DISTRICT
HOME PAGE

WATERFORD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

» Williams report home page
» About the Williams law
» Close this window

Waterford High School

Facilities, 2013–2014

This information about facilities is one small part of an annual report about our school. You can find this full report, which contains additional information about teachers, students, test scores, and resources, on our district's Web site. This portion of the report is also one part of our response to the 2004 Williams legislation.

Read more about facilities inspections.

Overall Rating

RATING: GOOD

Our school is in good repair, according to the criteria established by the Office of Public School Construction. Our deficiencies are minor ones resulting from common wear and tear, and there are few of them. We scored between 90 and 99 percent on the 15 categories of our evaluation.

A. SYSTEMS

Gas Leaks

No apparent problems.

Mechanical Problems (Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning)

No apparent problems.

Sewer System

No apparent problems.

B. INTERIOR

Interior Surfaces (Walls, Floors, and Ceilings)

Holes in wall of small wight room.
Room 1201 tear intack board.
Room 1202 hole in ceiling tile.
Room 1204 ceiling tile are stained and lights out.
Room 1207 tear in tackboard

C. CLEANLINESS

Overall Cleanliness

No apparent problems.

Pest or Vermin Infestation

No apparent problems.

D. ELECTRICAL

Electrical Systems and Lighting

Room 506 plug cover missing outside of room.
Room 205 plug cover missing.

E. RESTROOMS/FOUNTAINS

Bathrooms

No apparent problems.

Drinking Fountains (Inside and Out)

No apparent problems.

F. SAFETY

Fire Safety (Sprinkler Systems, Alarms, Extinguishers)

No apparent problems.

Hazardous Materials (Lead Paint, Asbestos, Mold, Flammables, etc.)

No apparent problems.

G. STRUCTURAL

Structural Damage (Cracks in Walls and Foundations, Sloping Ceilings, Posts or Beams Missing)

No apparent problems.

Roofs

No apparent problems.

H. EXTERNAL

Playground/School Grounds

No apparent problems.

Windows, Doors, Gates, Fences (Interior and Exterior)

Room 201

NOTES

No apparent problems.

Inspectors and Advisors

This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013 by Randall Azevedo (Director of Maintenance).
The facilities inspection occurred on Wednesday, August 24, 2011.
There were no other inspectors used in the completion of this form.

The Facilities Inspection Tool was completed on Thursday, July 26, 2012.

About Facilities Inspections

To determine the condition of our facilities, our district sent experts from our facilities team to do so. They used a survey, called the Facilities Inspection Tool, 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.

Waterford High School

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013
Waterford Unified School District



An annual report to the community about teaching, learning, test results, resources, and measures of progress in our school.

Published by
SCHOOL WISE PRESS

Waterford High School

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013
Waterford Unified School District

This School Accountability Report Card (SARC) provides information that can be used to evaluate and compare schools. State and federal laws require all schools to publish a SARC each year.

The information in this report represents the 2012–2013 school year, not the current school year. In most cases, this is the most recent data available. We present our school's results next to those of the average high school in the county and state to provide the most meaningful and fair comparisons. To find additional facts about our school online, please use the **DataQuest** tool offered by the California Department of Education.

Please note that words that appear in a smaller, bold typeface are links in the online version of this report to more information. You can find a list of those linked words and their Web page URLs at:

http://pub.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links_2013_en.html

Reports about other schools are available on the **California Department of Education Web site.** Internet access is available in local libraries.

If you have any questions related to this report, or would like to request a hardcopy version, please contact our school office.

How to Contact Our School
121 S. Reinway Ave.
Waterford, CA 95386
Principal: Ignacio Ramirez
Phone: (209) 874-9060

How to Contact Our District
219 North Reinway
Waterford, CA 95386
Phone: (209) 874-1809
http://waterford-ca.schoolloop.com/



Contents

ONLINE USERS: CLICK ON A TITLE TO JUMP TO THAT SECTION

Published by
SCHOOL WISE PRESS
466 Green Street, Suite 303
San Francisco, CA 94133
Phone: (415) 432-7800
www.schoolwisepress.com

Waterford High School

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013
Waterford Unified School District

Principal's Message

Waterford High School (WHS) is well known throughout the Central Valley for consistent gains in student achievement. In fact, WHS has the highest four-year growth in academic performance of any comprehensive high school in California. In 2007, WHS was named a California Distinguished School. The students at WHS received the Title I Academic Achievement Award presented at the state Title I conference in May 2006 and 2007. WHS was the first high school in the region to reach and surpass the state target of 800 (2008).

WHS offers a diverse catalog of courses. Students may explore the Arts, Music and Drama. Students can also enroll in Advanced Placement and Career Technical courses.

Our biggest challenge is sustaining academic growth over time. Our mission of providing an excellent comprehensive educational program for the students of Waterford High School requires each person (teacher, student, parent, and administrator) to strive daily to do his best.

Thank you for taking time to review our School Accountability Report Card. We hope the information in this report will give you a better understanding of our educational program and the level of student achievement at our school. The faculty and staff at Waterford High School believe that all of our students can succeed in school. Each year teachers receive training to improve their teaching techniques, and, as a result, we have seen improvements in the academic performance of our students.

High school should be a time of academic skill development, social maturation, and preparation for adult life. Our goal is to provide a quality educational program for all students. A rich and rewarding four-year experience is available here at Waterford High School; we want every student to make the most of this opportunity.

Ignacio Ramirez, PRINCIPAL

Grade range and calendar

9–12

TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index

808

County Average: 770
State Average: 750

Student enrollment

605

County Average: 1,039
State Average: 1,114

Major Achievements

- The WHS vision statement is as follows: "To become wholly focused on student learning, teacher-directed instruction, and professional collaboration, so that WHS serves a demonstration site for other educational professionals."
- In 2012-13, 86 percent of our tenth graders passed the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) in English language arts, and 91 percent passed in mathematics.
- In 2012-13, three of our athletic teams competed in the CIF Section Team finals: Wrestling, Football and Softball. Our Softball team won the first Section Championship in the history of our school.
- Waterford High School achieved a Silver Medal rating by the US News & World Report, and is considered by this publication to be one of the highest performing schools in the Nation.
- Waterford High School maintains a statewide ranking of 8 out of 10, placing it in to Top 30 percent of all high schools in California. It also maintains a similar school ranking of 10 out of 10, placing it in the top 10 percent of schools with similar demographics: student population, class size, teacher training, etc.
- In 2012-13, WHS juniors had the opportunity to experience a half-day job shadow in an industry sector of their choosing.
- All regular education students are scheduled into courses that lead to college admission. Students must earn a grade "C" or higher in each of these courses.

Focus for Improvement

- Our school site plan, known as the Single Plan for Student Achievement, clearly identifies the following goals:
- We will develop support programs to help students pass the CAHSEE. Sophomores will receive CAHSEE preparation lessons during the homeroom period, and 87.5 percent will pass the CAHSEE on their first attempt. Students who have not passed the CAHSEE on their first attempt will be placed in a CAHSEE remediation homeroom.
- We will provide extra help in algebra and assist all students in language development.
- WHS students will reach API and AYP growth targets.
- Teachers will receive training to improve the way they deliver instruction to effect academic language.
- The agriculture program will use funding to improve the school farm and enhance opportunities in agricultural education.
- We will develop and maintain high-quality co-curricular and extracurricular programs. We will continue to monitor these programs to promote fairness and opportunity.
- Funds will be expended to improve the use of technology in teaching and learning.

MEASURES OF PROGRESS

Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is California's way of comparing schools based on student test scores. The index was created in 1999 to help parents and educators recognize schools that show progress and identify schools that need help. It is also used to compare schools in a statewide ranking system. The California Department of Education (CDE) calculates a school's API using student test results from the California Standards Tests and, for high schools, the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE). APIs range from 200 to 1000. The CDE expects all schools to eventually obtain APIs of at least 800. **Additional information on the API** can be found on the CDE Web site.

Waterford's API was 808 (out of 1000). This is a decline of 2 points compared with last year's API. About 99 percent of our students took the test. You can find three years of detailed API results in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

CALIFORNIA
API
ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX

Met schoolwide growth target	**Yes**
Met growth target for prior school year	**Yes**
API score	**808**
Growth attained from prior year	**-2**
Met subgroup* growth targets	**No**

SOURCE: API based on spring 2013 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of December 2013.

*Ethnic groups, English Learners, special ed students, or socioeconomic groups of students that make up 15 percent or more of a school's student body. These groups must meet AYP and API goals. N/A - Results not available.

API RANKINGS: Based on our 2011–2012 test results, we started the 2012–2013 school year with a base API of 810. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared with all high schools in California, our school ranked 8 out of 10.

SIMILAR SCHOOL RANKINGS: We also received a second ranking that compared us with the 100 schools with the most similar students, teachers, and class sizes. Compared with these schools, our school ranked 10 out of 10. The CDE recalculates this factor every year. To read more about the specific elements included in this calculation, refer to the **CDE Web site**.

API GROWTH TARGETS: Each year the CDE sets specific API "growth targets" for every school. It assigns one growth target for the entire school, and it sets additional targets for ethnic groups, English Learners, special education students, or socioeconomic subgroups of students that make up a significant portion of the student body. Schools are required to meet all of their growth targets. If they do, they may be eligible to apply for awards through the California School Recognition Program and the Title I Achieving Schools Program.

We did not meet some or all of our assigned growth targets during the 2012–2013 school year. Just for reference, 33 percent of high schools statewide met their growth targets.

API, Spring 2013



SOURCE: API based on spring 2013 test cycle. State average represents high schools only.
NOTE: Only groups of students that represent at least 15 percent of total enrollment are calculated and displayed as student subgroups.

Adequate Yearly Progress

In addition to California's accountability system, which measures student achievement using the API, schools must also meet requirements set by the federal education law known as **No Child Left Behind** (NCLB). This law requires all schools to meet a different goal: **Adequate Yearly Progress** (AYP).

We met 15 out of 18 criteria for yearly progress. Because we fell short in three areas, we did not make AYP. Our school is also on the federal watchlist known as Program Improvement (PI). See the next page for background on this matter and an explanation of the consequences.

To meet AYP, high schools must meet four criteria. First, a certain percentage of students must score at or above Proficient levels on the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA): 88.9 percent on the English/language arts test and 88.7 percent on the math test. All significant ethnic, English Learners, special education, and socioeconomic subgroups of students also must meet these goals. Second, the schools must achieve an API of at least 770 or increase their API by one point from the prior year. Third, 95 percent of tenth grade students must take the CAHSEE or CAPA. Fourth, the graduation rate for the class of 2012 must be higher than 90 percent (or satisfy alternate improvement criteria).

If even one subgroup of students fails to meet just one of the criteria, the school fails to meet AYP. While all schools must report their progress toward meeting AYP, only schools that receive federal funding to help economically disadvantaged students are actually penalized if they fail to meet AYP goals. Schools that do not make AYP for two or more years in a row in the same subject enter **Program Improvement** (PI). They must offer students transfers to other schools in the district and, in their second year in PI, tutoring services as well.

FEDERAL
AYP
ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

Met AYP	**No**
Met schoolwide participation rate	**Yes**
Met schoolwide test score goals	**No**
Met subgroup* participation rate	**Yes**
Met subgroup* test score goals	**No**
Met schoolwide API for AYP	**Yes**
Met graduation rate	**Yes**
Program Improvement school in 2013	**Yes**

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of September 2013. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2012–2013 school year or earlier.

*Ethnic groups, English Learners, special ed students, or socioeconomic groups of students that make up 15 percent or more of a school's student body. These groups must meet AYP and API goals. N/A - Results not available.

Adequate Yearly Progress, Detail by Subgroup

● **MET GOAL** ● **DID NOT MEET GOAL** — **NOT ENOUGH STUDENTS**

	English/Language Arts		Math	
	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CAHSEE OR CAPA?	DID 88.9% ATTAIN PROFICIENCY ON THE CAHSEE OR CAPA?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CAHSEE OR CAPA?	DID 88.7% ATTAIN PROFICIENCY ON THE CAHSEE OR CAPA?
SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS	●	●	●	●
SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS				
Low income	●	●	●	●
STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY				
Hispanic/Latino	●	●	●	●
White/Other	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of September 2013, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2012–2013 school year. The green dots represent goals we met; red dots indicate goals we missed. Just one red dot means that we failed to meet AYP.

NOTE: Dashes indicate that too few students were in the category to draw meaningful conclusions. Federal law requires valid test scores from at least 50 students for statistical significance.

Program Improvement, a Federal Intervention Program

FEDERAL INTERVENTION PROGRAM **PI** PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	
In PI since	**2012**
Stage of PI	**2 of 5**
Change in 2013	**Moved one stage lower (did not make AYP)**

SOURCE: PI status is based on the Accountability Progress Report of September 2013. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2012–2013 school year or earlier.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF OUR SCHOOL'S PLACEMENT IN PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

Waterford has been in Program Improvement (PI) since 2012. In 2013, the school moved one stage lower in the program, from stage (year) 1 to 2. There are five stages in total. In California, 100 high schools were in stage 2 of PI as of December 2013.

THE STAGES OF PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT: Program Improvement is a five-stage process for monitoring, improving, and, if necessary, reorganizing any school that receives federal money under the Title I section of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Schools in PI get extra attention from their district office to help them improve.

When a school misses even one of its goals for Adequate Yearly Progress, it is at risk of entering PI. If a school misses the same AYP goals two years in a row, it enters stage 1 of PI. Each subsequent year that a school misses any of its AYP goals, it goes one stage deeper into the process. Each stage results in increasingly severe consequences. The first stage gives parents the right to choose another school. In the second stage, students have the right to free tutoring in addition to the option to change schools. The last three stages can result in a change of staff and leadership, the conversion of the school to charter status, transferring the school to another district, or even the school's closure.

YEAR	PI STAGE	SUMMARY OF EVENTS FOR THIS YEAR	AYP GOALS NOT MET ■ AYP GOALS MET ■
2011	**Not in PI**	Waterford met 13 of the 18 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress established by the federal law known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB).	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
2012	**1**	We met eight of the 14 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress, causing the school to enter the first stage of Program Improvement.	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■
2013	**2**	We met 15 of the 18 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress. As a result, the school moved to stage 2 of Program Improvement.	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■

SOURCE: PI status is based on the Accountability Progress Report of September 2013. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2012–2013 school year or earlier. Some schools were in Program Improvement prior to the passage of No Child Left Behind, when the definition of PI was significantly modified.

CONSEQUENCES

PARENTS: Because Waterford is in stage (year) 2 of PI, parents of students have two options. They can enroll their children in different schools in the district. To see the list of these schools, parents can contact either the principal or the district office staff. Their children are also entitled to free tutoring. Details about the district's list of approved tutoring providers are available from the district office. More information about both options is available on the **US Department of Education Web site**.

SCHOOL: The school staff is hard at work improving classroom teaching. The school may set aside ten percent of its Title I (federal) funding to help teachers improve.

DISTRICT: The district is providing coaching to teachers and helping the school's staff revise its improvement plan.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Here you'll find a three-year summary of our students' scores on the California Standards Tests (CST) in selected subjects. We compare our students' test scores with the results for students in the average high school in California. On the following pages we provide more detail for each test, including the scores for different subgroups of students. In addition, we provide links to the California Content Standards on which these tests are based. If you'd like more information about the CST, please contact our principal or our teaching staff. To find **grade-level-specific scores**, you can refer to the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Web site. Other tests in the **STAR program** can be found on the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site.

California Standards Tests

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

TESTED SUBJECT	2012–2013 LOW SCORES	2012–2013 HIGH SCORES	2011–2012 LOW SCORES	2011–2012 HIGH SCORES	2010–2011 LOW SCORES	2010–2011 HIGH SCORES
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher		56%		53%		52%
Average high school Percent Proficient or higher		56%		54%		52%
GEOMETRY						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher		49%		34%		33%
Average high school Percent Proficient or higher		25%		28%		27%
US HISTORY						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher		64%		56%		53%
Average high school Percent Proficient or higher		53%		52%		52%
BIOLOGY						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher		58%		67%		62%
Average high school Percent Proficient or higher		50%		53%		50%
LIFE SCIENCE (TENTH GRADE)						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher		65%		58%		59%
Average high school Percent Proficient or higher		56%		55%		52%

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 test cycle. State average represents high schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.

Frequently Asked Questions About Standardized Tests

HAVE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS KEPT UP WITH THE CHANGES IN WHAT WE TEACH? In two subjects, the answer is "yes," and in two more the answer is "no." The Common Core transition is the reason for this. The test questions in math and English/language arts in 2012-13 were likely to be less well aligned with the official standards for California curriculum than they were three years ago. But the test questions in social studies and science were just as well aligned in 2012-13 as they were in the past.

WHERE CAN I FIND GRADE-LEVEL REPORTS? Due to space constraints and concern for statistical reliability, we have omitted grade-level detail from these test results. Instead we present results at the schoolwide level. You can view the results of far more students than any one grade level would contain, which also improves their statistical reliability. Grade-level results are online on the **STAR Web site**. More information about student test scores is available in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

WHAT DO THE FIVE PROFICIENCY BANDS MEAN? Test experts assign students to one of these five proficiency levels, based on the number of questions they answer correctly. Our immediate goal is to help students move up one level. Our eventual goal is to enable all students to reach either of the top two bands, Advanced or Proficient. Those who score in the middle band, Basic, have come close to attaining the required knowledge and skills. Those who score in either of the bottom two bands, Below Basic or Far Below Basic, need more help to reach the Proficient level.

HOW HARD ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS? Experts consider California's standards to be among the most clear and rigorous in the country. Just 57 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 63 percent scored Proficient or Advanced in math. You can review the **California Content Standards** on the CDE Web site.

ARE ALL STUDENTS' SCORES INCLUDED? No. Only students in grades two through eleven are required to take the CST. When fewer than 11 students in one grade or subgroup take a test, state officials remove their scores from the report. They omit them to protect students' privacy, as called for by federal law.

CAN I REVIEW SAMPLE TEST QUESTIONS? Sample test questions for the CST are on the **CDE's Web site**. These are actual questions used in previous years.

WHERE CAN I FIND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION? The CDE has a wealth of resources on its Web site. The STAR Web site publishes detailed reports for schools and districts, and assistance packets for parents and teachers. This site includes explanations of **technical terms**, scoring methods, and the **subjects** covered by the tests for each grade. You'll also find a **guide** to navigating the STAR Web site as well as help for understanding how to **compare test scores**.

WHY ARE ONLY SOME OF THE TEST RESULTS PRESENT? California's test program includes many tests not mentioned in this report. For brevity's sake, we're reporting six CST tests usually taken by the largest number of students. We select at least one test from each core subject. For science, we've selected biology and the tenth grade life science test. For math, we've selected two courses: Algebra I, which students take if they haven't studied and passed it in eighth grade; and Geometry. In social studies, we've selected US History, which is taken by all juniors (eleventh graders). English/language arts summarizes the results of students in grades nine through eleven.

English/Language Arts (Reading and Writing)

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES / HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE		56%	93%	**SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:** The same percentage of students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced as did students at the average high school in California.
AVERAGE HIGH SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY		54%	93%	
AVERAGE HIGH SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA		56%	94%	

Subgroup Test Scores

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES / HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys		50%	205	**GENDER:** About 13 percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls		63%	206	
English proficient		59%	375	**ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:** English Learners scored lower on the CST than students who are proficient in English. Because we give this test in English, English Learners tend to be at a disadvantage.
English Learners		38%	35	
Low income		51%	246	**INCOME:** About 13 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income		64%	165	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE	N/A	23	**LEARNING DISABILITIES:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled		58%	392	
Hispanic/Latino		53%	197	**ETHNICITY:** Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
White/Other		60%	159	
Two or more races		55%	47	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 test cycle. County and state averages represent high schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

The graph to the right shows how our students' scores have changed over the years. We present each year's results in a vertical bar, with students' scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

You can read the California standards for **English/language arts** on the CDE's Web site.



Algebra I

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES / HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE		37%	37%	**SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:** About 15 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average high school in California.
AVERAGE HIGH SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY		20%	33%	
AVERAGE HIGH SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA		22%	26%	

Subgroup Test Scores

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES / HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys		36%	89	**GENDER:** About the same percentage of boys and girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls		37%	76	
English proficient		38%	137	**ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	26	
Low income		36%	109	**INCOME:** About three percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income		39%	55	
Learning disabled	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	13	**LEARNING DISABILITIES:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled		38%	154	
Hispanic/Latino		38%	79	**ETHNICITY:** Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
White/Other		36%	71	
Two or more races	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	14	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 test cycle. County and state averages represent high schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

The graph to the right shows how our students' scores have changed over the years. Any student in grades nine, ten, or eleven who took algebra is included in this analysis. We present each year's results in a vertical bar, with students' scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

About 37 percent of our students took the algebra CST, compared with 26 percent of all high school students statewide. To read more about California's **math standards**, visit the CDE's Web site.



SOURCE: CDE STAR research file: 2011, 2012, and 2013.

Geometry

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE		49%	26%	**SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:** About 24 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average high school in California.
AVERAGE HIGH SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY		21%	29%	
AVERAGE HIGH SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA		25%	27%	

Subgroup Test Scores

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys		49%	51	**GENDER:** About the same percentage of boys and girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls		48%	64	
English proficient		50%	108	**ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	NO DATA AVAILABLE	N/A	8	
Low income		42%	60	**INCOME:** About 13 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income		55%	56	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE	N/A	5	**LEARNING DISABILITIES:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled		50%	112	
Hispanic/Latino		37%	54	**ETHNICITY:** Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
White/Other		62%	47	
Two or more races	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	13	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 test cycle. County and state averages represent high schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

The graph to the right shows how our students' scores have changed over the years. Any student in grades nine, ten, or eleven who took geometry is included in this analysis. We present each year's results in a vertical bar, with students' scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

About 26 percent of our students took the geometry CST, compared with 27 percent of all high school students statewide. To read more about the **math standards for all grades**, visit the CDE's Web site.



SOURCE: CDE STAR research file: 2011, 2012, and 2013.

US History

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE		64%	97%	**SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:** About 11 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average high school in California.
AVERAGE HIGH SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY		53%	97%	
AVERAGE HIGH SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA		53%	96%	

Subgroup Test Scores

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys		72%	67	**GENDER:** About 15 percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls		57%	70	
English proficient		66%	133	**ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	NO DATA AVAILABLE	N/A	5	
Low income		59%	85	**INCOME:** About 13 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income		72%	53	
Learning disabled	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	11	**LEARNING DISABILITIES:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled		66%	128	
Hispanic/Latino		62%	73	**ETHNICITY:** Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
White/Other		58%	36	
Two or more races	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	23	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 test cycle. County and state averages represent high schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

The graph to the right shows how our eleventh grade students' scores have changed over the years. We present each year's results in a vertical bar, with students' scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

To read more about the eleventh grade **US history standards**, visit the CDE's Web site.



Biology

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES / HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE		58%	34%	**SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:** About eight percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average high school in California.
AVERAGE HIGH SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY		47%	37%	
AVERAGE HIGH SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA		50%	40%	

Subgroup Test Scores

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES / HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys		54%	72	**GENDER:** About ten percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls		64%	75	
English proficient		62%	137	**ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	11	
Low income		48%	81	**INCOME:** About 24 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income		72%	67	
Learning disabled	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	15	**LEARNING DISABILITIES:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled		62%	135	
Hispanic/Latino		48%	66	**ETHNICITY:** Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
White/Other		67%	64	
Two or more races	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	19	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 test cycle. County and state averages represent high schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

The graph to the right shows how our students' scores have changed over the years. Any student in grades nine, ten, or eleven who took biology is included in this analysis. We present each year's results in a vertical bar, with students' scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

About 34 percent of our students took the biology CST, compared with 40 percent of all high school students statewide. To read more about the **California standards for science** visit the CDE's Web site.



Life Science (Tenth Grade)

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE		65%	92%	**SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:** About nine percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average high school in California.
AVERAGE HIGH SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY		55%	93%	
AVERAGE HIGH SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA		56%	93%	

Subgroup Test Scores

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys		64%	64	**GENDER:** About four percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls		68%	69	
English proficient		70%	123	**ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	NO DATA AVAILABLE	N/A	9	
Low income		60%	70	**INCOME:** About 14 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income		74%	62	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE	N/A	7	**LEARNING DISABILITIES:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled		66%	128	
Hispanic/Latino		58%	53	**ETHNICITY:** Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
White/Other		73%	62	
Two or more races	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	19	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 test cycle. County and state averages represent high schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

The graph to the right shows how our tenth grade students' scores on the mandatory life science test have changed over the years. We present each year's results in a vertical bar, with students' scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

You can read the **science standards** on the CDE's Web site. Please note that some students taking this test may not have taken any science course in the ninth or tenth grade. In high school, science courses are electives.



Other Measures of Student Achievement

We use many means to assess student progress in addition to state-mandated standardized tests. These include homework completion, quizzes, tests and final exams, research papers, essays, multimedia projects, oral exams or presentations, and teacher observation. To fulfill one of our district's graduation requirements, our students compile a portfolio of their work. An exit interview team evaluates this portfolio and asks seniors to describe their high school experience and plans for the future. Parents can discuss the portfolio requirement with the senior portfolio coordinator.

We send home deficiency notices in the middle of each quarter for students who are in danger of failing a course. We offer a Report Card Night twice a year where parents can pick up their student's quarterly report card and meet one on one with teachers. We mail home semester grades. If a student is at risk of not graduating, or if there are other problems with grades or behavior, we notify parents by phone and by mail. Students and parents can always contact teachers via voicemail or email for more frequent progress checks.

PREPARATION FOR COLLEGE AND THE WORKFORCE

Our guidance counselor provides college admission counseling for our juniors and seniors. Guidance for students and parents about applying for financial aid and completing college applications and essays is also available. Admission officers from nearby community colleges visit our campus to discuss admissions and to recruit students for their programs. Our students benefit from on on-site College Night at which representatives from colleges, universities, community colleges and trade schools share information about their schools. We also give information to students about taking the SATs.

SAT College Entrance Exam

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
SAT participation rate	Percentage of seniors who took the test	37%	34%	44%
SAT critical reading	Average score of those who took the SAT critical reading test	472	487	491
SAT math	Average score of those who took the SAT math test	469	495	510
SAT writing	Average score of those who took the SAT writing test	458	482	491

SOURCE: SAT test data provided by the College Board for the 2011–2012 school year. County and state averages represent high schools only.

In the 2011–2012 academic year, 37 percent of Waterford seniors took the SAT, compared with 44 percent of high school students in California.

Waterford students' average score was 472 on the critical reading portion of the SAT, compared with 491 for students throughout the state. Waterford students' average score was 469 on the math portion of the SAT, compared with 510 for students throughout the state. Waterford students' average score was 458 on the writing portion of the SAT, compared with 491 for students throughout the state.

College Preparation

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
2012 graduates meeting UC or CSU course requirements	Percentage of graduates passing all of the courses required for admission to the UC or CSU systems	35%	32%	41%

SOURCE: Enrollment in UC/CSU qualifying courses comes from CALPADS, October 2012. County and state averages represent high schools only.

In the 2011–2012 school year, 35 percent of Waterford's graduates passed courses required for admission to the University of California (UC) or the California State University (CSU) system, compared with 41 percent of students statewide. This number is, in part, an indicator of whether the school is offering the classes required for admission to the UC or CSU systems. The courses that the **California State University** system requires applicants to take in high school, which are referred to as the A-G course requirements, can be reviewed on the CSU's official Web site. The **University of California** has the same set of courses required.

Another view of our school's effectiveness in preparing students for college is to ask: "How many of our students took courses in the 2012-13 school year that met the requirements for admission to the UC or CSU systems?" The answer to that question is contained in the Data Almanac, which is the last section of this annual report.

Advanced Placement Courses Offered

High school students can enroll in courses that are more challenging in their junior and senior years, including **Advanced Placement** (AP) courses. These courses are intended to be the most rigorous and challenging courses available. Most colleges regard AP courses as the equivalent of a college course.

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Enrollment in AP courses	Percentage of AP course enrollments out of total course enrollments	3%	2%	4%

SOURCE: This information provided by the California Department of Education.

The majority of comprehensive high schools offer AP courses, but the number of AP courses offered at any one school varies considerably. Unlike honors courses, AP courses and tests are designed by a national organization, the College Board, which charges fees to high schools for the rights to their materials. The number of AP courses offered is one indicator of a school's commitment to prepare its students for college, but students' participation in those courses and their test results are, in part, a measure of student initiative.

Students who take AP courses and pass the AP exams with scores of 3 or higher may qualify for college credit. Our high school offers 19 different courses that you'll see listed in the table.

More information about the **Advanced Placement program** is available from the College Board.

AP COURSES OFFERED	NUMBER OF COURSES
Fine and Performing Arts	0
Computer Science	0
English	3
Foreign Language	6
Mathematics	4
Science	4
Social Science	2
Total	19

SOURCE: This information is provided by the California Department of Education.

AP Exam Results, 2011–2012

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Completion of AP courses	Percentage of juniors and seniors who completed AP courses and took the final exams	35%	21%	32%
Number of AP exams taken	Average number of AP exams each of these students took in 2011–2012	1.4	1.6	1.8
AP test results	Percentage of AP exams with scores of 3 out of 5 or higher (college credit)	32%	51%	59%

SOURCE: AP exam data provided by the College Board for the 2011–2012 school year.

Here at Waterford, 35 percent of juniors and seniors took AP exams. In California, 32 percent of juniors and seniors in the average high school took AP exams. On average, those students took 1.4 AP exams, compared with 1.8 for students in the average high school in California.

California High School Exit Examination

Students first take the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) in the tenth grade. If they don't pass either the English/language arts or math portion, they can retake the test in the eleventh or twelfth grades. Here you'll see a three-year summary showing the percentage of tenth graders who scored Proficient or Advanced. (This should not be confused with the passing rate, which is set at a somewhat lower level.)

Answers to **frequently asked questions** about the exit exam can be found on the CDE Web site. Additional information about the **exit exam results** is also available there.

	PERCENTAGE OF TENTH GRADE STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CAHSEE		
	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English/language arts			
2012–2013	64%	61%	57%
2011–2012	57%	53%	56%
2010–2011	64%	65%	59%
Math			
2012–2013	64%	60%	60%
2011–2012	65%	53%	58%
2010–2011	56%	53%	56%

SOURCE: California Department of Education, SARC research file.

The table that follows shows how specific groups of tenth grade students scored on the exit exam in the 2012–2013 school year. The English/language arts portion of the exam measures whether a student has mastered reading and writing skills at the ninth or tenth grade level, including vocabulary, writing, writing conventions, informational reading, and reading literature. The math portion of the exam includes arithmetic, statistics, data analysis, probability, number sense, measurement, and geometry at sixth and seventh grade levels. It also tests whether a student has mastered algebra, a subject that most students study in the eighth or ninth grade.

Sample **questions and study guides** for the exit exam are available for students on the CDE Web site.

CAHSEE Results by Subgroup

	ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS			MATH		
	NOT PROFICIENT	PROFICIENT	ADVANCED	NOT PROFICIENT	PROFICIENT	ADVANCED
Tenth graders	36%	29%	35%	36%	41%	23%
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	47%	34%	19%	36%	48%	16%
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	27%	26%	47%	35%	37%	28%
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Male	49%	27%	23%	39%	35%	26%
Female	23%	31%	46%	33%	47%	19%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	46%	28%	26%	42%	41%	17%
English Learners	87%	7%	7%	67%	20%	13%
Students with disabilities	81%	6%	13%	73%	13%	13%
Students receiving migrant education services	57%	14%	29%	43%	36%	21%

SOURCE: California Department of Education, SARC research file. Scores are included only when 11 or more students are tested. When small numbers of students are tested, their average results are not very reliable.

High School Completion

This table shows the percentage of seniors in the graduating class of 2013 who met our district's graduation requirements and also passed the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE). We present the results for students schoolwide followed by the results for different groups of students.

Students can retake all or part of the CAHSEE twice in their junior year and up to five times in their senior year. School districts have been giving the CAHSEE since the 2001–2002 school year. However, 2005–2006 was the first year that passing the test was required for graduation.

More data about **CAHSEE results**, and additional detail by gender, ethnicity, and English language fluency, is available on the CDE Web site.

	PERCENTAGE OF SENIORS GRADUATING (CLASS OF 2013)	
GROUP	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE
All Students	20%	21%
African American	40%	40%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%	0%
Asian	20%	20%
Filipino	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	19%	20%
Pacific Islander	0%	0%
White (not Hispanic)	23%	24%
Two or more races	0%	2%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	20%	21%
English Learners	5%	7%
Students with disabilities	9%	12%

SOURCE: This data comes from the school district office.

Dropouts and Graduates

Waterford High School continues to show improvement, and we expect this growth to continue. We monitor students' progress toward earning their diplomas and provide extra support for students who are deficient in credits through programs such as the Portable Assisted Study Sequence (PASS), which supports migrant students. Our graduation rate tops 90 percent.

DROPOUT RATE: We define a **dropout** as any student who left school before completing the 2011–2012 school year, or who hasn't re-enrolled in school for the 2012–2013 year by October 2012.

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Dropout rate (four year)			
Class of 2012	5%	14%	13%
Class of 2011	8%	17%	15%
Class of 2010	4%	20%	17%
Graduation rate (four year)			
Class of 2012	93%	79%	79%
Class of 2011	90%	76%	77%
Class of 2010	93%	75%	75%

SOURCE: Dropout data comes from CALPADS, October 2012.

In the past, identifying dropouts was difficult because students often did not report why they were leaving or where they were going. Now districts use the Statewide Student Identifier (SSID), which can locate students who have enrolled in schools elsewhere in California, making dropout counts more accurate. This tracking system has been in place since the 2006–2007 school year.

GRADUATION RATE: This is the second year that the California Department of Education has relied upon its new system for counting whether individual students graduate in four years. Because officials have gathered this data for six years, they are now able to report on the graduation rates of the students who graduated in 2010, 2011 and 2012. This new approach to tracking individual students replaces a method of estimating graduation rates based on the numbers of students enrolled in each grade level. As a result, the new method is far more accurate.

Note that the high school completion rate we report in the preceding section shows only how many seniors graduated. The rate we report here indicates how students have fared over the four years leading to graduation.

Workforce Preparation

We have Regional Occupational Program offerings in child development, farm machinery, and small-business management. We also offer opportunities for work experience in a variety of fields, including important computer applications.

Our high school offers courses intended to help students prepare for the world of work. These career technical education (CTE) courses, formerly known as vocational education, are open to all students. The accompanying table shows the percentage of our students who enrolled in a CTE course at any time during the school year. We enrolled 365 students in career technical education courses.

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL
Number of students participating in CTE courses	365
Percentage of students completing a CTE program and earning a high school diploma	22%
Percentage of CTE courses coordinated with colleges	0%

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.

In 2012-13, our Career Technical Education offerings included an introduction to computer keyboarding that all students are required to complete. We offer CTE courses in the following areas:

Computer Technology: Computer Keyboarding, Computer Applications I and II, Office Procedures and Technology ROP

Agriculture: Ag Earth Science, Ag Biology, Advanced Placement Ag Environmental Science, Farm Machinery ROP, Ag Leadership and Communication

Child Development: Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education You can find information about our school's CTE courses and advisors in the Data Almanac at the end of this School Accountability Report Card. Information about **career technical education** policy is available on the CDE Web site.

STUDENTS

Students' English Language Skills

At Waterford, 89 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared with 89 percent of high school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	89%	89%	89%
English Learners	11%	11%	11%

SOURCE: Language census for the 2012–2013 school year. County and state averages represent high schools only.

Languages Spoken at Home by English Learners

Please note that this table describes the home languages of just the 66 students classified as English Learners. At Waterford, the language these students most often speak at home is Spanish. In California it's common to find English Learners in classes with students who speak English well. When you visit our classrooms, ask our teachers how they work with language differences among their students.

LANGUAGE	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Spanish	100%	88%	83%
Vietnamese	0%	0%	2%
Cantonese	0%	0%	2%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	0%	0%	2%
Korean	0%	0%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	1%	0%
All other	0%	11%	9%

SOURCE: Language census for the 2012–2013 school year. County and state averages represent high schools only.

Ethnicity

Most students at Waterford identify themselves as Hispanic/Latino or White. The state of California allows citizens to choose more than one ethnic identity, or to select "two or more races" or "decline to state." As a consequence, the sum of all responses rarely equals 100 percent.

ETHNICITY	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
African American	1%	3%	7%
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	2%	6%	12%
Hispanic/Latino	49%	50%	49%
White	40%	35%	28%

SOURCE: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), October 2012. County and state averages represent high schools only.

Family Income and Education

The free or reduced-price meal subsidy goes to students whose families earned less than $42,643 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2012–2013 school year. At Waterford, 59 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 52 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	59%	56%	52%
Parents with some college	40%	49%	58%
Parents with college degree	22%	23%	34%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2012–2013 school year. Parents' education level is collected in the spring at the start of testing. Rarely do all students answer these questions.

The parents of 40 percent of the students at Waterford have attended college and 22 percent have a college degree. This information can provide some clues to the level of literacy children bring to school. One precaution is that the students themselves provide this data when they take the battery of standardized tests each spring, so it may not be completely accurate. About 64 percent of our students provided this information.

CLIMATE FOR LEARNING

Average Class Sizes

The table at the right shows average class sizes for core courses. The average class size of all courses at Waterford varies from a low of 18 students to a high of 21. Our average class size schoolwide is 19 students. The average class size for high schools in the state is 26 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZES OF CORE COURSES	OUR SCHOOL	OUR DISTRICT
English	18	18
History	19	19
Math	18	18
Science	21	21

SOURCE: California Department of Education, SARC Research File. District averages represent high schools only.

Safety

Our administration, director of operations, and campus resources staff monitor school grounds to ensure that our campus is safe. We supervise facilities from before school begins until after school ends. Teachers help with morning supervision.

Waterford High School is a closed campus. Visitors must check in at the front office. Students are required to remain on campus all periods of the day and during the break and lunch periods. Students who have a work experience or Regional Occupational Program placement are permitted to leave campus. Sheriff Deputies provide added security at home football and basketball games.

WHS has a School Safety Plan that addresses our school's specific safety needs. We maintain a closed campus and check facilities, grounds, and equipment regularly for any problems.

Discipline

Our discipline policy is assertive; we do not tolerate gang activity or violence at our school. Teachers expect students to come to class prepared, to follow directions, and to participate. We state our policy in our Student-Parent Handbook. The policy includes consequences that are designed to change the behavior, and they include afterschool detention, classroom suspension, or Saturday School.

Homework

Students who participate in our college preparatory program or take Advanced Placement (AP) and honors courses generally have between 10 and 20 hours of homework per week. Other students generally have between 5 and 10 hours of homework per week. All students can receive help in our afterschool math and science homework labs. Individual teachers offer after-school hours for student assistance.

Schedule

Our school year includes 180 days of instruction. School begins in mid August and continues to the end of May or early June. We have a block schedule. On Mondays students attend all six classes; on Tuesdays and Thursdays they attend periods one, three, and five; on Wednesdays and Fridays they attend periods two, four, and six. Classes begin at 8:00 a.m. and end at 2:36 p.m.

Some clubs and groups meet at lunch, when students can also play intramural basketball. All sports teams and most clubs meet after school. Some athletic, theatrical, and musical productions require time commitments over holidays and weekends. Office hours are from 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Parent Involvement

We urge parents to become involved in our campus and school committees. Parent volunteers usually meet with the principal to work out a schedule. Parents also participate on our School Site Council, our English Language Advisory Committee, The Waterford Boosters Club, the Waterford Education Foundation and the Waterford Agricultural Advisory. We also have an Education Foundation that provides local scholarships. Parents may contact our office for more information on these organizations.

LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

Leadership

In 2011 – 12, Don Davis returned as the Principal of Waterford High School. Previously, Mr. Davis was the principal from 2001-02 to 2008-09. In 2008, Mr. Davis was awarded the Secondary Principal of the Year for the State of California. Mr. Davis is also the District Superintendent of the Waterford Unified School District. He is working on a doctoral degree through Walden University.

Important decision-making groups in our school include the School Site Council (SSC), which comprises the principal, faculty members, parents, and students; the English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC), and the Waterford Boosters Club.

Indicators of Teachers Who May Be Underprepared

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Core courses taught by a teacher not meeting NCLB standards	Percentage of core courses not taught by a "highly qualified" teacher according to federal standards in NCLB	22%	N/A	0%
Out-of-field teaching: courses	Percentage of core courses taught by a teacher who lacks the appropriate subject area authorization for the course	0%	N/A	N/A
Fully credentialed teachers	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	96%	N/A	N/A
Teachers lacking a full credential	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	4%	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: This information provided by the school district. Data on NCLB standards is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file.

PLEASE NOTE: Comparative data (county average and state averages) for some of the data reported in the SARC is unavailable as of December 2013.

"HIGHLY QUALIFIED" TEACHERS: The federal law known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requires districts to report the number of teachers considered to be "**highly qualified**." These "highly qualified" teachers must have a full credential, a bachelor's degree, and, if they are teaching a core subject (such as reading, math, science, or social studies), they must also demonstrate expertise in that field. The table above shows the percentage of core courses taught by teachers who are considered to be less than "highly qualified." There are exceptions, known as the **High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation** (HOUSSE) rules, that allow some veteran teachers to meet the "highly qualified" test who wouldn't otherwise do so.

TEACHING OUT OF FIELD: When a teacher lacks a subject area authorization for a course she is teaching, that course is counted as an **out-of-field** section. For example, if an unexpected vacancy in a biology class occurs, and a teacher who normally teaches English literature (and who lacks a subject area authorization in science) fills in to teach for the rest of the year, that teacher would be teaching out of field.

CREDENTIAL STATUS OF TEACHERS: Teachers who lack full credentials are working under the terms of an emergency permit, an internship credential, or a waiver. They should be working toward their credential, and they are allowed to teach in the meantime only if the school board approves. About four percent of our teachers were working without full credentials.

More facts about our teachers, called for by the Williams legislation of 2004, are available on our Accountability Web page, which is accessible from our district Web site. You will find specific facts about **misassigned teachers** and **teacher vacancies** in the 2013–2014 school year.

Districtwide Distribution of Teachers Who Are Not "Highly Qualified"

Here, we report the percentage of core courses in our district whose teachers are considered to be less than "highly qualified" by NCLB's standards. We show how these teachers are distributed among schools according to the percentage of low-income students enrolled.

When more than 40 percent of the students in a school are receiving subsidized lunches, that school is considered by the California Department of Education to be a school with higher concentrations of low-income students. When less than 25 percent of the students in a school are receiving subsidized lunches, that school is considered by the CDE to be a school with lower concentrations of low-income students.

DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT
Districtwide	Percentage of core courses not taught by "highly qualified" teachers (HQT)	11%
Schools with more than 40% of students from lower-income homes	Schools whose core courses are not taught by "highly qualified" teachers	11%
Schools with less than 25% of students from lower-income homes	Schools whose core courses are not taught by "highly qualified" teachers	0%

SOURCE: Data is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file.

Staff Development

Most of our onsite staff development focuses on teaching techniques as they relate to our instructional goals. The principal also refers teachers to content-specific workshops in the subjects they teach. One focus of staff development in 2012-13 was Academic Language Development. We show our commitment to staff development by reviewing and practicing an instructional strategy at each faculty meeting.

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
2012–2013	2.0
2011–2012	0.0
2010–2011	0.0

SOURCE: This information is supplied by the school district.

Evaluating and Improving Teachers

We evaluate new teachers three times a year and tenured teachers every other year. Evaluation includes formal observation by our administration and periodic drop-ins. We emphasize the teacher-directed model, a research-based instructional approach that emphasizes effective lesson design and classroom delivery. Our principal is certified as a teacher of this model. New teachers receive additional support through a program that connects them with mentor teachers.

Substitute Teachers

We do not generally have difficulty securing substitute teachers. Classroom teachers leave lesson plans for substitutes or email them to the substitute to ensure a minimal loss of learning time during the regular teacher's absence.

Specialized Resource Staff

The table to the right lists the number of full-time equivalent qualified support personnel who provide counseling and other pupil support services in our school. These specialists often work part time at our school and some may work at more than one school in our district. For more details on **statewide ratios of counselors, psychologists, or other pupil services** staff to students, see the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site. **Library facts** and frequently asked questions are also available there.

ACADEMIC GUIDANCE COUNSELORS: Our school has one full-time equivalent academic counselors, which is equivalent to one counselor for every 484 students. More information about **counseling and student support** is available on the CDE Web site.

STAFF POSITION	STAFF (FTE)
Academic counselors	1.3
Behavioral/career counselors	0.0
Librarians and media staff	0.0
Psychologists	0.5
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.3
Speech/language/ hearing specialists	0.3
Resource specialists	1.5

SOURCE: Data provided by the school district.

Specialized Programs and Staff

In 2012-13, our support staff included a speech and hearing specialist, a school nurse and a full-time guidance counselor. We offered CAHSEE math and CAHSEE English support classes during the academic homeroom. Additional support for CAHSEE is provided in our Afterschool Program (ASP). The ASP has been a significant addition, allowing students to recover credits, do homework, and receive extra help for the exit exam.

Students had a specialized opportunity to participate in the 11th grade Job Shadow.

Gifted and Talented Education (GATE)

In 2012-2013, students interested in more challenging courses participated in one or more of our eight Advanced Placement (AP) courses.

Special Education Program

In 2012-13, our special education program consisted of a Resource Specialist Program in which special education students received assistance in regular core classes. Additionally, Special Day Class (SDC) program students were enrolled in SDC English, Science, U.S. History, and Mathematics courses.

English Learner Program

Our program for English Learners focuses on helping students achieve fluency in English. We use the state-adopted Edge curriculum. One teacher and one bilingual aide supported the program. We also use the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) to gauge the progress of our students learning English. All of our English Learners also receive instruction in core English Language Arts.

RESOURCES

Buildings

Our main building was constructed in August 2001, so it is still rather new and in very good condition. All school buildings have working heating and cooling systems. Our custodial staff cleans and maintains all of our facilities daily. Currently, there are no trailer type portable classrooms at WHS.

Our athletic facilities and fields are well-maintained and provide opportunity for our students to compete in a wide variety of sports. A project to improve functionality at the school farm was completed in 2011–2012. Construction on a Pole Barn began in the summer of 2013 and should be completed and accessible in the Fall of the 2013.

More facts about the **condition of our school buildings** are available in an online supplement to this report called for by the Williams legislation of 2004. What you will find is an assessment of more than a dozen aspects of our buildings: their structural integrity, electrical systems, heating and ventilation systems, and more. The important purpose of this assessment is to determine if our buildings and grounds are safe and in good repair. If anything needs to be repaired, this assessment identifies it and targets a date by which we commit to make those repairs. The guidelines for this assessment were written by the **Office of Public School Construction** (OPSC) and were brought about by the Williams legislation. You can look at the six-page **Facilities Inspection Tool** used for the assessment on the Web site of the OPSC.

Library

In 2012-13, our school library included a computer lab and was staffed by a secretary/registrar. The library is open from an hour before school begins until an hour after school ends. The frequency with which classes visit the library varies from teacher to teacher.

Computers

We have 32 computers in the computer lab and 32 computers in the library. Many classrooms also have minilabs. In the ninth grade, students take keyboarding; in subsequent years students have the opportunity to take two levels of computer applications. Students use computers to conduct research and do work related to health, social science, and U.S. history and government classes. We have EUREKA, a computer program for career exploration.

Textbooks

We choose our textbooks from lists that have already been approved by state education officials. For a list of some of the textbooks we use at our school, see the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

We have also reported additional facts about our textbooks called for by the Williams legislation of 2004. This online report shows whether we had a textbook for each student in each core course during the 2013–2014 school year and whether those **textbooks** covered the California Content Standards.

Curriculum and the Transition to the Common Core

For many years, panels of scholars have decided what California students should learn and be able to do. Their decisions are known as the California Content Standards, and they apply to all public schools in the state. The textbooks we use and the tests we give are based on these content standards, and we expect our teachers to be firmly focused on them. Policy experts, researchers, and educators consider our state's standards to be among the most rigorous and challenging in the nation.

In 2010, California's State Board of Education voted to redefine what we teach. We are calling this the Common Core curriculum, because it is common or shared among schools in most states, and because it affects the core subjects. In 2012-2013, our district's teachers were already delivering a somewhat different curriculum in math and English/language arts. Changes to the science standards will follow in 2013-2014.

The **California Department of Education (CDE)** has published helpful background information about the Common Core curriculum. This includes a helpful **video introduction** as well as access to a **handbook for parents** of students in kindergarten through eighth grade. The full **math standards** are available as well as the standards for **English/language arts**.

Science Labs

Facts about our science labs, called for by the Williams legislation, are available in an online report. What you will find is whether we had sufficient lab equipment and materials for our **science lab** courses during the 2013–2014 school year.

SCHOOL EXPENDITURES

Because Waterford High School has a high percentage of low-income students, the school receives federal Title I funds. These funds are used to provide supplementary services, such as

Algebra support,

CAHSEE intervention,

Credit recovery in English Language Arts and World History,

Lower class sizes in freshmen English, and

Technology purchases to enhance teaching and learning.

Spending per Student (2011–2012)

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we first report our overall spending per student. We base our calculations on our average daily attendance (ADA), which was 574 students.

We've broken down expenditures by the type of funds used to pay for them. Unrestricted funds can be used for any lawful purpose. Restricted funds, however, must be spent for specific purposes set out by legal requirements or the donor. Examples include funding for instructional materials, economic impact aid, and teacher- and principal-training funds.

TYPE OF FUNDS	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE*	SCHOOL VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE
Unrestricted funds ($/student)	$3,801	$5,399	-30%	$5,653	-33%
Restricted funds ($/student)	$1,190	$2,690	-56%	$3,083	-61%
TOTAL ($/student)	$4,992	$8,089	-38%	$8,736	-43%

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.
* Districts allocate most of their costs to school sites and attribute other costs to the district office. When calculating the district average for school level spending per student, we include these district related costs in the denominator. This will often cause most schools to fall below the district average.

Total Expenditures, by Category (2011–2012)

Here you can see how much we spent on different categories of expenses. We're reporting the total dollars in each category, not spending per student.

CATEGORY	UNRESTRICTED FUNDS	RESTRICTED FUNDS	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL*
Teacher salaries (all certificated staff)	$1,438,861	$323,197	$1,762,058	62%
Other staff salaries	$136,454	$92,811	$229,265	8%
Benefits	$449,613	$118,376	$567,989	20%
Books and supplies	$95,557	$56,973	$152,530	5%
Equipment replacement	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Services and direct support	$60,258	$91,484	$151,742	5%
TOTAL	$2,180,743	$682,841	$2,863,584	

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.
* Totals may not add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

Compensation of Staff with Teaching Credentials (2011–2012)

The total of what our certificated staff members earn appears below. A certificated staff person is a school employee who is required by the state to hold teaching credentials, including full-time, part-time, substitute or temporary teachers, and most administrators. You can see the portion of pay that goes to salary and three types of benefits.

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we first report our compensation per full-time equivalent (FTE) certificated staff member. A teacher/administrator/pupil services person who works full time counts as 1.0 FTE. Those who work only half time count as 0.5 FTE. We had 25 FTE teachers working in our school.

CATEGORY	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE*	SCHOOL VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE
Salaries	$64,984	$59,512	9%	$71,848	-10%
Retirement benefits	$5,203	$5,909	-12%	$5,888	-12%
Health and medical benefits	$10,729	$10,797	-1%	$10,391	3%
Other benefits	N/A	N/A	N/A	$720	N/A
TOTAL	$80,915	$76,218	6%	$88,847	-9%

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.
* Districts allocate most of their staff costs to school sites, but attribute other staff costs to the district office. One example is a reading resource teacher or librarian who works at all school sites. When calculating the district average for compensation per staff member, we include these district related costs in the denominator. This will often cause most schools to fall below the district average.

Total Certificated Staff Compensation (2011–2012)

Here you can see how much we spent on different categories of compensation. We're reporting the total dollars in each category, not compensation per staff member.

CATEGORY	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL*
Salaries	$1,647,343	80%
Retirement benefits	$131,888	6%
Health and medical benefits	$271,975	13%
Other benefits	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	$2,051,206	

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.
* Totals may not add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY: All data is the most current available as of December 2013. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2012–2013 school year after the publication date of this report. We rely on the following sources of information from the California Department of Education: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) (October 2012); Language Census (March 2013); California Standards Tests (spring 2013 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (September 2013 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (September 2013).

rev20131231_50-75572-5030259h/24673

Adequacy of Key Resources 2013–2014

Here you'll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2013–2014. Please note that these facts are based on evaluations our staff conducted in accordance with the Williams legislation.

TEACHERS

Teacher Vacancies

The Williams legislation asked districts to disclose how frequently full-time teachers were not permanently assigned to a classroom. There are two general circumstances that can lead to the unfortunate case of a classroom without a full-time, permanently assigned teacher. Within the first 20 days of the start of school, we can be surprised by too many students showing up for school, or too few teachers showing up to teach. After school starts, however, teachers can also be surprised by sudden changes: family emergencies, injuries, accidents, etc. When that occurs, it is our school's and our district's responsibility to fill that teacher's vacancy with a qualified, full-time and permanently assigned replacement. For that reason, we report teacher vacancies in two parts: at the start of school, and after the start of school.

KEY FACTOR	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	0	0	0
Number of classes which lacked a permanently assigned teacher within the first 20 days of school	0	0	0
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Number of classes where the permanently assigned teacher left during the year	0	0	0
Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher	0	0	0

NOTES: This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013.

Teacher Misassignments

A "misassigned" teacher is one who lacks the appropriate subject-area authorization for a class she is teaching.

Under the terms of the Williams settlement, schools must inform the public of the number of their teachers who are misassigned. It is possible for a teacher who lacks the authorization for a subject to get special permission—in the form of an emergency permit, waiver, or internship authorization—from the school board or county office of education to teach the subject anyway. This permission prevents the teacher from being counted as misassigned.

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
Teacher Misassignments	Total number of classes taught by teachers without a legally recognized certificate or credential	0	0	0
Teacher Misassignments in Classes that Include English Learners	Total number of classes that include English learners and are taught by teachers without CLAD/BCLAD authorization, ELD or SDAIE training, or equivalent authorization from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing	0	0	0
Other Employee Misassignments	Total number of service area placements of employees without the required credentials	0	0	0

NOTES: This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013.

TEXTBOOKS

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 the California content standards calls for. This information is far more meaningful when viewed along with the more detailed description of textbooks contained in our School Accountability Report Card (SARC). There you'll find the names of the textbooks used in our core classes, their dates of publication, the names of the firms that published them, and more.

	ARE THERE TEXTBOOKS OR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN USE?		ARE THERE ENOUGH BOOKS FOR EACH STUDENT?	
SUBJECT	STANDARDS ALIGNED?	FROM THE MOST RECENT OFFICIAL ADOPTION?	FOR USE IN CLASS?	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS HAVING BOOKS TO TAKE HOME?
English	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Math	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Science	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Social Studies	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Foreign Languages	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Health Sciences	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Visual and Performing Arts	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%

NOTES: This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013. This information was collected on Friday, November 01, 2013.

FACILITIES

To determine the condition of our facilities, our district sent experts from our facilities team to inspect them. They used a survey, called the Facilities Inspection Tool, 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.

AREA	RATING	DESCRIPTION
OVERALL RATING	**Good**	Our school is in good repair, according to the criteria established by the Office of Public School Construction. Our deficiencies are minor ones resulting from common wear and tear, and there are few of them. We scored between 90 and 99 percent on the 15 categories of our evaluation.
A. SYSTEMS		
Gas Leaks		No apparent problems.
Mechanical Problems (Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning)		No apparent problems.
Sewer System		No apparent problems.
B. INTERIOR		
Interior Surfaces (Walls, Floors, and Ceilings)		Holes in wall of small wight room. Room 1201 tear intack board. Room 1202 hole in ceiling tile. Room 1204 ceiling tile are stained and lights out. Room 1207 tear in tackboard
C. CLEANLINESS		
Overall Cleanliness		No apparent problems.
Pest or Vermin Infestation		No apparent problems.
D. ELECTRICAL		
Electrical Systems and Lighting		Room 506 plug cover missing outside of room. Room 205 plug cover missing.
E. RESTROOMS/FOUNTAINS		
Bathrooms		No apparent problems.
Drinking Fountains (Inside and Out)		No apparent problems.
F. SAFETY		
Fire Safety (Sprinkler Systems, Alarms, Extinguishers)		No apparent problems.
Hazardous Materials (Lead Paint, Asbestos, Mold, Flammables, etc.)		No apparent problems.
G. STRUCTURAL		
Structural Damage (Cracks in		No apparent problems.

AREA	RATING	DESCRIPTION
Walls and Foundations, Sloping Ceilings, Posts or Beams Missing)		
Roofs		No apparent problems.
H. EXTERNAL		
Playground/School Grounds		No apparent problems.
Windows, Doors, Gates, Fences (Interior and Exterior)		Room 201
OTHER DEFICIENCIES	**N/A**	No apparent problems.

INSPECTORS AND ADVISORS: This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013 by Randall Azevedo (Director of Maintenance). The facilities inspection occurred on Wednesday, August 24, 2011. There were no other inspectors used in the completion of this form. The Facilities Inspection Tool was completed on Thursday, July 26, 2012.

SCIENCE LABS

Many science courses require that students conduct experiments. This gives our students a chance to practice the scientific method, in effect, learning science by doing science. Those courses are what we call lab courses, and, of course, they require equipment and materials. The purpose of the Williams legislation is to inform citizens if our schools have the proper equipment, and enough of it, for students to succeed. This legislation only requires high schools to provide this information.

Please note that there is no state standard for equipping science labs. The next best authority we have to rely upon is the policy of our own school board. So you'll see in our report whether our school board has voted to approve a standard for equipping our science labs. If you have further questions about the condition of our science labs, we recommend you speak with your child's science teacher directly.

COURSE TITLE	DID THE DISTRICT ADOPT ANY RESOLUTIONS TO DEFINE "SUFFICIENCY"?	IS THERE A SUFFICIENT SUPPLY OF MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT TO CONDUCT THE LABS?
Biology	Yes	Yes
Advanced Biology AP	Yes	Yes
Biology - Agriculture	Yes	Yes
Chemistry	Yes	Yes
Physics	Yes	Yes
Earth Science	Yes	Yes
Earth Science Agriculture	Yes	Yes

Notes

BIOLOGY	This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013.
CHEMISTRY	This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013.
PHYSICS	This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013.
EARTH SCIENCES	This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013.

» Data Almanac

This Data Almanac provides additional information about students, teachers, student performance, accountability, and district expenditures.

STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

Student Enrollment by Ethnicity and Other Characteristics

The ethnicity of our students, estimates of their family income and education level, their English fluency, and their learning-related disabilities.

GROUP	ENROLLMENT
Number of students	605
Black/African American	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	1%
Filipino	0%
Hispanic or Latino	49%
Pacific Islander	0%
White (not Hispanic)	40%
Two or more races	1%
Ethnicity not reported	7%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	61%
English Learners	29%
Students with disabilities	12%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CALPADS, October 2012. Data about students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged, English Learners, or learning disabled come from the School Accountability Report Card unit of the California Department of Education.

Student Enrollment by Grade Level

Number of students enrolled in each grade level at our school.

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS
Kindergarten	0
Grade 1	0
Grade 2	0
Grade 3	0
Grade 4	0
Grade 5	0
Grade 6	0
Grade 7	0
Grade 8	1
Grade 9	170
Grade 10	143
Grade 11	152
Grade 12	139

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012.

Average Class Size by Core Course

The average class size by core courses.

SUBJECT	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
English	25	27	18
History	24	24	19
Math	23	27	18
Science	25	27	21

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012.

Average Class Size by Core Course, Detail

The number of classrooms that fall into each range of class sizes.

	2010–2011			2011–2012			2012–2013		
SUBJECT	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+
English	10	9	8	6	5	12	19	5	9
History	6	6	4	7	1	10	14	3	7
Math	8	8	6	6	8	9	17	9	6
Science	4	7	5	4	7	7	10	11	4

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012.

Physical Fitness

Students in grades five, seven, and nine take the California Fitness Test each year. This test measures students' aerobic capacity, body composition, muscular strength, endurance, and flexibility using six different tests. The table shows the percentage of students at our school who scored within the "healthy fitness zone" on four, five, and all six tests. More information about **physical fitness testing and standards** is available on the CDE Web site.

	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING HEALTHY FITNESS ZONES		
GRADE LEVEL	MET FOUR OR MORE STANDARDS	MET FIVE OR MORE STANDARDS	MET ALL SIX STANDARDS
Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 9	79%	70%	44%

SOURCE: Physical fitness test data is produced annually as schools test their students on the six Fitnessgram Standards. This information is from the 2012–2013 school year.

Suspensions and Expulsions

At times we find it necessary to suspend students who break school rules. We report only suspensions in which students are sent home for a day or longer. We do not report in-school suspensions, in which students are removed from one or more classes during a single school day. Expulsion is the most serious consequence we can impose. Expelled students are removed from the school permanently and denied the opportunity to continue learning here.

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Suspensions per 100 students			
2012–2013	27	27	N/A
2011–2012	76	76	N/A
2010–2011	31	7	14
Expulsions per 100 students			
2012–2013	1	1	N/A
2011–2012	2	2	N/A
2010–2011	2	0	1

SOURCE: Information for the two most recent years provided by the school district. Prior data is from the Consolidated Application published by the California Department of Education. The numbers above are a ratio of suspension or expulsion events, per 100 students enrolled. District and state averages represent high schools only.

During the 2012–2013 school year, we had 162 suspension incidents. We had five incidents of expulsion. To make it easy to compare our suspensions and expulsions to those of other schools, we represent these events as a ratio (incidents per 100 students) in this report. Please note that multiple incidents may involve the same student.

Teacher Credentials

The number of teachers assigned to the school with a full credential and without a full credential, for both our school and the district. We also present three years' of data about the number of teachers who lacked the appropriate subject-area authorization for one or more classes they taught.

	SCHOOL			DISTRICT
TEACHERS	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013	2012–2013
With Full Credential	28	30	24	75
Without Full Credential	0	0	1	1
Teaching out of field	0	0	1	2

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

California Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

The California Standards Tests (CST) show how well students are doing in learning what the state content standards require. The CST include English/language arts, mathematics, science, and history/social science in grades nine through eleven. Student scores are reported as performance levels. We also include results from the California Modified Assessment and California Alternative Performance Assessment (CAPA).

STAR Test Results for All Students: Three-Year Comparison

The percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards) for the most current three-year period.

	SCHOOL PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			DISTRICT PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			STATE PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
SUBJECT	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**
English/ language arts	51%	51%	54%	48%	51%	52%	54%	56%	55%
History/social science	55%	60%	61%	41%	44%	47%	48%	49%	49%
Mathematics	49%	45%	42%	40%	43%	44%	49%	50%	50%
Science	59%	58%	65%	48%	49%	56%	57%	60%	59%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2013 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

STAR Test Results by Student Subgroup: Most Recent Year

The percentage of students, by subgroup, achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards) for the most recent testing period.

	STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			
STUDENT SUBGROUP	**ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS 2012–2013**	**HISTORY/ SOCIAL SCIENCE 2012–2013**	**MATHEMATICS 2012–2013**	**SCIENCE 2012–2013**
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	50%	60%	37%	59%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	60%	58%	48%	73%
Two or more races	52%	69%	53%	63%
Boys	49%	67%	39%	64%
Girls	61%	56%	45%	69%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	49%	55%	39%	61%
English Learners	28%	N/A	30%	N/A
Students with disabilities	22%	38%	27%	N/A
Receives migrant education services	40%	35%	31%	64%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2013 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

ACCOUNTABILITY

California Academic Performance Index (API)

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of the academic performance and progress of schools in California. APIs range from 200 to 1000, with a statewide target of 800. Detailed information about the API can be found on the CDE Web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/.

API Ranks: Three-Year Comparison

The state assigns statewide and similar-schools API ranks for all schools. The API ranks range from 1 to 10. A statewide rank of 1 means that the school has an API in the lowest 10 percent of all high schools in the state, while a statewide rank of 10 means that the school has an API in the highest 10 percent of all high schools in the state. The similar-schools API rank reflects how a school compares with 100 statistically matched schools that have similar teachers and students.

API RANK	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
Statewide rank	8	8	8
Similar-schools rank	10	10	10

SOURCE: The API Base Report from May 2013.

API Changes by Subgroup: Three-Year Comparison

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

	ACTUAL API CHANGE			API
SUBGROUP	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013	2012–2013
All students at the school	+4	+3	-2	808
Black/African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	-5	+6	-10	785
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	+18	-7	+12	834
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	-2	+6	+5	784
English Learners	-16	+21	+33	773
Students with disabilities	+26	-15	+17	643

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013. Students from all elementary, middle and high schools are included in the district and state columns for comparison.

API Scores by Subgroup

This table includes Academic Performance Index results for our school, our district, and the state.

	SCHOOL		DISTRICT		STATE	
SUBGROUP	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API
All students	428	808	1,258	776	4,655,989	790
Black/African American	3	N/A	17	769	296,463	708
American Indian or Alaska Native	3	N/A	4	N/A	30,394	743
Asian	7	N/A	13	822	406,527	906
Filipino	1	N/A	7	N/A	121,054	867
Hispanic or Latino	208	785	716	745	2,438,951	744
Pacific Islander	2	N/A	6	N/A	25,351	774
White (non Hispanic)	194	834	482	822	1,200,127	853
Two or more races	10	N/A	13	678	125,025	824
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	274	784	958	754	2,774,640	743
English Learners	122	773	521	731	1,482,316	721
Students with disabilities	54	643	169	632	527,476	615

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013. Students from all elementary, middle and high schools are included in the district and state columns for comparison.

Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Intervention Programs

The federal law known as No Child Left Behind requires that all schools and districts meet all four of the following criteria in order to attain Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):
(a) a 95-percent participation rate on the state's tests
(b) a CDE-mandated percentage of students scoring Proficient or higher on the English/language arts and mathematics tests
(c) an API of at least 770 or growth of at least one point
(d) the graduation rate for the graduating class must meet or exceed 90 percent (or satisfy alternate improvement criteria).

AYP for the District

Whether the district met the federal requirement for AYP overall, and whether the district met each of the AYP criteria.

AYP CRITERIA	DISTRICT
Overall	No
Graduation rate	Yes
Participation rate in English/language arts	Yes
Participation rate in mathematics	Yes
Percent Proficient in English/language arts	No
Percent Proficient in mathematics	No
Met Academic Performance Index (API)	Yes

SOURCE: The AYP Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013.

Intervention Program: District Program Improvement (PI)

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 (English/language arts or mathematics) and for each grade span or on the same indicator (API or graduation rate). After entering PI, districts advance to the next level of intervention with each additional year that they do not make AYP.

INDICATOR	DISTRICT
PI stage	3 of 3
The year the district entered PI	2011
Number of schools currently in PI	5
Percentage of schools currently in PI	83%

SOURCE: The Program Improvement Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES

Total expenses include only the costs related to direct educational services to students. This figure does not include food services, land acquisition, new construction, and other expenditures unrelated to core educational purposes. The expenses-per-student figure is calculated by dividing total expenses by the district's average daily attendance (ADA). More information is available on the **CDE's Web site.**

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	OUR DISTRICT	SIMILAR DISTRICTS	ALL DISTRICTS
FISCAL YEAR 2011–2012			
Total expenses	$14,132,936	$32,927,474,550	$46,420,178,248
Expenses per student	$8,463	$8,459	$8,382
FISCAL YEAR 2010–2011			
Total expenses	$14,591,761	$32,778,534,397	$46,278,595,991
Expenses per student	$8,533	$8,407	$8,323

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

District Salaries, 2011–2012

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2011–2012 school year. This table compares our average salaries with those in districts like ours, based on both enrollment and the grade level of our students. In addition, we report the percentage of our district's total budget dedicated to teachers' and administrators' salaries. The costs of health insurance, pensions, and other indirect compensation are not included.

SALARY INFORMATION	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Beginning teacher's salary	$40,788	$38,578
Midrange teacher's salary	$62,590	$59,799
Highest-paid teacher's salary	$79,677	$78,044
Average principal's salary (high school)	$0	$106,787
Superintendent's salary	$134,247	$150,595
Percentage of budget for teachers' salaries	31%	37%
Percentage of budget for administrators' salaries	5%	6%

SOURCE: School Accountability Report Card unit of the California Department of Education.

SCHOOL COMPLETION AND PREPARATION FOR COLLEGE

Dropout Rate and Graduation Rate

Percentage of students who leave school and don't continue elsewhere. Percentage of students who graduate in four years.

KEY FACTOR	DISTRICT	STATE
Dropout rate (four-year)		
Class of 2012	8%	13%
Class of 2011	12%	15%
Class of 2010	7%	17%
Graduation rate (four-year)		
Class of 2012	90%	79%
Class of 2011	86%	77%
Class of 2010	90%	75%

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012.

Courses Required for Admission to the University of California or California State University Systems

Percentage of students enrolled in the A-G courses required for admission to the University of California (UC) or California State University (CSU).

KEY FACTOR	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	STATE
Percentage of students enrolled in courses required for UC/CSU admission	63%	37%	64%
Percentage of graduates from class of 2012 who completed all courses required for UC/CSU admission	35%	23%	41%

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012, for the percentage of students enrolled in courses required for UC/CSU admission. District and state averages represent high schools only.

College Entrance Exam Reasoning Test (SAT)

The percentage of twelfth grade students (seniors) who voluntarily take the SAT Reasoning Test to apply to college, and the average critical reading, math, and writing scores of those students.

KEY FACTOR	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
Percentage of seniors taking the SAT	36%	42%	37%
Average critical reading score	486	472	472
Average math score	493	476	469
Average writing score	477	459	458

SOURCE: Original data from the College Board, for the class of 2012, and republished by the California Department of Education. To protect student privacy, scores are not shown when the number of students tested is fewer than 11.

rev20140121_50-75572-5030259h/24673

CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Programs and Courses

Our district offers 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.

PROGRAM	COURSE	AGENCY OFFERING COURSE	OFFERED THROUGH ROC?	SATISFIES GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS?	PART OF A-G CURRICULUM?
Agriculture	Ag Biology	Waterford High School	No	Yes	Yes
Agriculture	Ag Earth Science	Waterford High School	No	Yes	Yes
Agriculture	Ag Environmental Science AP	Waterford High School	No	Yes	Yes
Child Development	Early Childhood Education	Waterford High School	Yes	Yes	No
Child Development	Elementary Education	Waterford High School	Yes	Yes	No
Computer Applications	Computer Applications 1	Waterford High School	No	Yes	No
Computer Applications	Computer Applications 2	Waterford High School	No	Yes	No
Computer Applications	Keyboarding	Waterford High School	No	Yes	No
Computer Applications	Office Procedures and Technology (ROP)	Waterford High School	Yes	Yes	No
Agriculture	Farm Machinery ROP	Waterford High School	Yes	Yes	No
Agriculture	Ag Communications & Leadership	Waterford High School	No	Yes	No

Advisors

If you'd like more information about the programs our schools offer in career technical education, please speak with our staff. More information about career technical education policy is available on the **CDE Web site**.

FIELD OR INDUSTRY	ADVISOR	PHONE	EMAIL
Agriculture	Amanda Hazan-Sanchez	(209) 874-9060	asanchez@waterford.k12.ca.us
Child Development	Dawn Reece	(209) 874-3301	dreece@waterford.k12.ca.us
Computer Applications	Rosa Hernandez	(209) 874- 9060	rhernandez@waterford.k12.ca.us

TEXTBOOKS

Textbook Adoption List

TITLE	SUBJECT	DATE OF PUBLICATION	ADOPTION DATE
Levels A, B & C The Basics	"Success in Language"	2002	2002
Agr. Science Fundamentals & Applications	Ag. Science	2002	2003
Applications Equations and Graphs	Algebra 1	2001	2001
Applications Equations and Graphs	Algebra II	2001	2001
US Gov't Democracy in Action	American Gov't	2002	2002
Government By The People	American Gov't & Pol.	2002	2003
Modern Livestock and Poultry Production	Animal Science	2002	2004
Biology 6th Edition	Biology	2002	2002
The Dynalnics of Life	Biology	2002	2002
Calculus of a Single Variable	Calculus	2002	2003
Chemistry: 5th Edition	Chemistry	2000	2001
Holt Chemistry	Chemistry	2007	2007
Earth: Geology, the Environment and the Universe	Earth Science	2005	2005
Economics: Today and Tomorrow	Economics	2001	2001
Holt: Literature & Language Arts Course 3 - 6	ELA	2003	2005
Applying Reasoning and Measurement	Geometry	2001	2001
Lifetime Health	Health	2007	2007
Health	Health (St. Reqs.)	1997	2001
American Odyssey US in the 20th Century	History	2002	2002
Essentials of Biology	Integrated Science	1998	2003
Science: Spectrum A Balanced Approach	Integrated Science	2001	2001
Holt Physics	Physics	2007	2007
Physics: Principles and Problems	Physics	2002	2003
Conceptual Physics: Prentice Hall	Physics	2009	2011
Pre Calculus w/Limits	Precalculus	2001	2002
Psychology: Principles in Practice	Psychology	2003	2003
Corrective Reading Concept Application Level C	Reading Fundamentals	1999	2004
Corrective Reading Decoding Strategies Levels B1, 2, C	Reading Fundamentals	1999	2005
Earth Science Geology, The Environ. and the Universe	Social Science	2005	2005

Textbook Adoption List (continued)

TITLE	SUBJECT	DATE OF PUBLICATION	ADOPTION DATE
Sociology: Study of Human Relationships	Sociology	2003	2004
Tu Mundo	Span. Native Speakers	2002	2002
Dime Uno	Spanish 1	1997	2001
Dime Dos	Spanish II	1997	2001
Tu Mundo	Spanish III	2002	2002
American History A Survey	US Hist AP	2003	2003
The Americans, Reconstruction to the 21st Century	US History	2006	2007
Connections to Today: The Modern Era	World History	2001	2001
EDGE	ELD	2005	2006

DISTRICT
HOME PAGE

WATERFORD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

» Williams report home page
» About the Williams law
» Close this window

Waterford High School

Science Labs, 2013–2014

This information about our science lab class equipment and materials is one small part of an annual report about our school. You can find the full report, which contains additional information about teachers, students, test scores, and resources, on our district's Web site. This portion of the report is also one part of our response to the 2004 Williams legislation.

Read more about science labs.

COURSE TITLE	DID THE DISTRICT ADOPT ANY RESOLUTIONS TO DEFINE "SUFFICIENCY"?	IS THERE A SUFFICIENT SUPPLY OF MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT TO CONDUCT THE LABS?
Biology	Yes	Yes
Advanced Biology AP	Yes	Yes
Biology - Agriculture	Yes	Yes
Chemistry	Yes	Yes
Physics	Yes	Yes
Earth Science	Yes	Yes
Earth Science Agriculture	Yes	Yes

BIOLOGY: This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013.

CHEMISTRY: This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013.

PHYSICS: This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013.

EARTH SCIENCES: This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013.

About Science Labs

Many science courses require that students conduct experiments. This gives our students a chance to practice the scientific method, in effect, learning science by doing science. Those courses are what we call lab courses, and, of course, they require equipment and materials. The purpose of the Williams legislation is to inform citizens if our schools have the proper equipment, and enough of it, for students to succeed. This legislation only requires high schools to provide this information.

Please note that there is no state standard for equipping science labs. The next best authority we have to rely upon is the policy of our own school board. So you'll see in our report whether our

school board has voted to approve a standard for equipping our science labs. If you have further questions about the condition of our science labs, we recommend you speak with your child's science teacher directly.

Waterford High School

ADDRESS: 121 S. Reinway Ave., Waterford, CA 95386 **PHONE:** (209) 874-9060
PRINCIPAL: Ignacio Ramirez **GRADE RANGE:** 9–12 **SCHEDULE:** Traditional **ENROLLMENT:** 605

CALIFORNIA ACCOUNTABILITY

The state's education officials measure schools' performance using students' test scores. They combine standardized test results and measure progress year to year to calculate each school's Academic Performance Index (API).

Academic Performance Index (API)	**808**
Growth attained from prior year	**-2**
Met schoolwide growth target	**Yes**
Met growth targets for all groups of students	**No**

API

The API is California's way of rating schools. Using student test scores, the API places schools on a scale from 200 to 1000. Our school's API was 808, compared with 750 for the average high school (shown in gray in the graph below). The state expects schools to attain an API of 800 eventually. Each major subgroup of students in our school also receives an API.



California Standards Tests

This series of tests is based on what California students are expected to know and learn at each grade level.

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC BELOW BASIC BASIC PROFICIENT ADVANCED

SUBJECT	PERCENT PROFICIENT OR HIGHER	LOW SCORES HIGH SCORES
English/Language Arts (Reading and Writing)		
Our school	56%	
Calif. high schools	56%	
Geometry		
Our school	49%	
Calif. high schools	25%	
US History		
Our school	64%	
Calif. high schools	53%	
Biology		
Our school	58%	
Calif. high schools	50%	
Life Science (Tenth Grade)		
Our school	65%	
Calif. high schools	56%	

SOURCE: The scores for the California Standards Tests are from the spring 2013 test cycle. State averages represent high schools only.

FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The federal accountability standard differs from California's. It requires schools to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The AYP includes students' scores and participation rates on the high school exit exam (CAHSEE), along with the graduation rate and the API. If a school doesn't meet one of these criteria two years in a row, it is put in Program Improvement.

Made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	**No**
Number of AYP targets met	**15**
Number of AYP targets school was required to meet	**18**
Is the school in Program Improvement (PI)?	**Yes** Stage 2 of 5

SOURCE: API growth score and AYP from the 2013 test cycle. API and AYP current as of September 2013.



This year, high schools are expected to help 89 percent of their students score Proficient or higher on California's high school exit exam. This goal rises every year until 2014, when 100 percent of students are expected to reach this mark. As a result, increasing numbers of schools are falling short of this goal, and landing on the federal watch list known as Program Improvement.

Please go to http://www1.waterford.k12.ca.us/ for more information about this school, including our School Accountability Report Card, or visit us at the school office.

PUBLISHED BY SCHOOL WISE PRESS
www.schoolwisepress.com

rev20130926_50-75572-5030259/24673

DISTRICT
HOME PAGE

WATERFORD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

» Williams report home page
» About the Williams law
» Close this window

Waterford High School

Teacher Misassignments, 2013–2014

This information about teacher misassignments is one small part of an annual report about our school. You can find the full report, which contains additional information about teachers, students, test scores, and resources, on our district's Web site. This portion of the report is also one part of our response to the 2004 Williams legislation.

Read more about teacher misassignments.

Teacher Misassignments

	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
Total number of classes taught by teachers without a legally recognized certificate or credential	0	0	0

Teacher Misassignments in Classes that Include English Learners

	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
Total number of classes that include English learners and are taught by teachers without CLAD/BCLAD authorization, ELD or SDAIE training, or equivalent authorization from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing	0	0	0

Other Employee Misassignments

	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
Total number of service area placements of employees without the required credentials	0	0	0

Notes

This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013.

About Teacher Misassignments

A “misassigned” teacher is one who lacks the appropriate subject-area authorization for a class she is teaching.

Under the terms of the Williams settlement, schools must inform the public of the number of their teachers who are misassigned. It is possible for a teacher who lacks the authorization for a subject to get special permission—in the form of an emergency permit, waiver, or internship authorization—from the school board or county office of education to teach the subject anyway. This permission prevents the teacher from being counted as misassigned.

WATERFORD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Waterford High School

Teacher Vacancies, 2013–2014

This information about teacher vacancies is one small part of an annual report about our school. You can find the full report, which contains additional information about teachers, students, test scores, and resources, on our district's Web site. This portion of the report is also one part of our response to the 2004 Williams legislation.

Read more about teacher vacancies.

Teacher Vacancies Occurring at the Beginning of the School Year

	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
Total number of classes at the start of the year	0	0	0
Number of classes which lacked a permanently assigned teacher within the first 20 days of school	0	0	0

Teacher Vacancies Occurring During the School Year

	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
Number of classes where the permanently assigned teacher left during the year	0	0	0
Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher	0	0	0

Notes

This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013.

About Teacher Vacancies

The Williams legislation also asked districts to disclose how frequently full-time teachers were not permanently assigned to a classroom. There are two general circumstances that can lead to the unfortunate case of a classroom without a full-time, permanently assigned teacher. Within the first 20 days of the start of school, we can be surprised by too many students showing up for school, or too few teachers showing up to teach. After school starts, however, teachers can also be surprised by sudden changes: family emergencies, injuries, accidents, etc. When that occurs, it is our school's and our district's responsibility to fill that teacher's vacancy with a qualified, full-time and

permanently assigned replacement. For that reason, we report teacher vacancies in two parts: at the start of school, and after the start of school.

DISTRICT
HOME PAGE

WATERFORD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

» Williams report home page
» About the Williams law
» Close this window

Waterford High School

Textbooks, 2013–2014

This information about textbooks is one small part of an annual report about our school. You can find the full report, which contains additional information about teachers, students, test scores, and resources, on our district's Web site. This portion of the report is also one part of our response to the 2004 Williams legislation.

Read more about textbooks.

SUBJECT	ARE THERE TEXTBOOKS OR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN USE?		ARE THERE ENOUGH BOOKS FOR EACH STUDENT?	
	STANDARDS ALIGNED?	FROM THE MOST RECENT OFFICIAL ADOPTION?	FOR USE IN CLASS?	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS HAVING BOOKS TO TAKE HOME?
English	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Math	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Science	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Social Studies	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Foreign Languages	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Health Sciences	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Visual and Performing Arts	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%

Notes

This report was completed on Friday, November 01, 2013.
This information was collected on Friday, November 01, 2013.

About Textbooks

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 the California content standards calls for. This information is far more meaningful when viewed along with the more detailed description of textbooks contained in our School Accountability Report Card (SARC). There you'll find the names of the textbooks used in our core classes, their dates of publication, the names of the firms that published them, and more.