LEA Plan Annual Update   2012-2013

Local Education Agency (LEA) Plans

Local Education Agency (LEA) Plans were developed in May of 2003 as five year plans, from July 1, 2003-June 30, 2008 with annual revisions. The approval of a Local Educational Agency (LEA) Plan by the local school board and State Board of Education is a requirement for receiving federal funding for NCLB programs which are considered Categorical Programs.   Although the plan covered the time period through June 30, 2008, CDE will not require new LEA Plans until NCLB is reauthorized.   This year, an addendum to the LEA plan was written due to the District's LEA-Program Improvement, Year 1 status. An annual update to the School Board of progress towards the LEA Plan goals is required.

The LEA Plan is organized around 5 Performance Goals:

1. **All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics, by 2013-2014.**

   - Please see attached 2011-2012 Accountability Progress Report (APR)

      In the 2011-12, 78.4% of all students, as well as all subgroups, needed to score at or above proficient in English-Language Arts while 79.0% of all students, as well as all subgroups, needed to score at or above proficient in Mathematics. We met our 2012 Adequate Yearly Progress 95% participation rate in English-Language Arts (99%) and in Mathematics (99%) However, we did not meet all of our Percent Proficient- Annual Measureable Objective (AMOs) 65.9% of all students were proficient or above in English-Language Arts while 70.9% of all students were proficient or above in Mathematics. Our Hispanic or Latino and White subgroups met the English-Language Arts target with the application of the "Safe Harbor" criteria. Our Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, English Learners and Students with Disabilities subgroups did not meet the English-Language Arts target. In Mathematics, our White, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged and English Learner groups met the target utilizing "Safe Harbor" criteria. The Hispanic-Latino and Students with Disabilities did not meet the target in Mathematics.

      In 2002-2003, the base year for the LEA Plan, 13.6% of all students, as well as subgroups, needed to score at or above proficient in English-Language Arts and 16% of all students, as well as subgroups, needed to score at or above proficient in Mathematics. In Placerville Union School District, 40.7% of all students scored at or above proficient in English-Language Arts while 36.2% of all students scored at or above proficient in Mathematics. All subgroups met the English-Language Arts and Mathematics targets with the exception of Students with Disabilities where 8.5% of the students were at or above proficient in English-Language Arts and 14.9% were at or above proficient in Mathematics.

2. **All limited-English-proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**

- Please see attached 2011-2012 Title III Accountability Report

This goal is primarily measured by our students' performance on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) and the STAR California Standards Test (CST). The results of these two tests are used to measure our performance against three Title III Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). AMAO 1 is the percentage of EL students making annual progress in learning English. AMAO 2 is the percentage of EL students attaining the English Proficient level on the CELDT Tests. AMAO 3 is the same criteria as the NCLB Adequate Yearly Progress measure for English Learners in English – Language Arts.

In 2010-2011, we did not meet AMAO 2 for students who have been English Learners for five years or more and we did not meet AMAO 3. Since we did not meet all of our AMAOs for 2010-2011, we were identified as Year 1 of English Learner Program Improvement.

In 2011-2012 , we met AMAO 1 and AMAO 2. However, we did not meet AMAO 3. Since it was our second year not meeting all of our AMAOs, we had to write a Title III Program Improvement plan this year which was submitted to the California Department of Education on March 1, 2013. It is an eighteen month plan and we are still awaiting final approval on our plan. The plan focuses on providing ongoing, systematic English Language Development (ELD), provide ongoing Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) strategies and staff development for our teachers.

The preliminary 2012-2013 AMAO data has not been released yet.

Our English Learner student population is an area of focus for all three of our school sites. All Kindergarten – 2nd grade teachers received intensive staff development in an EL methodology, emphasizing language acquisition and literacy, called Project G.L.A.D. (Guided Language Acquisition Design) strategies this past school year. Next year, our 3rd – 5th grade teachers will be trained in G.L.A.D. strategies. English Learner students are targeted for intervention through our Title I programs, United Way Grant and our RtI intervention classes. Schnell and Sierra Schools have an active English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC). Markham is not required to have an ELAC since they have less than 20 English Learner students. Schnell and Sierra Schools offered English as a Second Language classes during the 2012-2013 school year to parents of our EL students.

By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- In 2004-2005, 30.4% of PUSD's core academic classes were taught by NCLB compliant teachers. In 2012-2013, 100% of our core academic classes were taught by NCLB compliant teachers.

- In 2002-2003, 44% of our Title I paraeducators met NCLB qualifications. In 2012-2013, 100% of all paraeducators met NCLB Highly Qualified criteria.

3. **All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.**

   - Please see attached the Historical UMIRS Report.
   - The UMIRS report and School Safety Data Summaries are reviewed by the Health Education Advisory Committee (HEAC) and School Site Councils.
   - School climate, health and safety areas are addressed by the district administration, school sites and the HEAC.

4. **All students will graduate from high school. N/A**

Performance Goal #1:

All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics, by 2013-2014.

2011 - 12 Accountability Progress Reporting (APR)

Local Educational Agency (LEA) List of Schools
2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report

California Department of Education
Analysis, Measurement, &
Accountability Reporting Division
4/8/2013

LEA: Placerville Union Elementary
LEA Type: Elementary
County: El Dorado
CD Code: 09-61952

| AYP LEA Report |
| APR LEA Summary |
| API LEA List of Schools |
| API County List of Schools |
| AYP County List of Schools |

(API = Academic Performance Index)

| | Met 2012 Criteria for: | | | | | PI Status |
	All Components	English-Language Arts	Mathematics	API	Graduation Rate	PI Status
PLACERVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Year 1
Elementary Schools						
Louisiana Schnell Elementary	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	Not in PI
Sierra Elementary	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	Not in PI
Middle Schools						
Edwin Markham Middle	No	Yes	No	Yes	N/A	Not Title 1

2011-12 Accountability Progress Reporting (APR)

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Report
2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report

California Department of Education
Analysis, Measurement, &
Accountability Reporting Division
4/8/2013

LEA: Placerville Union Elementary

LEA Type: Elementary

County: El Dorado

CD Code: 09-61952

2012 AYP and PI Links:

| LEA Chart |
| LEA PI Status and Grade Spans |
| Cohort Graduation Rates |
| LEA List of Schools |
| County List of Schools |

(An LEA is a school district, county office of education, or statewide benefit charter.)

2011-12 APR		2011-12 State API			2012 Federal AYP and PI		
Summary	Glossary	Base	Guide	Growth	AYP	PI	Guide

Made AYP: No
Met 19 of 25 AYP Criteria

California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA)

	Percent Proficient and Above	Above 1.0	Exception Approved
English-Language Arts	1.2	Yes	Adj
Mathematics	1.1	Yes	Adj

California Modified Assessment (CMA)

	Percent Proficient and Above	Cap	Above Cap
English-Language Arts	2.1	2.0	Yes
Mathematics	1.3	2.0	No

Participation Rate

	English-Language Arts Target 95% Met all participation rate criteria? Yes					Mathematics Target 95% Met all participation rate criteria? Yes				
GROUPS	Enrollment First Day of Testing	Number of Students Tested	Rate	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Enrollment First Day of Testing	Number of Students Tested	Rate	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
LEA-wide	944	938	99	Yes		944	937	99	Yes	
Black or African American	5	5	100	--		5	5	100	--	
American Indian or Alaska Native	14	14	100	--		14	14	100	--	
Asian	7	7	100	--		7	7	100	--	
Filipino	3	3	100	--		3	3	100	--	
Hispanic or Latino	251	248	99	Yes		251	248	99	Yes	

Group								
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2	2	100	--	2	2	100	--
White	610	608	100	Yes	610	607	100	Yes
Two or More Races	46	45	98	--	46	45	98	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	509	504	99	Yes	509	503	99	Yes
English Learners	132	130	98	Yes	132	130	98	Yes
Students with Disabilities	131	130	99	Yes	131	129	98	Yes

Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)

GROUPS	English-Language Arts Target 78.4 % Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No					Mathematics Target 79.0 % Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No				
	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
LEA-wide	881	581	65.9	No		880	624	70.9	Yes	SH
Black or African American	4	--	--	--		4	--	--	--	
American Indian or Alaska Native	14	7	50.0	--		14	8	57.1	--	
Asian	6	--	--	--		6	--	--	--	
Filipino	1	--	--	--		1	--	--	--	
Hispanic or Latino	233	118	50.6	Yes	SH	233	131	56.2	No	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2	--	--	--		2	--	--	--	
White	572	412	72.0	Yes	SH	571	439	76.9	Yes	SH
Two or More Races	43	30	69.8	--		43	31	72.1	--	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	482	270	56.0	No		481	302	62.8	Yes	SH
English Learners	127	51	40.2	No		127	69	54.3	Yes	SH
Students with Disabilities	123	57	46.3	No		122	66	54.1	No	

Academic Performance Index (API) - Additional Indicator for AYP

2011 Base API	2012 Growth API	2011-12 Growth	Met 2012 API Criteria	Alternative Method
839	856	17	Yes	

2012 API Criteria for meeting federal AYP: A minimum "2012 Growth API" score of 740 OR "2011-12 Growth" of at least one point.

Graduation Rate Goal: 90 Percent

Graduation Rate data not available.

Current Year: Graduation Rate Results

Graduation Rate data not available.

Graduation Rate Criteria: (1) met or exceeded the goal of 90%, or (2) met the fixed target graduation rate, or (3) met the variable target graduation rate. Fixed and variable target graduation rates are calculated for local educational agencies and schools that have not reached the 90% goal.

2011 -12 Accountability Progress Reporting (APR)

School Report
2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report

California Department of Education
Analysis, Measurement, &
Accountability Reporting Division
4/8/2013

School: Louisiana Schnell Elementary
LEA: Placerville Union Elementary
County: El Dorado
CDS Code: 09-61952-6005656
School Type: Elementary

Direct Funded Charter School: No

2012 AYP and PI Links:

| School Chart |
| School PI Status |
| Cohort Graduation Rates |
| LEA List of Schools |
| County List of Schools |

(An LEA is a school district, county office of education, or statewide benefit charter.)

2011-12 APR		2011-12 State API			2012 Federal AYP and PI		
Summary	Glossary	Base	Guide	Growth	AYP	PI	Guide

Made AYP: No
Met 19 of 21 AYP Criteria

Participation Rate

	English-Language Arts Target 95% Met all participation rate criteria? Yes					Mathematics Target 95% Met all participation rate criteria? Yes				
GROUPS	Enrollment First Day of Testing	Number of Students Tested	Rate	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Enrollment First Day of Testing	Number of Students Tested	Rate	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
Schoolwide	279	276	99	Yes		279	276	99	Yes	
Black or African American	2	2	100	--		2	2	100	--	
American Indian or Alaska Native	4	4	100	--		4	4	100	--	
Asian	1	1	100	--		1	1	100	--	
Filipino	0	0	--	--		0	0	--	--	
Hispanic or Latino	91	89	98	Yes	ER	91	89	98	Yes	ER
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0	--	--		0	0	--	--	
White	160	159	99	Yes		160	159	99	Yes	
Two or More Races	20	20	100	--		20	20	100	--	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	178	175	98	Yes		178	175	98	Yes	
English Learners	59	57	97	Yes	ER	59	57	97	Yes	ER
Students with Disabilities	30	29	97	--		30	29	97	--	

> Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)

English-Language Arts Target 78.4 %	Mathematics Target 79.0 %

	Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No					Met all percent proficient rate criteria? Yes				
GROUPS	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
Schoolwide	256	151	59.0	No		256	185	72.3	Yes	SH
Black or African American	2	--	--	--		2	--	--	--	
American Indian or Alaska Native	4	--	--	--		4	--	--	--	
Asian	1	--	--	--		1	--	--	--	
Filipino	0	--	--	--		0	--	--	--	
Hispanic or Latino	80	38	47.5	Yes	SH	80	49	61.2	Yes	SH
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	--	--	--		0	--	--	--	
White	149	98	65.8	No		149	118	79.2	Yes	
Two or More Races	19	10	52.6	--		19	12	63.2	--	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	166	87	52.4	Yes	SH	166	110	66.3	Yes	SH
English Learners	55	25	45.5	Yes	SH	55	33	60.0	Yes	SH
Students with Disabilities	29	18	62.1	--		29	22	75.9	--	

Academic Performance Index (API) - Additional Indicator for AYP

2011 Base API	2012 Growth API	2011-12 Growth	Met 2012 API Criteria	Alternative Method
839	841	2	Yes	

2012 API Criteria for meeting federal AYP: A minimum "2012 Growth API" score of 740 OR "2011-12 Growth" of at least one point.

Graduation Rate Goal: 90 Percent

Graduation Rate data not available.

Current Year: Graduation Rate Results

Graduation Rate data not available.

Graduation Rate Criteria: (1) met or exceeded the goal of 90%, or (2) met the fixed target graduation rate, or (3) met the variable target graduation rate. Fixed and variable target graduation rates are calculated for local educational agencies and schools that have not reached the 90% goal.

DataQuest home > AYP home > Reports > Select School > School Reports > Current Page

2011 -12 Accountability Progress Reporting (APR)

School Report
2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report

California Department of Education
Analysis, Measurement, &
Accountability Reporting Division
4/8/2013

School: Sierra Elementary
LEA: Placerville Union Elementary
County: El Dorado
CDS Code: 09-61952-6005664
School Type: Elementary

Direct Funded Charter School: No

2012 AYP and PI Links:

| School Chart |
| School PI Status |
| Cohort Graduation Rates |
| LEA List of Schools |
| County List of Schools |

(An LEA is a school district, county office of education, or statewide benefit charter.)

2011-12 APR		2011-12 State API			2012 Federal AYP and PI		
Summary	Glossary	Base	Guide	Growth	AYP	PI	Guide

Made AYP: No
Met 14 of 17 AYP Criteria

Participation Rate

GROUPS	English-Language Arts Target 95% Met all participation rate criteria? Yes					Mathematics Target 95% Met all participation rate criteria? Yes				
	Enrollment First Day of Testing	Number of Students Tested	Rate	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Enrollment First Day of Testing	Number of Students Tested	Rate	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
Schoolwide	294	294	100	Yes		294	293	100	Yes	
Black or African American	2	2	100	--		2	2	100	--	
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	2	100	--		2	2	100	--	
Asian	2	2	100	--		2	2	100	--	
Filipino	2	2	100	--		2	2	100	--	
Hispanic or Latino	71	71	100	Yes	ER	71	71	100	Yes	ER
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	1	100	--		1	1	100	--	
White	198	198	100	Yes		198	197	99	Yes	
Two or More Races	15	15	100	--		15	15	100	--	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	146	146	100	Yes		146	145	99	Yes	
English Learners	37	37	100	--		37	37	100	--	
Students with Disabilities	39	39	100	--		39	38	98	--	

> **Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)**

English-Language Arts Target 78.4 %	Mathematics Target 79.0 %

| | Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No | | | | | Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No | | | |
GROUPS	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
Schoolwide	286	218	76.2	Yes	SH	285	228	80.0	Yes	
Black or African American	1	--	--	--		1	--	--	--	
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	--	--	--		2	--	--	--	
Asian	2	--	--	--		2	--	--	--	
Filipino	0	--	--	--		0	--	--	--	
Hispanic or Latino	70	41	58.6	No		70	50	71.4	No	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	--	--	--		1	--	--	--	
White	194	161	83.0	Yes		193	161	83.4	Yes	
Two or More Races	15	13	86.7	--		15	13	86.7	--	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	144	94	65.3	Yes	SH	143	101	70.6	No	
English Learners	37	15	40.5	--		37	27	73.0	--	
Students with Disabilities	39	25	64.1	--		38	26	68.4	--	

Academic Performance Index (API) - Additional Indicator for AYP

2011 Base API	2012 Growth API	2011-12 Growth	Met 2012 API Criteria	Alternative Method
888	905	17	Yes	

2012 API Criteria for meeting federal AYP: A minimum "2012 Growth API" score of 740 OR "2011-12 Growth" of at least one point.

Graduation Rate Goal: 90 Percent

Graduation Rate data not available.

Current Year: Graduation Rate Results

Graduation Rate data not available.

Graduation Rate Criteria: (1) met or exceeded the goal of 90%, or (2) met the fixed target graduation rate, or (3) met the variable target graduation rate. Fixed and variable target graduation rates are calculated for local educational agencies and schools that have not reached the 90% goal.

2011 -12 Accountability Progress Reporting (APR)

School Report
2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report

California Department of Education
Analysis, Measurement, &
Accountability Reporting Division
4/8/2013

School: Edwin Markham Middle
LEA: Placerville Union Elementary
County: El Dorado
CDS Code: 09-61952-6005649
School Type: Middle

Direct Funded Charter School: No

2012 AYP and PI Links:

| School Chart |
| School PI Status |
| Cohort Graduation Rates |
| LEA List of Schools |
| County List of Schools |

(An LEA is a school district, county office of education, or statewide benefit charter.)

2011-12 APR		2011-12 State API			2012 Federal AYP and PI		
Summary	Glossary	Base	Guide	Growth	AYP	PI	Guide

Made AYP: No
Met 16 of 17 AYP Criteria

Participation Rate

GROUPS	English-Language Arts Target 95% Met all participation rate criteria? Yes					Mathematics Target 95% Met all participation rate criteria? Yes				
	Enrollment First Day of Testing	Number of Students Tested	Rate	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Enrollment First Day of Testing	Number of Students Tested	Rate	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
Schoolwide	358	355	99	Yes		358	355	99	Yes	
Black or African American	1	1	100	--		1	1	100	--	
American Indian or Alaska Native	8	8	100	--		8	8	100	--	
Asian	4	4	100	--		4	4	100	--	
Filipino	1	1	100	--		1	1	100	--	
Hispanic or Latino	88	87	99	Yes	ER	88	87	99	Yes	ER
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	1	100	--		1	1	100	--	
White	240	239	100	Yes		240	239	100	Yes	
Two or More Races	11	10	91	--		11	10	91	--	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	179	177	99	Yes		179	177	99	Yes	
English Learners	35	35	100	--		35	35	100	--	
Students with Disabilities	49	49	100	--		49	49	100	--	

> Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)

English-Language Arts Target 78.4 %	Mathematics Target 79.0 %

GROUPS	Met all percent proficient rate criteria? Yes					Met all percent proficient rate criteria? No				
	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method	Valid Scores	Number At or Above Proficient	Percent At or Above Proficient	Met 2012 AYP Criteria	Alternative Method
Schoolwide	326	208	63.8	Yes	SH	326	206	63.2	Yes	SH
Black or African American	1	--	--	--		1	--	--	--	
American Indian or Alaska Native	8	--	--	--		8	--	--	--	
Asian	3	--	--	--		3	--	--	--	
Filipino	· 1	--	--	--		1	--	--	--	
Hispanic or Latino	81	38	46.9	Yes	SH	81	31	38.3	No	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	--	--	--		1	--	--	--	
White	218	150	68.8	Yes	SH	218	156	71.6	Yes	SH
Two or More Races	9	--	--	--		9	--	--	--	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	166	87	52.4	Yes	SH	166	89	53.6	Yes	SH
English Learners	34	10	29.4	--		34	8	23.5	--	
Students with Disabilities	46	10	21.7	--		46	14	30.4	--	

Academic Performance Index (API) - Additional Indicator for AYP

2011 Base API	2012 Growth API	2011-12 Growth	Met 2012 API Criteria	Alternative Method
798	837	39	Yes	

2012 API Criteria for meeting federal AYP: A minimum "2012 Growth API" score of 740 OR "2011-12 Growth" of at least one point.

Graduation Rate Goal: 90 Percent

Graduation Rate data not available.

Current Year: Graduation Rate Results

Graduation Rate data not available.

Graduation Rate Criteria: (1) met or exceeded the goal of 90%, or (2) met the fixed target graduation rate, or (3) met the variable target graduation rate. Fixed and variable target graduation rates are calculated for local educational agencies and schools that have not reached the 90% goal.

DataQuest home > API home > Reports > Select District > District Reports > Current Page

2012 -13 Accountability Progress Reporting (APR)

Local Educational Agency (LEA) List of Schools
2012 Base
Academic Performance Index (API) Report

California Department of Education
Analysis, Measurement, &
Accountability Reporting Division
5/30/2013

LEA: Placerville Union Elementary

LEA Type: Elementary

County: El Dorado

CD Code: 09-61952

2012 Base API Links:

| APR LEA Summary |
| API LEA Report |
| API County List of Schools |

(An LEA is a school district, county office of education, or statewide benefit charter.)

	Number of Students Included in the 2012 API	2012 Base API	Ranks		Targets	
			2012 Statewide Rank	2012 Similar Schools Rank	2012-13 Growth Target	2013 API Target
Placerville Union Elementary	884	860	B	B	B	B
Elementary Schools						
Louisiana Schnell Elementary	256	842	7	7	A	A
Sierra Elementary	286	905	9	10	A	A
Middle Schools						
Edwin Markham Middle	327	846	7	9	A	A

Click on column header link to view notes.

"N/A" means a number is not applicable or not available due to missing data.
" * " means this API is calculated for a small school, defined as having between 11 and 99 valid Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program test scores included in the API. APIs based on small numbers of students are less reliable and therefore should be carefully interpreted. Similar schools ranks are not calculated for small schools.
"A"   means the school scored at or above the statewide performance target of 800 in 2012.
"B"   means this is either an LEA or an Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) school. Schools with an approved ASAM application do not receive statewide or similar schools rankings. Growth, target, and rank information are not applicable to LEAs.
"C"   means this is a special education school. Statewide and similar schools ranks and API growth targets are not applicable to special education schools.
"I"   means the school has some invalid data, and the California Department of Education cannot calculate a valid similar schools rank for this school.

Missing schools - some schools in the LEA may not appear on this list because APIs were not generated for them. Very small schools (fewer than 11 non-mobile students with STAR Program test scores) and schools that had no STAR Program test results in 2012 will not receive a 2012 Base API report.

Data file: Download a data file containing the information displayed above.

Questions: Academic Accountability Team | aau@cde.ca.gov | 916-319-0863

Performance Goal #2:

All limited-English-proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

California Department of Education
Assessment and Accountability Division

2011-12 Title III Accountability Reports
Local Educational Agency (LEA) Level Data

Release Date:	March 19, 2013
LEA:	Placerville Union Elementary
County:	El Dorado
CDS Code:	09-61952-0000000

School-level Data

DataQuest Help

The Title III Accountability Report indicates the status of each Title III-funded local educational agency (LEA) or consortium in meeting the three annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs).

AMAO 1 - Percentage of ELs Making Annual Progress in Learning English

Number of 2011-12 Annual CELDT Takers	120
Number with Required Prior CELDT Scores	120
Percentage with Required Prior CELDT Scores	100%
Number in Cohort Meeting Annual Growth Target	72
Percentage Meeting AMAO 1 in LEA	60.0%
2011-12 Target	56.0%
Met Target for AMAO 1	**Yes**

AMAO 2 - Percentage of ELs Attaining the English Proficient Level on the CELDT

Less than 5 Years Cohort

Number of 2011-12 English Learners in Cohort	121
Number in Cohort Attaining the English Proficient Level	28
Percentage in Cohort Attaining the English Proficient Level	23.1%
2011-12 Target	20.1%
Cohort Met Target	Yes

5 Years or More Cohort

Number of 2011-12 English Learners in Cohort	31
Number in Cohort Attaining the English Proficient Level	14
Percentage in Cohort Attaining the English Proficient Level	45.2%
2011-12 Target	45.1%
Cohort Met Target	Yes
Met Targets for AMAO 2	**Yes**

AMAO 3 - Adequate Yearly Progress for EL Student Group at the LEA Level

English-Language Arts

	Met Percent Proficient or Above for English Learner stude group
	No

Mathematics

Met Participation Rate for English Learner student group	Yes
Met Percent Proficient or Above for English Learner student group	Yes
Met Targets for AMAO 3	**No**

Met All AMAO Criteria

Met all AMAOs	**No**

Number of Consecutive Years Not Meeting AMAOs

Number of Years	**2**

Note: If less than 65 percent of the 2011 Annual CELDT takers have prior year scores, no values will be printed for AMAO 1 and the LEA or consortium will not meet the AMAO 1 target.

Yes* – Met the AMAO target through the application of confidence intervals (the LEA/consortium had fewer than 30 valid scores in the AMAO cohort).

For more information on Title III accountability, refer to the CDE Title III Accountability Web page.

Web Policy

Performance Goal #3:

By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

*All of our teachers meet the No Child Left Behind Act criteria in order to be classified as a Highly Qualified Teacher. This information used to be reported on our Consolidated Application but is now reported through the California Department of Education's California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).

Performance Goal #4:

All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.

Historical Comparison of Uniform Management Information Reporting System (UMIRS)
2003-2013

	Schnell	Sierra	Markham	(CARE)	CDS	Districtwide
2003 - 2004 Truancy Rate	53.10%	23.30%	52.90%		20%	
2004 - 2005 Truancy Rate	57.70%	25.90%	53.60%		75%	
2005 - 2006 Truancy Rate	64.10%	26.50%	56.70%		100%	
2006 - 2007 Truancy Rate	41.80%	35.80%	34.50%		33.3%	
2007 - 2008 Truancy Rate	52.50%	33.50%	42.20%		60.0%	
2008 - 2009 Truancy Rate	46.90%	34.90%	34.30%		60.0%	
2009 - 2010 Truancy Rate	37.60%	27.10%	51.40%		25.0%	
2010- 2011 Truancy Rate	48.10%	25.30%	22.60%			32.2%
2011-2012 Truancy Rate	39.26%	28.16%	27.22%			31.7%
2012-2013 Truancy Rate	34.00%	31.00%	24%			30%
2003 - 2004 # of Suspensions	14	38	76		2	
2004 - 2005 # of Suspensions	18	32	124		11	
2005 - 2006 # of Suspensions	14	8	23		12	
2006 - 2007 # of Suspensions	16	17	32		12	
2007 - 2008 # of Suspensions	17	14	23		7	
2008 - 2009 # of Suspensions	24	19	130		6	
2009- 2010 # of Suspensions	12	14	81		4	
2010- 2011 # of Suspensions	4	13	76			
2011- 2012 # of Suspensions	26	10	40	22		
2012- 2013 # of Suspensions	28	14	16	8		
2003 - 2004 # of Expulsions	0	0	6		0	
2004 - 2005 # of Expulsions	1	0	6		0	
2005 - 2006 # of Expulsions	0	2	7		0	
2006 - 2007 # of Expulsions	0	0	3		0	
2007 - 2008 # of Expulsions	0	0	5		0	
2008 - 2009 # of Expulsions	0	0	1		0	
2009 - 2010 # of Expulsions	0	0	6		0	
2010 - 2011 # of Expulsions	0	0	4		0	
2011 - 2012 # of Expulsions	0	0	2	*2		
2012 - 2013 # of Expulsions	0	0	1	0		

*Agreement in lieu of expulsion

Comprehensive School Safety Plan 2012 - 2013
Data Summary and Analysis

_____Schnell School_____
School Site

List Data Sources Reviewed and How the Data Determined Goals: (surveys, focus groups, discipline and attendance records)

Annual S.L.I.P. parent survey results, telephone calls for parents, formal and informal discussions with staff, parents, community and students

Areas of Pride and Strength (school programs and practices that promote a positive learning environment)

Bobcat Bonus program, class meetings, special Bobcat of the week, weekly School Spirit award, "Bobby the Bobcat" mascot, individual achievement awards, teaching of non-bullying and conflict management by all teachers and staff, staff fosters individual relationships with parents and students, welcoming environment, family evening events, staff supports and appreciates parent help, Garden of Learning program, P.E. program, newsletters, automated phone and e-mail message system, administration is visible to parents and students, Accelerated Reader (AR) program, AR incentives (Million words reader club) and rewards, Bobcat Corner blog, weekly attendance awards, ESL classes for parents; active and supportive Parent Club and morning stretch.

Areas we wish to address or change:
  I. Explore changing fire gate next to MP room to by kitchen shed. This will still allow for parking while discouraging parents from driving behind building to access their students.
  II. Continue to enhance painted lines in parking, pick-up, and drop-off areas so that parents and visitors obey traffic flow patterns. (Arrows were repainted.)
  III. Continue exploring playground upgrades and equipment enhancements which will allow for more students to be engaged at recess
  IV. Extend cyclone fence parallel to the bike trail and the end of the school property.
  V. Establish parent waiting area in the front of the school at the end of the school day.
  VI. Place signage at student restrooms indicating, "For student use only".

Date Developed by School Site Council: __December 19, 2012__

Comprehensive School Safety Plan 2012-2013

Data Summary and Analysis

Sierra School
School Site

List Data Sources Reviewed and How the Data Determined Goals: (surveys, focus groups, discipline and attendance records) Monthly referral charts; monthly Schools Insurance Authority (SIA) safety checklist; S.L.I.P. Parent Survey results; formal and informal input from staff, parents, and students
Areas of Pride and Strength (school programs and practices that promote a positive learning environment) F.A.M.E.; *P.A.L.S.*; Morning Stretch; *Sparky Program-* Positive Action Assemblies; Kindergarten Round-Up; *Flexible Reading Program*; Dragon Tag Incentive- PATS on the Back; *Student Helpers* in the cafeteria and office; Spirit Day every Friday; *Right Start*; School wide Positive Discipline program (colored card or point system*); Parent Club Sponsored Activities and Events* (Box Top Program, Movie Nights, Walk-A-Thon); Buddy Reading Across the grade levels; *MAC Land program*; 4/5 Academy; *Links with other agencies*: Federated Church, Ponderosa HS Interact Club; Boys and Girls Club; Library sponsored programs/events: Birthday Book club, special Reading events, Read to the Roof Challenge, California Young Readers Medal Program, Six Flags-Read to Success, Bookmobile visits; *English Language Advisory Committee events*; Practice Drills Monthly; *School Performances*/Students up on the Stage; School wide radios/walkie-talkies; *Team Teaching* and Professional Learning Communities; grade level team planning; *Accelerated Reader*; Peacemakers Program, *clearly marked "safe zones" for ingress and egress routes*; additional handicapped parking spaces added; *Use of technology in the classrooms*: netbooks, school wide wireless, Mobi-Boards, iPads for instruction, teacher research and some student use; Extended Learning Opportunities: Early Birds, ASES/Power Hour, Enrichment classes; School Based Coordinated Programs; Principal for A Day; Gifted and Talented Education (G.A.T.E.) program; Oral Interpretation festival; Cross Country Team; Anti-Bully Pledge.
Areas we wish to address or change: I.   People are creating additional parking spaces along the entrance to the Federated Church driveway. Explore painting "No parking zone" in red across the driveway or placing cones there during pick up time. II.   When students walk from the Federated Church parking to Sierra School through the District Office parking lot, the walkway along the drive way is very narrow. Explore putting in a fence along the driveway so there is a barrier between the cars and the students. III.   Can a crosswalk be placed on Thompson Way from the Federated Church parking lot to the D.O. driveway?

Date Developed by School Site Council: March 21, 2013

Comprehensive School Safety Plan 2012 - 2013

Data Summary and Analysis

Markham School
School Site

List Data Sources Reviewed and How the Data Determined Goals: (surveys, focus groups, discipline and attendance records) Informal and formal discussions with parents, staff and administration; Grade Level and Subject Area Team meetings; General staff meetings; annual SLIP Parent survey results
Areas of Pride and Strength (school programs and practices that promote a positive learning environment) Accelerated Reader (AR); AR incorporated into homeroom classes; afterschool homework club in library; In-house Student Support Center; Academic Grace program; Afterschool math tutoring; school facilities and appearance; Leadership activities; homeroom activities; sports; Academic/Co-Curricular activities (Science Fair, Geography Bee, Spelling Bee, Oral Interpretation, Outdoor Education field trips); Builder's Club; Extracurricular Activities; band program; C.J.S.F.; Art elective; Winter Arts Festival; Multi-Cultural Event/Health Fair; Markham Talent Show; the number of student recognition awards given for academic achievement has increased; Safe School Ambassadors program; very supportive Parent Club; Parent and Community volunteers who provide supervision and coaching and Student vs. Staff sports events (competitions).

Areas we wish to address or change:
  I. Repair holes in the cyclone fence surrounding the school field.
  II. Something needs to be done about the planter box in the quad area. It serves no purpose since it does not have a water source. Students run along the ledge and it turns muddy when it rains which presents a safety issue.
  III. Many classrooms lack signage indicating its room number. Some buildings are numbers and some are letters: need a uniform numbering or letter system for classrooms and buildings.

Date Developed by School Site Council: December 13, 2012