

Loyalton High School

School Accountability Report Card

Reported Using Data from the 2012-13 School Year

Published During 2013-14

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.

- For more information about SARC requirements, see the California Department of Education (CDE) SARC webpage at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/>.
- 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 at <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/> 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., state Academic Performance Index [API], federal Adequate Yearly Progress [AYP]), test data, enrollment, high school 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 may include the hours of operation, the length of time that a workstation may be used (depending on availability), the types of software programs available on a workstation, and the ability to print documents.

Additional Information

For further information regarding the data elements and terms used in the SARC see the 2012–13 Academic Performance Index Reports Information Guide located on the CDE API Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/>.

II. About This School

Contact Information (School Year 2013-14)

| School Contact Information | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| School Name | Loyalton High School |
| Street | 700 Fourth Strett |
| City, State, Zip | Loyalton, CA 96118-0037 |
| Phone Number | 530.993.4454 |
| Principal | Marla Stock |
| E-mail Address | mstock@spjUSD.org |
| CDS Code | 46701774634259 |

| District Contact Information | |
|------------------------------|---|
| District Name | Sierra-Plumas Joint Unified School District |
| Phone Number | 530.993.1660 |
| Web Site | www.sierracountyofficeofeducation.org |
| Superintendent | Dr. Merrill M. Grant |
| E-mail Address | mgrant@spjUSD.org |

School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2012-13)

This section provides information about the school, its programs and its goals.

Loyalton High School experiences similar challenges to other small schools in providing a comprehensive educational experience for our students. Students at Loyalton High School can choose from a variety of courses to help them meet academic and vocational interests. These courses range from Agriculture to Advanced Placement Calculus. Graduates of Loyalton High School have succeeded in rigorous university settings and graduated with marketable employment skills. Because of our small enrollment, students receive personalized attention in setting and achieving their academic goals. The dedicated staff provides a wide array of co- and extra-curricular activities to enrich the lives of our students.

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2012-13)

This section provides information on how parents can become involved in school activities, including contact information pertaining to organized opportunities for parent involvement.

Parents are valuable contributors to the Loyalton High School learning community. As such, the staff encourages and welcomes parental involvement. Parents are invited to participate in annual four-year planning evening sessions where the academic progress of their child(ren) is discussed one-on-one with staff members. Three parents are selected each year to serve on the Loyalton High School Site Council and Loyalton Booster Club is mostly comprised of parents who provide financial and physical support to school programs. Parents are welcome to visit classrooms and are encouraged to participate in school activities. Parents are sought to serve on WASC Committees during accreditation visit years. Parents often serve as field trip chaperons and drivers to extra- and co-curricular activities.

III. Student Performance

The Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program consists of several key components, including:

- **California Standards Tests (CSTs)**, which 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 nine through eleven.
- **California Modified Assessment (CMA)**, an alternate assessment that is based on modified achievement standards in ELA for grades three through eleven; mathematics for grades three through seven, Algebra I, and Geometry; and science in grades five and eight, and Life Science in grade ten. 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.
- **California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA)**, includes ELA and mathematics in grades two through eleven, and 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 assessments under the STAR Program show how well students are doing in relation to the state content standards. On each of these assessments, student scores are reported as performance levels.

For detailed information regarding the STAR Program results for each grade and performance level, including the percent of students not tested, see the CDE STAR Results Web site at <http://star.cde.ca.gov>.

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 | 60 | 58 | 57 | 56 | 59 | 61 | 54 | 56 | 55 |
| Mathematics | 36 | 27 | 42 | 46 | 47 | 57 | 49 | 50 | 50 |
| Science | 55 | 67 | 50 | 61 | 67 | 70 | 57 | 60 | 59 |
| History-Social Science | 51 | 40 | 43 | 46 | 44 | 43 | 48 | 49 | 49 |

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.

Standardized Testing and Reporting Results by Student Group - Most Recent Year

| Group | Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced | | | |
|---|---|-------------|---------|------------------------|
| | English-Language Arts | Mathematics | Science | History-Social Science |
| All Students in the LEA | 61 | 57 | 70 | 43 |
| All Student at the School | 57 | 42 | 50 | 43 |
| Male | 47 | 42 | | 48 |
| Female | 68 | 43 | | 36 |
| Black or African American | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | |
| Asian | | | | |
| Filipino | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 50 | 47 | | 33 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | | | | |
| White | 56 | 42 | 36 | 44 |
| Two or More Races | | | | |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 64 | 62 | | 47 |
| English Learners | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | | | | |
| Students Receiving Migrant Education Services | | | | |

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.

California High School Exit Examination

The California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) is primarily used as a graduation requirement. However, the grade ten results of this exam are also used to establish the percentages of students at three proficiency levels (not proficient, proficient, or advanced) in ELA and mathematics to compute AYP designations required by the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), also known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

For detailed information regarding CAHSEE results, see the CDE CAHSEE Web site at <http://cahsee.cde.ca.gov/>.

California High School Exit Examination Results for All Grade Ten Students – Three-Year Comparison

| Subject | Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | School | | | District | | | State | | |
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| English-Language Arts | 47 | 76 | 58 | 54 | 77 | 46 | 59 | 56 | 57 |
| Mathematics | 62 | 61 | 74 | 61 | 59 | 61 | 56 | 58 | 60 |

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.

California High School Exit Examination Grade Ten Results by Student Group – Most Recent Year

| Group | English-Language Arts | | | Mathematics | | |
|---|-----------------------|------------|----------|----------------|------------|----------|
| | Not Proficient | Proficient | Advanced | Not Proficient | Proficient | Advanced |
| All Students in the LEA | 54 | 14 | 32 | 39 | 46 | 14 |
| All Students at the School | 42 | 16 | 42 | 26 | 53 | 21 |
| Male | | | | | | |
| Female | | | | | | |
| Black or African American | | | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | | | |
| Asian | | | | | | |
| Filipino | | | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | | | | | | |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | | | | | | |
| White | 50 | 14 | 36 | 29 | 50 | 21 |
| Two or More Races | | | | | | |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 36 | 18 | 45 | 27 | 55 | 18 |
| English Learners | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | | | | | | |
| Students Receiving Migrant Education Services | | | | | | |

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.

California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2012-13)

The California Physical Fitness Test (PFT) is administered to students in grades five, seven, and nine only. This table displays by grade level the percent of students meeting the fitness standards for the most recent testing period. For detailed information regarding this test, and comparisons of a school's test results to the district and state, see the CDE PFT Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/pf/>.

| Grade Level | Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards | | |
|-------------|---|-----------------------|----------------------|
| | Four of Six Standards | Five of Six Standards | Six of Six Standards |
| 9 | 10.0 | 20.0 | 46.7 |

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.

IV. Accountability

Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of state academic performance and progress of schools in California. API scores range from 200 to 1,000, with a statewide target of 800. For detailed information about the API, see the CDE API Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/>.

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 1 to 10. A statewide rank of 1 means that the school has an API score in the lowest ten percent of all schools in the state, while a statewide rank of 10 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 1 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 10 means that the school's academic performance is better than at least 90 of the 100 similar schools.

| API Rank | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|-----------------|------|------|------|
| Statewide | 5 | 8 | 8 |
| Similar Schools | | | |

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 | 76 | -13 | -21 |
| Black or African American | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | |
| Asian | | | |
| Filipino | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | | | |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 75 | -20 | -18 |
| Two or More Races | | | |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | | | |
| 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.

Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group - 2013 Growth API Comparison

This table displays, by student group, the number of students included in the API and the 2013 Growth API at the school, LEA, and state level.

| Group | 2013 Growth API | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|
| | School | | District | | State | |
| | # of Students | Growth API | # of Students | Growth API | # of Students | Growth API |
| All Students at the School | 73 | 787 | 275 | 829 | 4,655,989 | 790 |
| Black or African American | 2 | | 4 | | 296,463 | 708 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1 | | 2 | | 30,394 | 743 |
| Asian | 0 | | 3 | | 406,527 | 906 |
| Filipino | 0 | | 0 | | 121,054 | 867 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 14 | 769 | 43 | 809 | 2,438,951 | 744 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 0 | | 0 | | 25,351 | 774 |
| White | 56 | 788 | 219 | 833 | 1,200,127 | 853 |
| Two or More Races | 0 | | 2 | | 125,025 | 824 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 31 | 813 | 116 | 830 | 2,774,640 | 743 |
| English Learners | 3 | | 21 | 777 | 1,482,316 | 721 |
| Students with Disabilities | 5 | | 28 | 740 | 527,476 | 615 |

Adequate Yearly Progress

The federal ESEA 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)

For detailed information about AYP, including participation rates and percent proficient results by student group, see the CDE AYP Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/>.

Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2012-13)

| AYP Criteria | School | District |
|---|--------|----------|
| Made AYP Overall | No | No |
| Met Participation Rate: English-Language Arts | Yes | Yes |
| Met Participation Rate: Mathematics | Yes | Yes |
| Met Percent Proficient: English-Language Arts | No | No |
| Met Percent Proficient: Mathematics | Yes | No |
| Met API Criteria | Yes | Yes |
| Met Graduation Rate (if applicable) | N/A | N/A |

Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2013-14)

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. For detailed information about PI identification, see the CDE PI Status Determinations Web page: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/tidetermine.asp>.

| 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 | --- | 1 |
| Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement | --- | 20.0 |

V. School Climate

Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2012-13)

| Grade Level | Number of Students |
|------------------|--------------------|
| Grade 9 | 30 |
| Grade 10 | 21 |
| Grade 11 | 29 |
| Grade 12 | 29 |
| Total Enrollment | 109 |

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2012-13)

| Group | Percent of Total Enrollment | Group | Percent of Total Enrollment |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Black or African American | 1.8 | White | 78.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1.8 | Two or More Races | 0.0 |
| Asian | 0.9 | Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 45.0 |
| Filipino | 0.0 | English Learners | 4.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 17.4 | Students with Disabilities | 7.3 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 0.0 | | |

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)

| Subject | 2010-11 | | | | 2011-12 | | | | 2012-13 | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------|-----|-----------------|----------------------|-------|-----|-----------------|----------------------|-------|-----|
| | 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 | 15.8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 10.8 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 15.6 | 7 | | |
| Mathematics | 16.1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 11.3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 11.8 | 11 | | |
| Science | 13.8 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10.4 | 8 | | |
| Social Science | 13.5 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 12.4 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 15.4 | 5 | | |

Note: Number of classes indicates how many classrooms fall into each size category (a range of total students per classroom). At the secondary school level, this information is reported by subject area rather than grade level.

School Safety Plan (School Year 2012-13)

This section provides information about the school's comprehensive safety plan, including the dates on which the safety plan was last reviewed, updated, and discussed with faculty; as well as a brief description of the key elements of the plan.

Loyalton High School staff and students enjoy a safe place to work and learn. Staff members remain vigilant during school breaks and before and after school each day. All visitors are asked to check in at the school office, and regular school volunteers are screened through the district screening process. The district School Safety Plan was revised and implemented in the fall of 2008 and reviewed annually since. Monthly safety drills are performed; students are well aware of safety procedures during safety drills. District personnel are assigned to review health records and report to the staff the special health needs of students. The addition of a short, daily period in the school schedule has allowed for all students to participate in school culture activities that promote a safe school environment.

Suspensions and Expulsions

| Rate | School | | | District | | |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Suspensions | 15 | 10 | 7 | 6.37 | 4.04 | 18 |
| Expulsions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | .25 | 0 |

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

VI. School Facilities

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (School Year 2013-14)

This section provides information from the most recent Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) data (or equivalent), including:

- Description of the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of the school facility
- Description of any planned or recently completed facility improvements
- Description of any needed maintenance to ensure good repair

To determine the condition of our facilities our district performs an annual inspection using the Facilities Inspection Tool, which is issued by the Office of Public School Construction.

Based on that survey, we've answered the questions you see on this report. Please note that the information reflects the condition of our buildings as of the date of the report. Since that time, those conditions may have changed.

School Facility Good Repair Status (School Year 2013-14)

This section provides information from the most recent Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) data (or equivalent), including:

- Determination of repair status for systems listed
- Description of any needed maintenance to ensure good repair
- The year and month in which the data were collected
- The Overall Rating

| School Facility Good Repair Status (School Year 2013-14) | | | | |
|--|---------------|------|------|--|
| Year and month in which data were collected: September 2013 | | | | |
| System Inspected | Repair Status | | | Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned |
| | Good | Fair | Poor | |
| Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer | [X] | [] | [] | Several heaters malfunctioned during the extreme cold weather in November and December 2013. These have been replaced or repaired. |
| Interior: Interior Surfaces | [] | [X] | [] | New ceilings and new hall lighting was installed during the summer of 2013. This has greatly improved the overall appearance of the hallway and classrooms. Carpet and floor tiles still need to be replaced school wide. Classrooms need painting. Gym bleachers need constant repair. |
| Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation | [X] | [] | [] | Rough athletic field surfaces and gopher problems continue in fields. |
| Electrical: Electrical | [X] | [] | [] | Electrical improvements and new wiring school wide were part of the roof project completed during the summer of 2013. |
| Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains | [X] | [] | [] | Need new stalls in student restrooms, need appropriate flooring in hallway restrooms and faculty restrooms, boys' restroom heater needs replacing. |
| Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials | [X] | [] | [] | With the roof construction project and new ceilings installed school wide during the summer of 2013, danger of hazardous elements and materials has been significantly reduced or totally eliminated. Safety drills are conducted once a month and fire extinguishers are serviced annually. As part of the summer of 2013 construction project, fire alarms were updated. |
| Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs | [X] | [] | [] | At great expense, the roof over the main school building was replaced during the summer of 2013. While this hasn't greatly affected the aesthetics of our school building, the project brought the school building to a place of security for many years ahead. The roof project did allow for the skylight in the main hallway to be updated, reopened, and secured which has added a nice touch to the interior of the school. In addition, this construction project confirmed that the structural integrity of the school building remains intact. |
| External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences | [] | [] | [X] | Single-pane windows leak and are so old that many of them no longer operate as designed. Because of the age of the windows, we are unable to find replacement hardware. The front and side parking lots remain in poor condition. |

Overall Facility Rate

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

VII. Teachers**Teacher Credentials**

| Teachers | School | | | District |
|--|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2012-13 |
| With Full Credential | 11 | 11 | 11 | 26 |
| Without Full Credential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence (with full credential) | N/A | N/A | N/A | --- |

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

| Indicator | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|
| 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 2012-13)

The federal ESEA, also known as NCLB, requires 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 core academic subject area competence. For more information, see the CDE Improving Teacher and Principal Quality Web page at www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/tq/.

| Location of Classes | Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers | Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers |
| This School | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| All Schools in District | 95.5 | 4.6 |
| High-Poverty Schools in District | 96.8 | 3.2 |
| Low-Poverty Schools in District | 87.5 | 12.5 |

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.

VIII. Support Staff

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2012-13)

| Title | Number of FTE Assigned to School | Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| Academic Counselor | .12 | 120 |
| Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development) | .12 | --- |
| Library Media Teacher (Librarian) | 0 | --- |
| Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional) | .38 | --- |
| Psychologist | .37 | --- |
| Social Worker | 0.0 | --- |
| Nurse | 0.0 | --- |
| Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist | .12 | --- |
| Resource Specialist | 1.0 | --- |
| Other | 1.7 | --- |

Note: 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.

IX. Curriculum and Instructional Materials

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2013-14)

This section describes whether the textbooks and instructional materials used at the school are from the most recent adoption; whether there are sufficient textbooks and instruction materials for each student; and information about the school's use of any supplemental curriculum or non-adopted textbooks or instructional materials.

Year and month in which data were collected: November 2013

The main fact about textbooks that the Williams legislation calls for described whether schools have enough books in core classes for all students. The law also asks districts to reveal whether those books are presenting what is required by the California Content Standards.

| Core Curriculum Area | Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption | From Most Recent Adoption? | Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|
| Reading/Language Arts | Literature & Language Arts - Holt Adopted 2003 Norton Introduction to Literature - W.W. Norton Adopted 2002 Rhetoric at Work in Reading and Writing - Pearson Adopted 2005 Holt Handbook - Holt Adopted 2003 | Yes | 0 |
| Mathematics | Algebra 1 - Glencoe Adopted 2009 Geometry - Glencoe Adopted 2009 Algebra II McGraw-Hill - Glencoe Adopted 2009 PreCalculus - Houghton Mifflin Adopted 2009 | Yes | 0 |
| Science | Biology, the Dynamics of Life - Glencoe Adopted 2005 Biology - McGraw-Hill Adopted 2004 Chemistry - Concepts & Applications - Glencoe Adopted 2002 Physics - Principles & Problems - Glencoe Adopted 2005 | Yes | 0 |
| History-Social Science | Modern World History Patterns of Interaction - McDougal Littell Adopted 2009 Magruder's American Government - Prentice Hall Adopted 2013 Economics - Principles in Action - Prentice Hall Adopted 2007 The American Pageant - Volumes I and II - Houghton Mifflin Adopted 2006 | Yes | 0 |
| Foreign Language | Spanish: Avancemos! - Holt McDougal, 2010, Levels 1-4 | Yes | 0 |
| Health | Health Promotion Waves curriculum - Health Wave, 2010, all reproducible units. | Yes | N/A |
| Visual and Performing Arts | Color: A Workshop Approach - McGraw Hill, 2005 (classroom set only) Living with Art - McGraw Hill, 2008 (classroom set only) | Yes | 0 |

| Core Curriculum Area | Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption | From Most Recent Adoption? | Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy |
|---|---|----------------------------------|---|
| Science Laboratory Equipment (grades 9-12) | A grant provided for the purchase of updated lab equipment in 2011. In addition, a chemical sweep in 2010 made it necessary for an entirely new purchase of chemicals for science labs in 2011. | Yes | N/A |

X. School Finances

Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2011-12)

| Level | Expenditures Per Pupil | | | Average Teacher Salary |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Total | Supplemental/ Restricted | Basic/ Unrestricted | |
| School Site | \$16,185 | \$3,075 | \$13,110 | \$51,508 |
| District | --- | --- | \$10,414 | \$52,490 |
| Percent Difference: School Site and District | --- | --- | 25.9 | -1.9 |
| State | --- | --- | \$5,537 | \$58,606 |
| Percent Difference: School Site and State | --- | --- | 136.8 | -12.1 |

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.

For detailed information on school expenditures for all districts in California, see the CDE Current Expense of Education & Per-pupil Spending Web page at <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 <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/>. To look up expenditures and salaries for a specific school district, see the Ed-Data Web site at: <http://www.ed-data.org>.

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2012-13)

This section provides specific information about the types of programs and services available at the school that support and assist students. For example, this narrative may include information about supplemental educational services related to the school's federal Program Improvement (PI) status.

According to the goals in our Single Plan for Student Achievement, budgeted funds were used to support students in the following programs and positions: Noon Lunch Supervisor, Intervention Aides, EIA/EL Aide to assist English Learners with core classes, Library Aide, AVID, GATE, FFA, athletics, and advanced placement and on-line classes. In addition, funding was provided for the purchase of technology to assist in our educational goals. Smartboards were installed in classrooms and mobile computer lab was maintained and made available to classes for use on a sign-up basis. Funding is also provided for professional development to keep teachers and administrators up to date in methods and curriculum.

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2011-12)

| Category | District Amount | State Average for Districts In Same Category |
|---|-----------------|--|
| Beginning Teacher Salary | \$32,223 | \$38,390 |
| Mid-Range Teacher Salary | \$49,184 | \$55,793 |
| Highest Teacher Salary | \$66,147 | \$72,306 |
| Average Principal Salary (Elementary) | \$92,796 | \$88,846 |
| Average Principal Salary (Middle) | \$92,796 | \$92,801 |
| Average Principal Salary (High) | \$95,618 | \$95,916 |
| Superintendent Salary | \$114,228 | \$116,026 |
| Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries | 28.5% | 34.0% |
| Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries | 6% | 6.6% |

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

XI. School Completion and Postsecondary Preparation**Admission Requirements for California's Public Universities****University of California**

Admission requirements for the University of California (UC) follow guidelines set forth in the Master Plan, which requires that the top one-eighth of the state's high school graduates, as well as those transfer students who have successfully completed specified college course work, be eligible for admission to the UC. These requirements are designed to ensure that all eligible students are adequately prepared for University-level work.

For general admissions requirements, please visit the UC Admissions Information Web page at <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/admissions/>.

California State University

Eligibility for admission to the California State University (CSU) is determined by three factors:

- Specific high school courses
- Grades in specified courses and test scores
- Graduation from high school

Some campuses have higher standards for particular majors or students who live outside the local campus area. Because of the number of students who apply, a few campuses have higher standards (supplementary admission criteria) for all applicants. Most CSU campuses have local admission guarantee policies for students who graduate or transfer from high schools and colleges that are historically served by a CSU campus in that region. For admission, application, and fee information see the CSU Web page at <http://www.calstate.edu/admission/admission.shtml>.

Dropout Rate and Graduation Rate

| Indicator | School | | | District | | | State | | |
|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 |
| Dropout Rate | 0.00 | 5.00 | 0.00 | 6.40 | 7.10 | 3.00 | 16.60 | 14.70 | 13.10 |
| Graduation Rate | 94.74 | 95.00 | 100.00 | | 92.86 | 96.97 | 80.53 | 77.14 | 78.73 |

Completion of High School Graduation Requirements

This table displays, by student group, the number of students who were a part of the school's most recent graduating class for which CDE has available data and meet all state and local graduation requirements for grade twelve completion, including having passed both the ELA and mathematics portions of the CAHSEE or received a local waiver or state exemption.

| Group | Graduating Class of 2012 | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------|---------|
| | School | District | State |
| All Students | 26 | 31 | 418,598 |
| Black or African American | 2 | 2 | 28,078 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | 3,123 |
| Asian | | | 41,700 |
| Filipino | | | 12,745 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 4 | 4 | 193,516 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | | | 2,585 |
| White | 20 | 25 | 127,801 |
| Two or More Races | | | 6,790 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 14 | 17 | 217,915 |
| English Learners | 2 | 2 | 93,297 |
| Students with Disabilities | 2 | 3 | 31,683 |

Career Technical Education Programs (School Year 2012-13)

This section provides information about Career Technical Education (CTE) programs including:

- Programs and classes offered that are specifically focused on career preparation and or preparation for work
- How these programs and classes are integrated with academic courses and how they support academic achievement
- How the school addresses the needs of all students in career preparation and/or preparation for work, including needs unique to defined special populations of students
- The measurable outcomes of these programs and classes, and how they are evaluated
- State the primary representative of the district's CTE advisory committee and the industries represented on the committee

Some high schools offer courses intended to help students prepare for the world of work. These career technical education courses (CTE, formerly known as vocational education) are open to all students. Loyalton High School has programs in Construction Trades and Agriculture.

Career Technical Education Participation (School Year 2012-13)

| Measure | CTE Program Participation |
|---|---------------------------|
| Number of pupils participating in CTE | 56 |
| % of pupils completing a CTE program and earning a high school diploma | 24% |
| % of CTE courses sequenced/articulated between the school/institutions of postsecondary education | 8 |

Courses for University of California and/or California State University Admission

| UC/CSU Course Measure | Percent |
|---|---------|
| 2012-13 Students Enrolled in Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission | 50.8 |
| 2011-12 Graduates Who Completed All Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission | 53.8 |

Advanced Placement Courses (School Year 2011–12)

| Subject | Number of AP Courses Offered* | Percent of Students In AP Courses |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Computer Science | | --- |
| English | 4 | --- |
| Fine and Performing Arts | | --- |
| Foreign Language | 1 | --- |
| Mathematics | 2 | --- |
| Science | | --- |
| Social Science | 2 | --- |
| All courses | 9 | 6.9 |

* Where there are student course enrollments.

XII. Instructional Planning and Scheduling

Professional Development

This section provides information on the number of days provided for professional development and continuous professional growth in the most recent three year period. Questions that may be answered include:

- What are the primary/major areas of focus for staff development and specifically how were they selected? For example, were student achievement data used to determine the need for professional development in reading instruction?
- What are the methods by which professional development is delivered (e.g., after school workshops, conference attendance, individual mentoring, etc.)?
- How are teachers supported during implementation (e.g., through in-class coaching, teacher-principal meetings, student performance, and data reporting, etc.)?

Teachers take some time each year to improve their teaching skills and to extend their knowledge of the subjects they teach. Here you will see the amount of time each year we set aside for continuing education and professional development. Loyalton High School has been focusing on school-wide literacy improvement for the past six years. During the past few years, we have spent time at Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and faculty meetings on school-wide literacy systems such as note taking strategies, writing across the curriculum, academic vocabulary development, and reading. During this school year, our PLCs centered on the Common Core State Standards and teaching techniques that support the new standards and the inclusion of more technology in all classrooms. In addition, the district has promoted the use of technology by purchasing smart boards, computers, and other technology for classrooms and offering multiple in-service programs on their use and the development of classroom activities to support new standards. The PLCs continue to encourage teacher collaboration for the improvement of subject area teaching, classroom management, and student learning and the development of systems to allow for continual improvement. Teacher meetings are held twice a month on alternate Wednesday afternoons. More and more we are including teaching strategies, plans for intervention, and school planning into these meetings. Student data is the beginning point of all planning each school year. In addition to test scores, the staff looks at grades and attendance data to plan for the success of each student in meeting individual goals. This data drives the direction the school takes in professional development, support services, and school goals for each year. School funds have been available for staff to attend a variety of subject specific or general professional development programs during the school year and summers. There is a provision in the certificated contract to pay stipends to teachers for attending in-service programs during holidays or school vacations. Release time is provided for programs offered during the school year. Administration makes every effort to encourage and support professional development.