to ensure the educational success of every child. Stoneman Elementary is a member of the National Network of Partnership Schools, which provides a foundation and process for engaging parent and community involvement in schools. Parents and guardians are encouraged to participate in one or more of our committees and/or events.

Stoneman Elementary has an active School Site Council (SSC), English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) and Parent Faculty Club. Back-to-School Night, conferences, open house, Family Literacy Night, Family Math Night and Field Day are a few of Stoneman's highly attended family events held throughout the school year.

For more information on how to become involved at the school, please contact Parent Coordinator Rose Aguilarat (925) 473-2430.

## School Safety

Stoneman Elementary School has a Safe School Plan for emergencies such as fire, earthquake, chemical spills and other civil disasters on file in the main office. Procedures in this plan are reviewed with all staff regularly in order for readiness in the event of an emergency.

A fire drill is conducted monthly. Other drills, such as earthquake and shelter-in-place, are also practiced multiple times each year.

The school safety plan was most recently reviewed, updated and discussed with school faculty in October 2015.

## Public 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-serve 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 at a workstation and the ability to print documents.

## School Accountability Report Card

In accordance with state and federal requirements, the School Accountability Report Card (SARC) is put forth annually by all public schools as a tool for parents and interested parties to stay informed of the school's progress, test scores and achievements.



## Pittsburg Unified Mission Statement

It is the mission of Pittsburg Unified School District to inspire our students, to ensure they achieve equity in academic excellence and to bring students closer together through shared experiences in learning. We believe the cultural diversity of our community and our youth are our greatest assets. We endeavor to bring our students to their fullest potential and to create lifelong learners who will contribute positively to the world.

## Governing Board

Mr. Duane Smith, President  
 Mr. De'Shawn Woolridge, Vice president  
 Dr. Laura Canciamilla, Trustee  
 Mr. George Miller, Trustee  
 Mr. Joseph Arenivar, Trustee

## Board Goals

### 1. Student Achievement

- Students will demonstrate continuous improvement in academic excellence, as measured by clear and accessible multiple assessments
- Opportunity gaps will have accelerated reduction through purposeful interventions and supports

### 2. Powerful Instruction

- Effective instruction aligned to the common core will be expected, supported and measured to ensure continuous improvement of student achievement

### 3. Outstanding Staff

- The district will recruit "highly qualified" and appropriately credentialed teachers
- The district will support, retain and promote quality staff through good working conditions, competitive total compensation packages, and coaching and professional development

### 4. Quality Learning Environment

- High-quality facilities
- Safe, orderly and secure schools
- School site culture of caring and respect
- State-of-the-art technology

### 5. High-Performing, Accountable Organization


- Fiscal stability and responsible long-range planning
- Comprehensive accountability system
- Effective informational and instructional technology
- Responsible, respectful, efficient and transparent service

### 6. Meaningful Collaboration, Partnership and Parental Engagement

- Timely and accessible communication with community
- Strategic community partnerships
- Focus on parent and student engagement, including diverse opportunities for involvement
- Strong communication and relationships between parents/guardians and schools
- Proactive engagement in students' academic and personal growth
- Board and superintendent and staff communication

## Class Size Distribution

The bar graph displays the three-year data for average class size and the table displays the three-year data for the number of classrooms by size.



**Number of Classrooms by Size** **Three-Year Data**

Grade	2012-13			2013-14			2014-15		
	Number of Students								
	1-20	21-32	33+	1-20	21-32	33+	1-20	21-32	33+
K	5			6				6	
1	6			5				4	
2	5			6				4	
3	5			5				5	
4		4			4			4	
5		4			4			4	

## Professional Development

The Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP), Local Education Agency Plan (LEAP) addendum and the sites' Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) are the genesis of selected focus for professional development. The data from student achievement drives the selection of adult learning opportunities. Based on student-achievement data, including the data from underserved student groups, the district is focusing professional development on integrating the Common Core State Standards in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics.

Every teacher participates in three full-release professional-development days. In addition, educators collaborate with each other in facilitated grade-level/department meetings. Site administrators provide support and feedback to staff members related to targeted improvements. Pittsburg teachers also participate in a structured Collaboration Cycle where they meet with their colleagues to create common lessons that they teach in their classrooms while their colleagues and instructional coaches provide them feedback.

Summer institutes are numerous and comprehensive. In-depth trainings are available in implementing core curricula, intervention programs, English Language Development, structured engagement, expository writing, reading comprehension and mathematics, as a few examples. Teachers fulfill the No Child Left Behind Act requirements for being highly qualified with district support. Compensation is provided to teachers who attend professional development outside the workday.


**Professional Development Days** **Three-Year Data**

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
<b>Stoneman ES</b>	3 days	3 days	3 days

*"Collaborative efforts from parents, teachers, administrators and the community at large are required to ensure the educational success of every child."*

### Enrollment by Student Group

The total enrollment at the school was 648 students for the 2014-15 school year. The pie chart displays the percentage of students enrolled in each group.



### California Physical Fitness Test

Each spring, all students in grades 5, 7 and 9 are required to participate in the California Physical Fitness Test (PFT). The Fitnessgram® is the designated PFT for students in California public schools put forth by the State Board of Education. The PFT measures six key fitness areas:


1. Aerobic Capacity
2. Body Composition
3. Flexibility
4. Abdominal Strength and Endurance
5. Upper Body Strength and Endurance
6. Trunk Extensor Strength and Flexibility

Encouraging and assisting students in establishing lifelong habits of regular physical activity is the primary goal of the Fitnessgram. The table shows the percentage of students meeting the fitness standards of being in the "healthy fitness zone" for the most recent testing period. For more detailed information on the California PFT, please visit [www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/pf](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/pf).

California Physical Fitness Test		2014-15 School Year
Percentage of Students Meeting Fitness Standards	Stoneman ES	
	Grade 5	
Four of six standards	22.2%	
Five of six standards	21.2%	
Six of six standards	20.2%	

### Enrollment by Grade

The bar graph displays the total number of students enrolled in each grade for the 2014-15 school year.



### Suspensions and Expulsions

This table shows the school, district, and state suspension and expulsion rates for the most recent three-year period. Note: Students are only counted one time, regardless of the number of suspensions.

Suspension and Expulsion Rates			
Stoneman ES			
	12-13	13-14	14-15
Suspension rates	3.1%	7.6%	4.8%
Expulsion rates	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pittsburg USD			
	12-13	13-14	14-15
Suspension rates	10.4%	10.8%	7.8%
Expulsion rates	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%
California			
	12-13	13-14	14-15
Suspension rates	5.1%	4.4%	3.8%
Expulsion rates	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%



## Types of Services Funded

The following services are provided at the district and/or site level:

- Collaboration and Intervention Team
- Professional Development including ELA and math trainings, cross-cultural language and academic-development examination, ADEPT, Systematic ELD, Lesson Study, data protocol, etc.
- Parent and family engagement opportunities and training
- Extended-day and summer intervention programs
- College-readiness programs
- Counseling
- Class-size reduction
- Summer programs
- Credit recovery programs

*“Stoneman Elementary School is a learning institution where students succeed, families are welcome and professionals thrive.”*

## Adequate Yearly Progress

The federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires all schools and districts meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements. California public schools and districts are required to meet or exceed criteria in the following four target areas:

- Participation rate on statewide assessments in English language arts and mathematics
- Percentage of students scoring proficient on statewide assessments in English language arts and mathematics
- Attendance rates for schools with enrollment in Transitional Kindergarten through grade eight (TK-8)
- Graduation rate for high schools

The table displays whether or not the school, district, and state met each of the AYP criteria and made overall AYP for 2014-15. For more information, visit [www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay).

Adequate Yearly Progress Criteria		2014-15 School Year		
	Stoneman ES	Pittsburg USD	California	
<b>Met overall AYP</b>	Yes	No	Yes	
<b>Met participation rate:</b>				
<b>English language arts</b>	Yes	No	Yes	
<b>Mathematics</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	
<b>Met percent proficient:</b>				
<b>English language arts</b>	■	■	■	
<b>Mathematics</b>	■	■	■	
<b>Met attendance rates</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	
<b>Met graduation rate</b>	○	Yes	Yes	

## Federal Intervention Program

Schools and districts receiving Title I funding that fail to meet AYP over two consecutive years in the same content area (English language arts or mathematics) or on the same indicator enter into Program Improvement (PI). Each additional year that the district or school(s) do not meet AYP results in advancement to the next level of intervention. The percentage of schools identified for Program Improvement is calculated by taking the number of schools currently in PI within the district and dividing it by the total number of Title I schools within the district.

This table displays the 2015-16 Program Improvement status for the school and district. For detailed information about PI identification, please visit [www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/tidetermine.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/tidetermine.asp).

Federal Intervention Program		2015-16 School Year	
	Stoneman ES	Pittsburg USD	
<b>Program Improvement status</b>	Not In PI	In PI	
<b>First year of Program Improvement</b>	◇	2008-2009	
<b>Year in Program Improvement</b>	◇	Year 3	
<b>Number of Title I schools currently in Program Improvement</b>	8		
<b>Percentage of Title I schools currently in Program Improvement</b>	72.70%		

■ Not applicable. Due to the transition to the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments, the U.S. Department of Education approved the California Department of Education's waiver request to exclude the percent proficient results from AYP determinations. For more information on the AYP reports, please visit <http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>.

○ Not applicable. This AYP indicator is only applicable for high schools.

◇ Not applicable. The school is not in Program Improvement.

## California Standards Tests for All Students: Science (grades 5, 8 and 10)

The tables show the percentage of students in grades 5, 8 and 10 who scored at Proficient or Advanced levels (meeting or exceeding state standards) in science.

Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced Levels							Three-Year Data		
Subject	Stoneman ES			Pittsburg USD			California		
	12-13	13-14	14-15	12-13	13-14	14-15	12-13	13-14	14-15
Science	36%	41%	35%	44%	49%	42%	59%	60%	56%

## California Standards Tests Results by Student Group: Science (grades 5, 8 and 10)

Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced Levels		2014-15 School Year
Group	Science	
All students in the district	42%	
All students at the school	35%	
Male	36%	
Female	35%	
Black or African-American	27%	
American Indian or Alaska Native	❖	
Asian	❖	
Filipino	❖	
Hispanic or Latino	32%	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	❖	
White	❖	
Two or more races	❖	
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	30%	
English learners	18%	
Students with disabilities	❖	
Students receiving Migrant Education services	❖	
Foster youth	◇	

## California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress Results for All Students (grades 3-8 and 11)

The table below shows the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the state standards in English language arts/literacy and mathematics.

Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding State Standards			2014-15 School Year
Subject	Stoneman ES	Pittsburg USD	California
English language arts/literacy	33%	29%	44%
Mathematics	27%	21%	33%

❖ Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or fewer, either because the number of students tested in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

◇ Information is not available at this time.

## California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress/Standardized Testing and Reporting Results

Beginning in the 2013-14 school year, the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program was eliminated and replaced by a new set of assessments called the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP).

For the 2015 school year, the CAASPP included a mix of online and paper-pencil assessments. The online component contained the Smarter Balanced English language arts/literacy and mathematics tests. The paper-pencil science assessments of CAASPP included the California Standards Test (CST), California Modified Assessment (CMA) and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). There was also the optional Standards-based tests in Spanish for reading/language arts.

The CST is a multiple-choice test in science for varying grade levels. The CMA is a modified assessment for students with disabilities who have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). The CAPA is an alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities who are unable to take the CST with accommodations or modifications or the CMA with accommodations.

For more information on the CAASPP assessments, please visit [www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca).

## CAASPP by Student Group: English Language Arts and Mathematics

The tables on the following pages display the information on student achievement at each performance level in English language arts and mathematics for the school by student groups for grades 3-5.

Levels of achievement include:

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

Note: The number of students tested includes students who did not receive a score. However, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the performance level percentages. The performance level percentages are calculated using students with scores.

## CAASPP Results by Student Group: English Language Arts and Mathematics - Grade 3

Students Achieving at Each Performance Level				2014-15 School Year			
English Language Arts: Grade 3	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percentage Tested of Total Enrollment	Percent Achievement			
Group				Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
All students	122	121	99.2%	36%	33%	17%	12%
Male		58	47.5%	34%	36%	14%	16%
Female		63	51.6%	38%	30%	19%	10%
Black or African-American		36	29.5%	28%	39%	17%	14%
American Indian or Alaska Native		0	0.0%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Asian		5	4.1%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Filipino		10	8.2%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Hispanic or Latino		59	48.4%	47%	31%	15%	7%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander		1	0.8%	❖	❖	❖	❖
White		5	4.1%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Two or more races		3	2.5%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Socioeconomically disadvantaged		104	85.2%	38%	33%	15%	13%
English learners		40	32.8%	48%	25%	18%	10%
Students with disabilities		6	4.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Students receiving Migrant Education services		0	0.0%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Foster youth		◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇
Mathematics: Grade 3	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percentage Tested of Total Enrollment	Percent Achievement			
Group				Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
All students	122	120	98.4%	41%	31%	22%	7%
Male		58	47.5%	33%	34%	22%	10%
Female		62	50.8%	48%	27%	21%	3%
Black or African-American		36	29.5%	39%	31%	22%	8%
American Indian or Alaska Native		0	0.0%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Asian		5	4.1%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Filipino		10	8.2%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Hispanic or Latino		58	47.5%	48%	34%	16%	2%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander		1	0.8%	❖	❖	❖	❖
White		5	4.1%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Two or more races		3	2.5%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Socioeconomically disadvantaged		103	84.4%	43%	30%	20%	7%
English learners		40	32.8%	43%	38%	13%	8%
Students with disabilities		6	4.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Students receiving Migrant Education services		0	0.0%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Foster youth		◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇

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

❖ Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or fewer, either because the number of students tested in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

◇ Information is not available at this time.



## CAASPP Results by Student Group: English Language Arts and Mathematics - Grade 4

Students Achieving at Each Performance Level				2014-15 School Year			
English Language Arts: Grade 4	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percentage Tested of Total Enrollment	Percent Achievement			
Group				Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
All students	103	102	99.0%	38%	27%	26%	8%
Male		48	46.6%	33%	31%	31%	4%
Female		54	52.4%	43%	24%	22%	11%
Black or African-American		33	32.0%	58%	18%	24%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native		2	1.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Asian		7	6.8%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Filipino		11	10.7%	9%	27%	36%	27%
Hispanic or Latino		40	38.8%	30%	35%	28%	8%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander		1	1.0%	❖	❖	❖	❖
White		4	3.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Two or more races		4	3.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Socioeconomically disadvantaged		85	82.5%	41%	26%	26%	7%
English learners		33	32.0%	45%	36%	18%	0%
Students with disabilities		2	1.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Students receiving Migrant Education services		0	0.0%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Foster youth		❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖
Mathematics: Grade 4	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percentage Tested of Total Enrollment	Percent Achievement			
Group				Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
All students	103	102	99.0%	22%	47%	25%	6%
Male		48	46.6%	19%	44%	29%	8%
Female		54	52.4%	24%	50%	22%	4%
Black or African-American		33	32.0%	30%	55%	12%	3%
American Indian or Alaska Native		2	1.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Asian		7	6.8%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Filipino		11	10.7%	9%	45%	36%	9%
Hispanic or Latino		40	38.8%	18%	43%	35%	5%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander		1	1.0%	❖	❖	❖	❖
White		4	3.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Two or more races		4	3.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Socioeconomically disadvantaged		85	82.5%	24%	48%	25%	4%
English learners		33	32.0%	21%	42%	30%	6%
Students with disabilities		2	1.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Students receiving Migrant Education services		0	0.0%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Foster youth		❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖

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

❖ Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or fewer, either because the number of students tested in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

❖ Information is not available at this time.

## CAASPP Results by Student Group: English Language Arts and Mathematics - Grade 5

Students Achieving at Each Performance Level				2014-15 School Year			
English Language Arts: Grade 5	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percentage Tested of Total Enrollment	Percent Achievement			
Group				Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
All students	102	102	100.0%	44%	21%	23%	13%
Male		48	47.1%	48%	17%	27%	8%
Female		54	52.9%	41%	24%	19%	17%
Black or African-American		33	32.4%	52%	18%	27%	3%
American Indian or Alaska Native		1	1.0%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Asian		4	3.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Filipino		5	4.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Hispanic or Latino		44	43.1%	48%	20%	14%	18%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander		4	3.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
White		7	6.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Two or more races		4	3.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Socioeconomically disadvantaged		84	82.4%	46%	24%	19%	11%
English learners		28	27.5%	61%	32%	7%	0%
Students with disabilities		11	10.8%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Students receiving Migrant Education services		0	0.0%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Foster youth		❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖
Mathematics: Grade 5	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percentage Tested of Total Enrollment	Percent Achievement			
Group				Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
All students	102	102	100.0%	47%	33%	13%	7%
Male		48	47.1%	46%	33%	17%	4%
Female		54	52.9%	48%	33%	9%	9%
Black or African-American		33	32.4%	58%	36%	6%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native		1	1.0%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Asian		4	3.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Filipino		5	4.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Hispanic or Latino		44	43.1%	50%	23%	18%	9%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander		4	3.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
White		7	6.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Two or more races		4	3.9%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Socioeconomically disadvantaged		84	82.4%	51%	31%	11%	7%
English learners		28	27.5%	61%	29%	11%	0%
Students with disabilities		11	10.8%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Students receiving Migrant Education services		0	0.0%	❖	❖	❖	❖
Foster youth		❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖

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

❖ Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or fewer, either because the number of students tested in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

❖ Information is not available at this time.

## Textbooks and Instructional Materials

California state-adopted textbooks are recommended by district committees adopted by the board and then purchased. Each site, through funds supplied by the district, has been able to provide each student with a copy of every core textbook to use in class and take home for homework.

The district has purchased textbooks and instructional materials for grades K-12; said textbooks and instructional materials are used by students at each grade level in each school. The Pittsburg Unified School District Governing Board declared during its fall school board meeting that PUSD has provided sufficient textbooks or instructional materials consistent with the state board-adopted curriculum framework cycle.

### Textbooks and Instructional Materials List

2015-16 School Year

Subject	Textbook	Adopted
English language arts	Treasures, Macmillan/McGraw-Hill (K-5)	2010
Mathematics	Macmillan/McGraw-Hill (K-5)	2008
Science	Macmillan/McGraw-Hill (K-5)	2007
History/social science	Scott Foresman (K-5)	2006



## Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials

The following lists the percentage of pupils who lack their own assigned textbooks and instructional materials.

### Percentage of Students Lacking Materials by Subject

2015-16 School Year

Stoneman ES	Percentage Lacking
Reading/language arts	0%
Mathematics	0%
Science	0%
History/social science	0%
Visual and performing arts	◇
Foreign language	◇
Health	◇

## Quality of Textbooks

The following table outlines the criteria required for choosing textbooks and instructional materials.

### Quality of Textbooks

2015-16 School Year

Criteria	Yes/No
Are the textbooks adopted from the most recent state-approved or local governing-board-approved list?	Yes
Are the textbooks consistent with the content and cycles of the curriculum frameworks adopted by the State Board of Education?	Yes
Do all students, including English learners, have access to their own textbooks and instructional materials to use in class and to take home?	Yes

◇ Not applicable.

## Currency of Textbook Data

This table displays the date when the textbook and instructional materials information was collected and verified.

### Currency of Textbooks

2015-16 School Year

Data collection date	9/2015
----------------------	--------

«Stoneman celebrates its diversity and partnerships with the parent community.»»



## School Facilities

Stoneman Elementary School currently serves approximately 650 students in 33 classrooms. Additional rooms are allocated for such services as counseling, special education and two computer labs. Special features include an enclosed courtyard and a spacious parking lot. The school was built in 1990.

A regular custodial team maintains the campus and its structures. Large projects are arranged on a yearly schedule to ensure regular maintenance.

Stoneman is a closed campus. All visitors are required to register with the principal's office. In the office, identification is confirmed, and guests sign in and are given a badge to use while on campus.

Supervision is provided 15 minutes before and after school and during the school day to ensure the safety of all students during school hours.

Every site is inspected according to the guidelines generated by the Williams settlement decision. At this time, we have no safety-related discrepancies. The site administrator and the custodial staff address school cleanliness daily. Restrooms are cleaned on a routine basis and discrepancies are noted, work orders created and corrections made on a timely basis. School grounds and facilities are adequate for the student enrollments assigned to the site. Deferred maintenance items are scheduled and completed in a timely manner.



*"Instruction focuses on the goal that all students will be successful in meeting end-of-the year state standards and district benchmarks."*



## School Facility Items Inspected

The tables show the results of the school's most recent inspection using the Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) or equivalent school form. The following is a list of items inspected.

- **Systems:** Gas systems and pipes, sewer, mechanical systems (heating, ventilation and air-conditioning)
- **Interior:** Interior surfaces (floors, ceilings, walls and window casings)
- **Cleanliness:** Pest/vermin control, overall cleanliness (school grounds, buildings, rooms and common areas)
- **Electrical:** Electrical systems (interior and exterior)
- **Restrooms/fountains:** Restrooms, sinks and drinking fountains (interior and exterior)
- **Safety:** Fire-safety equipment, emergency systems, hazardous materials (interior and exterior)
- **Structural:** Structural condition, roofs
- **External:** Windows/doors/gates/fences, playgrounds/school grounds

## School Facility Good Repair Status

This inspection determines the school facility's good repair status using ratings of good condition, fair condition or poor condition. The overall summary of facility conditions uses ratings of exemplary, good, fair or poor.

### School Facility Good Repair Status

2015-16 School Year

Items Inspected	Repair Status	Items Inspected	Repair Status
<b>Systems</b>	Good	<b>Restrooms/fountains</b>	Fair
<b>Interior</b>	Good	<b>Safety</b>	Good
<b>Cleanliness</b>	Good	<b>Structural</b>	Good
<b>Electrical</b>	Good	<b>External</b>	Good
<b>Overall summary of facility conditions</b>			Good
<b>Date of the most recent school site inspection</b>			8/7/2015
<b>Date of the most recent completion of the inspection form</b>			8/7/2015


## Deficiencies and Repairs

The table lists the repairs required for all deficiencies found during the site inspection. Regardless of each item's repair status, all deficiencies are listed.

### Deficiencies and Repairs

2015-16 School Year

Items Inspected	Deficiencies, Action Taken or Planned, and Date of Action
<b>Electrical</b>	Plan to upgrade HVAC system summer 2016.
<b>Restrooms/fountains</b>	Tile in need of repair. Work order put in construction due to take place summer 2016.



## Teacher Qualifications

This table shows information about teacher credentials and teacher qualifications. Teachers without a full credential include teachers with district and university internships, pre-internships, emergency or other permits, and waivers. For more information on teacher credentials, visit [www.ctc.ca.gov](http://www.ctc.ca.gov).

Teacher Credential Information	Three-Year Data			
	Pittsburg USD	Stoneman ES		
Teachers	15-16	13-14	14-15	15-16
<b>With full credential</b>	485	33	32	29
<b>Without full credential</b>	15	0	0	0
<b>Teaching outside subject area of competence (with full credential)</b>	7	0	0	0

## Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

This table displays the number of teacher misassignments (positions filled by teachers who lack legal authorization to teach that grade level, subject area, student group, etc.) 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). Please note total teacher misassignments includes the number of teacher misassignments of English learners.

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions	Three-Year Data		
	Stoneman ES		
Teachers	13-14	14-15	15-16
<b>Teacher misassignments of English learners</b>	0	0	0
<b>Total teacher misassignments</b>	0	0	0
<b>Vacant teacher positions</b>	0	0	1

## Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) extended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to require that core academic subjects be taught by "highly qualified" teachers, defined as having at least a bachelor's degree, an appropriate California teaching credential, and demonstrated competence for each core academic subject area he or she teaches. The table displays data regarding highly qualified teachers from the 2014-15 school year.

High-poverty schools are defined as those schools with student participation of approximately 40 percent or more in the free and reduced priced meals program. Low-poverty schools are those with student participation of approximately 39 percent or less in the free and reduced priced meals program. For more information on teacher qualifications related to NCLB, visit [www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/tq](http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/tq).

No Child Left Behind Compliant Teachers	2014-15 School Year	
	Percentage of Classes in Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
<b>Stoneman ES</b>	100.00%	0.00%
<b>All schools in district</b>	86.66%	13.34%
<b>High-poverty schools in district</b>	86.66%	13.34%
<b>Low-poverty schools in district</b>	◇	◇

◇ Not applicable.

★ Lincoln Center.



## Academic Counselors and School Support Staff

This table displays information about academic counselors and support staff at the school and their full-time equivalent (FTE).

Academic Counselors and School Support Staff Data	
2014-15 School Year	
Academic Counselors	
<b>FTE of academic counselors</b>	0.0
<b>Average number of students per academic counselor</b>	◇
Support Staff	
<b>Social/behavioral or career development counselors</b>	2.0 ★
<b>Library media teacher (librarian)</b>	0.0
<b>Library media services staff (paraprofessional)</b>	1.0
<b>Psychologist</b>	0.5
<b>Social worker</b>	0.0
<b>Nurse</b>	0.0
<b>Speech/language/hearing specialist</b>	0.5
<b>Resource specialist (nonteaching)</b>	1.0
Other	
<b>Reading intervention coach</b>	1.0

## School Financial Data

The following table displays the school's average teacher salary and a breakdown of the school's expenditures per pupil from unrestricted and restricted sources.

School Financial Data	
2013-14 Fiscal Year	
Total expenditures per pupil	\$4,684
Expenditures per pupil from restricted sources	\$1,001
Expenditures per pupil from unrestricted sources	\$3,683
Annual average teacher salary	\$62,099

## Financial Data

The financial data displayed in this SARC is from the 2013-14 fiscal year. The most current fiscal information available provided by the state is always two years behind the current school year and one year behind most other data included in this report. For detailed information on school expenditures for all districts in California, see the California Department of Education (CDE) Current Expense of Education & Per-pupil Spending Web page at [www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/ec](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/ec). For information on teacher salaries for all districts in California, see the CDE Certificated Salaries & Benefits Web page at [www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs). To look up expenditures and salaries for a specific school district, see the Ed-Data website at [www.ed-data.org](http://www.ed-data.org).

## District Financial Data

This table displays district teacher and administrative salary information and compares the figures to the state averages for districts of the same type and size based on the salary schedule. Note: The district salary data does not include benefits.

District Salary Data	2013-14 Fiscal Year	
	Pittsburg USD	Similar Sized District
Beginning teacher salary	\$41,429	\$43,062
Midrange teacher salary	\$61,869	\$67,927
Highest teacher salary	\$76,884	\$87,811
Average elementary school principal salary	\$101,398	\$110,136
Average middle school principal salary	\$109,895	\$115,946
Average high school principal salary	\$121,484	\$124,865
Superintendent salary	\$189,855	\$211,869
Teacher salaries: percentage of budget	37%	39%
Administrative salaries: percentage of budget	6%	5%

## Financial Data Comparison

This table displays the school's per-pupil expenditures from unrestricted sources and the school's average teacher salary and compares it to the district and state data.

Financial Data Comparison	2013-14 Fiscal Year	
	Expenditures Per Pupil From Unrestricted Sources	Annual Average Teacher Salary
Stoneman ES	\$3,683	\$62,099
Pittsburg USD	\$6,035	\$61,038
California	\$5,348	\$59,180
School and district: percentage difference	-39.0%	+1.7%
School and California: percentage difference	-31.1%	+4.9%

## Expenditures Per Pupil

Supplemental/restricted expenditures come from money whose use is controlled by law or by a donor. Money that is designated for specific purposes by the district or governing board is not considered restricted. Basic/unrestricted expenditures are from money whose use, except for general guidelines, is not controlled by law or by a donor.

### School Accountability Report Card

PUBLISHED BY:



Data for this year's SARC was provided by the California Department of Education (CDE), school and district offices. For additional information on California schools and districts and comparisons of the school to the district, the county and the state, please visit DataQuest at <http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>. DataQuest is an online resource that provides reports for accountability, test data, enrollment, graduates, dropouts, course enrollments, staffing and data regarding English learners. Per Education Code 35256, each school district shall make hard copies of its annually updated report card available, upon request, on or before February 1 of each year.

All data accurate as of December 2015.

# Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) Requirements Aligned in Your SARC

The tables below outline the state priority areas that are included in the School Accountability Report Card.

## Conditions of Learning

The table below describes information in the SARC that is relevant to the Basic State Priority (Priority 1).

Local Control Accountability Plan Requirements	Alignment Between State Priority Areas and the SARC
<b>Conditions of Learning</b>	
<b>State Priority: Basic</b>	
Degree to which teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject area and for the pupils they are teaching. Education Code (EC) § 52060 (d)(1)	
Pupils have access to standards-aligned instructional materials. EC § 52060 (d)(1)	
School facilities are maintained in good repair. EC § 52060 (d)(1)	

## Pupil Outcomes

The table below describes information in the SARC that is relevant to Pupil Achievement State Priority (Priority 4) and Other Pupil Outcomes State Priority (Priority 8).

Local Control Accountability Plan Requirements	Alignment Between State Priority Areas and the SARC
<b>Pupil Outcomes</b>	
<b>State Priority: Pupil Achievements</b>	
Statewide assessments (e.g., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress). EC § 52060 (d)(4)(A)	
The Academic Performance Index. EC § 52060 (d)(4)(B)	
The percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and California State University, or career technical education sequences or programs of study. EC § 52060 (d)(4)(C)	
<b>State Priority: Other Pupil Outcomes</b>	
Pupil outcomes in subject areas such as English, mathematics, social sciences, science, visual and performing arts, health, physical education, career technical education, and other studies prescribed by the governing board. <sup>1</sup> EC § 52060 (d)(8)	

## Engagement

The table below describes information in the SARC that is relevant to the Parental Involvement State Priority (Priority 3), Pupil Engagement State Priority (Priority 5) and School Climate State Priority (Priority 6).

Local Control Accountability Plan Requirements	Alignment Between State Priority Areas and the SARC
<b>Engagement</b>	
<b>State Priority: Parent Involvement</b>	
Efforts the school district makes to seek parent input in making decisions for the school district and each school site. EC § 52060 (d)(3)	
<b>State Priority: Pupil Engagement</b>	
High school dropout rates. EC § 52060 (d)(5)(D)	
High school graduation rates. EC § 52060 (d)(5)(E)	
<b>State Priority: School Climate</b>	
Pupil suspension rates. EC § 52060 (d)(6)(A)	
Pupil expulsion rates. EC § 52060 (d)(6)(B)	
Other local measures including surveys of students, parents and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness. <sup>2</sup> EC § 52060 (d)(6)(C)	

**Note:** State Priority 2 and 7 are not required in the SARC, as well as certain portions of Priority 4 and 5. For detailed information about LCAP and frequently asked questions, please visit [www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/lcfaq.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/lcfaq.asp).

<sup>1</sup> English, mathematics and physical education are the only subject areas included in Other Pupil Outcomes (Priority 8) that are reflected in the SARC.

<sup>2</sup> The school safety plan is the only other local measure of School Climate (Priority 6) that is reflected in the SARC.