

Congressman Jerry Lewis Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card

Reported Using Data from the 2013-14 School Year

Published During 2014-15

Every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC), by February 1 of each year. The SARC contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school. Under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) all local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to prepare a Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP), which describes how they intend to meet annual school-specific goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities. Additionally, data reported in an LCAP is to be consistent with data reported in the SARC.

- For more information about SARC requirements, see the California Department of Education (CDE) SARC Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/>.
- View this SARC online at the school and/or LEA Web sites.
- For more information about the LCFF or LCAP, see the CDE LCFF Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/>.
- For additional information about the school, parents and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.

About This School

Contact Information (Most Recent Year)

School Contact Information	
School Name	Congressman Jerry Lewis Elementary School
Street	1800 Black Hawk
City, State, Zip	Ft. Irwin, CA 92310
Phone Number	(760) 386-1900
Principal	Patricia LeBlanc
E-mail Address	pleblanc@svusdk12.net
Web Site	www.svusdk12.net
CDS Code	36-73890-6035331

District Contact Information	
District Name	Silver Valley Unified School District
Phone Number	760.254.2916
Superintendent	Jill Kemock
E-mail Address	jkemock@svusdk12.net
Web Site	www.svusdk12.net

School Description and Mission Statement (Most Recent Year)

School Vision Statement

Lewis Elementary School is dedicated to work in a partnership with parents, community, and staff to meet the academic, social, and emotional needs of each student. Collectively, we will provide a safe, supportive learning environment so that all students reach their maximum potential and become lifelong learners.

We are Lewis
United, Educated, Moving Forward ...
Coyote Strong!

Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2013-14)

Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	240
Grade 1	202
Grade 2	190
Total Enrollment	632

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2013-14)

Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	11.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.9
Asian	1.9
Filipino	1.4
Hispanic or Latino	31.3
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	3.2
White	42.9
Two or More Races	6.5
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	47.0
English Learners	5.4
Students with Disabilities	13.0

A. Conditions of Learning

State Priority: Basic

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Basic State Priority (Priority 1):

- Degree to which teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject area and for the pupils they are teaching;
- Pupils have access to standards-aligned instructional materials; and
- School facilities are maintained in good repair.

Teacher Credentials

Teachers	School			District
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2014-15
With Full Credential	30	33	34	135
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	2
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence (with full credential)	0	0	0	0

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

Indicator	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments *	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

Note: "Misassignments" refers to the number of positions filled by teachers who lack legal authorization to teach that grade level, subject area, student group, etc.

* Total Teacher Misassignments includes the number of Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners.

Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (School Year 2013-14)

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
This School	96.77	3.23
All Schools in District	99.36	0.64
High-Poverty Schools in District	98.97	1.03
Low-Poverty Schools in District	100.00	0.00

Note: High-poverty schools are defined as those schools with student eligibility of approximately 40 percent or more in the free and reduced price meals program. Low-poverty schools are those with student eligibility of approximately 39 percent or less in the free and reduced price meals program.

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2014-15)

Year and month in which data were collected: September 2014

Pursuant to the settlement of Williams vs. the State of California, Silver Valley Unified School District thoroughly inspected each of its school sites at the start of the 2012-13 school year to determine whether or not each school had sufficient and good quality textbooks, instructional materials, and/or science laboratory equipment. The date of the most recent resolution of the sufficiency of textbooks is September 09, 2014.

All students, including English Learners, are given their own individual textbooks and/or instructional materials in core subjects, as well as foreign language and health (as appropriate), for use in the classroom and to take home if necessary. Additionally, all textbooks and instructional materials used within the district must be aligned with the California State Content Standards and frameworks, with the final approval by the Board of Education. The table displays information collected in September 2014 about the quality, currency, and availability of the standards-aligned textbooks and other instructional materials used at the school.

Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
Reading/Language Arts	Pearson - 2010	Yes	0%
Mathematics	MacMillan/McGraw Hill - 2006	Yes	0%
Science	Houghton Mifflin - 2007	Yes	0%
History-Social Science	Houghton Mifflin - 2006	Yes	0%

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

Situated on 17.7 acres, Lewis School was originally constructed in 1994. The campus is comprised of 30 permanent classrooms, 12 portable classrooms, a library, a multipurpose room, a kindergarten building, a kindergarten playground, and one first and second grade playground. August 2013 a flash flood caused major flooding and damage to Lewis Elementary School; 95% of the school had 6" of dirty, muddy water rush through the rooms and campus. All carpet was removed/replaced, all wallboard was removed/replaced, and hallways and painted surfaces were repainted. Students were displaced from the time of the flash flood until the first week of January 2014.

Cleaning Process

The school provides a safe and clean environment for students, staff, and volunteers. The district governing board has adopted cleaning standards for all schools in the district. Basic cleaning operations are performed on a daily basis throughout the school year with emphasis on classrooms and restrooms. A joint effort between students and staff helps keep the campus clean and litter-free. The principal works daily with the custodial staff to develop sanitation schedules that ensure a clean, safe, and functional learning environment.

Maintenance & Repair

A scheduled maintenance program is administered by the District's maintenance staff on a regular basis, with heavy maintenance functions occurring during vacation periods. Additionally, a scheduled maintenance program is administered by Silver Valley Unified School District, including regular facilities inspections, to ensure that school grounds and facilities remain in excellent repair. A work order process is used when issues arise that require immediate attention.

Repair requests are completed efficiently and in the order in which they are received. The chart displays the results of the most recent school facilities inspection, provided by the district .

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year) Year and month in which data were collected: 7/8/14				
System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	[X]	[]	[]	Rms 34, 35, 36, and 37 - Poor performing HVAC (not occupied).
Interior: Interior Surfaces	[X]	[]	[]	Rm 34 - 37 - Carpet in poor condition (not occupied)
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	[X]	[]	[]	
Electrical: Electrical	[X]	[]	[]	
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	[X]	[]	[]	
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	[X]	[]	[]	
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	[X]	[]	[]	
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	[X]	[]	[]	

Overall Facility Rating (Most Recent Year)

Overall Rating	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

B. Pupil Outcomes

State Priority: Pupil Achievement

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Pupil Achievement State Priority (Priority 4):

- Statewide assessments (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress and its successor the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program);
- The Academic Performance Index; and
- The percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and the California State University, or career technical education sequences or programs of study.

California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress / Standardized Testing and Reporting Results for All Students in Science (Three-Year Comparison)

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)				60	58	64	60	59	60

Note: Science assessments include California Standards Tests (CSTs), California Modified Assessment (CMA), and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress Results by Student Group in Science (School Year 2013-14)

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

Note: CAASPP includes science assessments (CSTs, CMA, and CAPA) in grades 5, 8, and 10. 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.

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

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
English-Language Arts	51	62	73	53	56	59	54	56	55
Mathematics	51	63	81	46	52	53	49	50	50
History-Social Science				40	44	42	48	49	49

Note: STAR Program was last administered in 2012-13. Percentages are not calculated when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Academic Performance Index Ranks (Three-Year Comparison)

API Rank	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Statewide	4	7	9
Similar Schools	3	10	10

Note: For 2014 and subsequent years, the statewide and similar schools ranks will no longer be produced.

Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group (Three-Year Comparison)

Group	Actual API Change		
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
All Students at the School	-11	71	43
Black or African American			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Filipino			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			
White	-46	94	43
Two or More Races			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-12	84	30
English Learners			
Students with Disabilities			

Note: "N/D" means that no data were available to the CDE or LEA to report. "B" means the school did not have a valid API Base and there is no Growth or target information. "C" means the school had significant demographic changes and there is no Growth or target information.

C. Engagement

State Priority: Parental Involvement

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

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

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (Most Recent Year)

Parents and the community are very supportive of the educational program at the school. The PTA has made generous contributions to numerous trips, assemblies, book fairs, presentations, and the Fall/Spring Carnival.

Parents are encouraged to volunteer in the classroom, as well as attend school-wide events held throughout the year. Parents are kept abreast through community forums, parent surveys, parent notifications in the Thursday folder, Back-to-School Night, and parent conferences in November and March, including winter performances, spring performances, monthly assemblies, and Family Nights.

State Priority: School Climate

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

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

Suspensions and Expulsions

Rate	School			District			State		
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Suspensions	0.1	0.5	0.4	6.2	5.9	4.6	5.7	5.1	4.4
Expulsions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1

Note: The rate of suspensions and expulsions is calculated by dividing the total number of incidents by the total enrollment x 100.

School Safety Plan (Most Recent Year)

The safety of students and staff is a primary concern of Lewis School. All guests to the campus must sign in at the office and wear a visitor's badge at all times. Supervision is provided to ensure the safety of each student before school, during breaks, at lunch, and after school. Supervision is a responsibility shared among noon-duty aides, teachers, and school administrator.

To safeguard the well-being of students and staff, Comprehensive School Site Safety Plans have been developed for each site by the district. The Safety Plans were most recently updated in March 2013, with all revisions reviewed immediately with the staff. Key elements of the Safety Plan focus on the following: school rules and procedures, disaster procedures, current status of school crime, notification to teachers, child abuse reporting procedures, school-wide dress code, routine and emergency drills, sexual harassment policy, policies related to suspension and expulsion, maintaining a safe and orderly school environment, safe ingress and egress of pupils, parents, and school employees.

The school is always in compliance with the laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to hazardous materials and state earthquake standards. Safety drills, including fire, earthquake and intruder drills, are held monthly.

D. Other SARC Information

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

Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2013-14)

AYP Criteria	School	District
Made AYP Overall		
Met Participation Rate: English-Language Arts		
Met Participation Rate: Mathematics		
Met Percent Proficient: English-Language Arts		
Met Percent Proficient: Mathematics		

Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2014-15)

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	---	0
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	---	0.0

Note: Cells with "----" do not require data.

* DW (determination waiver) indicates that the PI status of the school was carried over from the prior year in accordance with the flexibility granted through the federal waiver process.

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)

Grade Level	2011-12				2012-13				2013-14			
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes		
		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+
K	22.3	1	9	0	25	1	9		20	5	7	
1	20.8	5	5	0	22	1	8		20	2	8	
2	22.4	4	4	0	24		8		21	1	8	
Other	0	3	0	0								

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

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2013-14)

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor	0	
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	0	---
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	0	---
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	1	---
Psychologist	.25	---
Social Worker	0	---
Nurse	.15	---
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	2.4	---
Resource Specialist	0	---
Other	0	---

Note: Cells with "----" do not require data. One Full Time Equivalent (FTE) equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time.

Expenditures per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2012-13)

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Supplemental/ Restricted	Basic/ Unrestricted	
School Site	\$4,395	\$1,695	\$2,700	\$55,104
District	---	---	\$4,984	\$61,539
Percent Difference: School Site and District	---	---	-45.8	-5.9
State	---	---	\$4,690	\$63,037
Percent Difference: School Site and State	---	---	-51.2	-12.8

Note: Cells with "----" do not require data.

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2013-14)

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2012-13)

Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$41,802	\$38,920
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$63,688	\$59,803
Highest Teacher Salary	\$86,425	\$78,096
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	\$103,623	\$95,836
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$102,189	\$99,849
Average Principal Salary (High)	\$111,258	\$107,599
Superintendent Salary	\$187,197	\$151,912
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	29	37
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	6	6

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

Professional Development

A constructive evaluation process promotes quality instruction and is a fundamental element in a sound educational program. Evaluations and formal observations are designed to encourage common goals and to comply with the state's evaluation criteria and district policies. Temporary and probationary teachers are evaluated twice a year and permanent teachers are evaluated every other year. Permanent teachers with ten years experience in the district and good evaluations are evaluated on a rotating basis or with an alternative evaluation process.

Evaluations are conducted by the principal, who has been trained and certified for competency to perform teacher evaluations. Evaluations include the following: engaging and supporting all students in learning, understanding and organizing subject matter for student learning, assessing student learning, creating and maintaining effective environments for student learning, planning instruction and designing learning experiences for all students, and developing as a professional educator.

Staff members build teaching skills and concepts through participation in conferences and workshops throughout the year. The district sponsored five staff development days in 2009-10, six in 2010-11, and forty in 2011-12. Teachers were offered a broad-based variety of professional growth opportunities in curriculum, teaching strategies, and methodologies. In 2013-2014, staff development topics included Pearson Math Training, Pearson Common Core Training, Singapore Math Training, Waterford Early Reading Training, and Conference opportunities including 3 day CUE Conference, 3 day Singapore Math Conference, Differentiated Instruction Conference, Common Core Strategies Conference, I Teach K and I Teach 1st.

For additional support in their profession, teachers may enlist the services of the district's Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) support provider and/or the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) Program.