

# Joe Hamilton Elementary School

## School Accountability Report Card

### Reported Using Data from the 2015-16 School Year

#### Published During 2016-17

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

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

#### **DataQuest**

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE DataQuest Web page at <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/> that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district and the county. Specifically, DataQuest is a dynamic system that provides reports for accountability (e.g., test data, enrollment, high school graduates, dropouts, course enrollments, staffing, and data regarding English learners).

#### **Internet Access**

Internet access is available at public libraries and other locations that are publicly accessible (e.g., the California State Library). Access to the Internet at libraries and public locations is generally provided on a first-come, first-served basis. Other use restrictions may include the hours of operation, the length of time that a workstation may be used (depending on availability), the types of software programs available on a workstation, and the ability to print documents.

## **About This School**

#### **Contact Information (School Year 2016-17)**

<b>School Contact Information</b>	
<b>School Name</b>	Joe Hamilton Elementary School
<b>Street</b>	1050 E Street
<b>City, State, Zip</b>	Crescent City, CA 95531
<b>Phone Number</b>	707-464-0330
<b>Principal</b>	Denise Harnden
<b>E-mail Address</b>	dharnden@delnorte.k12.ca.us
<b>Web Site</b>	<a href="https://sites.google.com/a/delnorte.k12.ca.us/joehamilton">https://sites.google.com/a/delnorte.k12.ca.us/joehamilton</a>
<b>CDS Code</b>	08-61820-6005391

<b>District Contact Information</b>	
<b>District Name</b>	Del Norte County Unified School District
<b>Phone Number</b>	707-464-6141
<b>Superintendent</b>	Jeff Harris
<b>E-mail Address</b>	jharris@delnorte.k12.ca.us
<b>Web Site</b>	www.delnorte.k12.ca.us

### **School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2016-17)**

Joe Hamilton School offers students an all-inclusive student based education and is focused on Language Arts, Mathematics, and early intervention for students performing below standards.

The staff of Joe Hamilton School works diligently to improve math and literacy achievement of all students and provides a safe, secure, and friendly learning environment for learning environment. Joe Hamilton School is proud of the diversity of its students and honors all of the cultures that are represented at our school.

We believe....

We believe that students at Joe Hamilton will become literate and responsible members of society who will strive toward their full potential to become independent and self-motivated problem solvers. We appreciate the diversity of our students and we aim to tailor our programs to insure student success. Our purpose is to prepare every student to succeed in an ever-changing world.

We value...

- Education that empowers all students
- Teacher excellence
- A safe and positive learning environment
- Choices in our classrooms
- Parent and community involvement
- Diversity and self esteem
- Lifelong learning

### **Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2015-16)**

<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>
<b>Kindergarten</b>	61
<b>Grade 1</b>	53
<b>Grade 2</b>	48
<b>Grade 3</b>	55
<b>Grade 4</b>	59
<b>Grade 5</b>	59
<b>Total Enrollment</b>	335

### Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2015-16)

Student Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	0.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	15.2
Asian	8.7
Filipino	0
Hispanic or Latino	17.6
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.6
White	50.7
Two or More Races	6.6
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	84.5
English Learners	10.1
Students with Disabilities	16.1
Foster Youth	3.3

## A. Conditions of Learning

### State Priority: Basic

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

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

### Teacher Credentials

Teachers	School			District
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2016-17
With Full Credential	17	17	15	161
Without Full Credential	0	0	1	10
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence (with full credential)	0	0	0	0

### Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

Indicator	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments *	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

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

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

**Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (School Year 2015-16)**

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
<b>This School</b>	100.0	0.0
<b>All Schools in District</b>	99.1	0.9
<b>High-Poverty Schools in District</b>	100.0	0.0
<b>Low-Poverty Schools in District</b>	90.5	9.5

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

**Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2016-17)**

Year and month in which data were collected: October, 2016

Subject	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>	Developmental Studies Center – SIPPS, Making Meaning and Being a Writer	Yes	0
<b>Mathematics</b>	Grades K-2 - Everyday Math - McGraw-Hill - Adopted 2016 Grades 3-5 - My Math - Adopted May 2015	Yes	0
<b>Science</b>	MacMillan/McGraw Hill – Adopted 2007 Glencoe/McGraw Hill – Adopted 2007	Yes	0
<b>History-Social Science</b>	K-5 Pearson/Scott Foresman – Adopted 2006  Pearson/Prentice Hall – Adopted 2006 TCI (as supplemental)	Yes	0

**School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)**

On October 11, 2016, Joe Hamilton Elementary and Grounds were inspected by the CSI General Manager. The report stated that Joe Hamilton was overall in Fair condition. As cited, additional work and maintenance needs to be done to bring the school up to satisfactory condition. Repairs will be made to ensure the safety of students, staff and community members at Joe Hamilton School.

### School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)				
Year and month of the most recent FIT report: October 11, 2016				
System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
<b>Systems:</b> Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	X			
<b>Interior:</b> Interior Surfaces			X	Repairs to be made as needed for safety.
<b>Cleanliness:</b> Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	X			
<b>Electrical:</b> Electrical			X	Repairs to be made as needed for safety.
<b>Restrooms/Fountains:</b> Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	X			
<b>Safety:</b> Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials		X		Repairs to be made as needed for safety.
<b>Structural:</b> Structural Damage, Roofs	X			
<b>External:</b> Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	X			

### Overall Facility Rating (Most Recent Year)

Year and month of the most recent FIT report: October 11, 2016				
Overall Rating	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
				X

## B. Pupil Outcomes

### State Priority: Pupil Achievement

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

- **Statewide assessments** (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress [CAASPP] System, which includes the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for students in the general education population and the California Alternate Assessments [CAAs] for English language arts/literacy [ELA] and mathematics given in grades three through eight and grade eleven. The CAAs have replaced the California Alternate Performance Assessment [CAPA] for ELA and mathematics, which were eliminated in 2015. Only eligible students may participate in the administration of the CAAs. CAA items are aligned with alternate achievement standards, which are linked with the Common Core State Standards [CCSS] for students with significant cognitive disabilities); and
- The percentage of students who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and the California State University, or career technical education sequences or programs of study

### CAASPP Test Results in English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA) and Mathematics for All Students

Subject	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standards (grades 3-8 and 11)					
	School		District		State	
	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16
<b>English Language Arts/Literacy</b>	27	31	34	35	44	48
<b>Mathematics</b>	15	22	23	23	34	36

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

**CAASPP Test Results in ELA by Student Group  
Grades Three through Eight and Grade Eleven (School Year 2015-16)**

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
<b>All Students</b>	<b>3</b>	55	55	100.0	21.8
	<b>4</b>	59	57	96.6	35.1
	<b>5</b>	59	58	98.3	34.5
<b>Male</b>	<b>3</b>	26	26	100.0	30.8
	<b>4</b>	36	35	97.2	31.4
	<b>5</b>	22	21	95.5	33.3
<b>Female</b>	<b>3</b>	29	29	100.0	13.8
	<b>4</b>	23	22	95.7	40.9
	<b>5</b>	37	37	100.0	35.1
<b>American Indian or Alaska Native</b>	<b>4</b>	12	12	100.0	41.7
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	<b>3</b>	13	13	100.0	30.8
<b>White</b>	<b>3</b>	29	29	100.0	24.1
	<b>4</b>	29	27	93.1	25.9
	<b>5</b>	26	25	96.2	36.0
<b>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</b>	<b>3</b>	45	45	100.0	17.8
	<b>4</b>	49	47	95.9	29.8
	<b>5</b>	51	50	98.0	30.0
<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	<b>4</b>	17	17	100.0	5.9
	<b>5</b>	16	15	93.8	13.3

Note: ELA test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The "Percent Met or Exceeded" is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Note: The number of students tested includes all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using only students who received scores.

**CAASPP Test Results in Mathematics by Student Group  
Grades Three through Eight and Grade Eleven (School Year 2015-16)**

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
<b>All Students</b>	<b>3</b>	56	56	100.0	25.0
	<b>4</b>	59	57	96.6	24.6
	<b>5</b>	59	58	98.3	17.2
<b>Male</b>	<b>3</b>	27	27	100.0	33.3
	<b>4</b>	36	35	97.2	31.4
	<b>5</b>	22	21	95.5	14.3

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
Female	3	29	29	100.0	17.2
	4	23	22	95.7	13.6
	5	37	37	100.0	18.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	4	12	12	100.0	8.3
Hispanic or Latino	3	14	14	100.0	21.4
White	3	29	29	100.0	31.0
	4	29	27	93.1	25.9
	5	26	25	96.2	12.0
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	3	46	46	100.0	19.6
	4	49	47	95.9	21.3
	5	51	50	98.0	14.0
Students with Disabilities	4	17	17	100.0	
	5	16	15	93.8	

Note: Mathematics test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The "Percent Met or Exceeded" is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Note: The number of students tested includes all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using only students who received scores.

#### CAASPP Test Results in Science for All Students

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)	29	34	37	51	49	46	60	56	54

Note: Science test results include California Standards Tests (CSTs), California Modified Assessment (CMA), and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) in grades five, eight, and ten.

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

**CAASPP Test Results in Science by Student Group  
Grades Five, Eight, and Ten (School Year 2015-16)**

Student Group	Total Enrollment	# of Students with Valid Scores	% of Students with Valid Scores	% of Students Proficient or Advanced
All Students	59	59	100.0	37.3
Male	22	22	100.0	50.0
Female	37	37	100.0	29.7
White	26	26	100.0	46.2
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	51	51	100.0	35.3
Students with Disabilities	16	16	100.0	43.8

Note: Science test results include CSTs, CMA, and CAPA in grades five, eight, and ten. The “Proficient or Advanced” is calculated by taking the total number of students who scored at Proficient or Advanced on the science assessment divided by the total number of students with valid scores.

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

**State Priority: Other Pupil Outcomes**

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Other Pupil Outcomes State Priority (Priority 8):

- Pupil outcomes in the subject areas of physical education.

**California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2015-16)**

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards
5	13.6	22	15.3

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

**C. Engagement**

**State Priority: Parental Involvement**

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

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

**Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2016-17)**

Parents and the community are very supportive of the educational programs at Joe Hamilton School. The school has an active School Site Council, parents participate in the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO), which assists in planning and implementing school-wide events and rewards students and classrooms for attending school. Parents also participate in the District Advisory Committee (DAC) and the Title VII Advisory Committee. The school benefits from Redwood State and National Parks, The Fifth Grade Mentoring Program, The CAPP Program, Boys and Girls Moving Forward, and the Sunrise Rotary.



## State Priority: School Climate

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

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

### Suspensions and Expulsions

Rate	School			District			State		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
<b>Suspensions</b>	0.0	2.6	2.9	9.8	6.6	6.4	4.4	3.8	3.7
<b>Expulsions</b>	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1

### School Safety Plan (School Year 2016-17)

Joe Hamilton School's Safety plan is updated annually each Fall by the Safety Plan Committee, which is composed of the principal, teachers, parents, and community members, to adhere to the requirements of the "Safe Schools: Planning Guide for Action."

This year we have many new staff members so our Crisis Response Team was updated as well as our Teacher Buddy List. Site Drill Procedures were updated on October 1, 2016 as well as our school map. Fire Drills are practiced monthly. We were participants in the Great American Shakeout on October 20, 2016, at 10:20 am. For the safety of our staff and students we practice fire drills, silent fire drills, earthquake drills, and lockdown drills.

## D. Other SARC Information

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

### Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2016-17)

Indicator	School	District
<b>Program Improvement Status</b>	In PI	In PI
<b>First Year of Program Improvement</b>	2007-2008	2011-2012
<b>Year in Program Improvement*</b>	Year 5	Year 3
<b>Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement</b>	N/A	7
<b>Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement</b>	N/A	63.6

Note: Cells with N/A values do not require data.

### Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)

Grade Level	2013-14				2014-15				2015-16			
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes		
		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+
<b>K</b>	26		2		25		3		21	1	1	
<b>1</b>	25		2		24		1		26		2	
<b>2</b>	23		2		25		2		22		2	
<b>3</b>	23		2		24		2		25		2	
<b>4</b>	23	1	1		19	1	2		25	1	2	
<b>5</b>	17	2	2		22		2		25		2	
<b>Other</b>					14	1			5	3		

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

### Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2015-16)

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor	10%	
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	90%	N/A
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	3%	N/A
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	3%	N/A
Psychologist	17%	N/A
Social Worker		N/A
Nurse	9%	N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	23%	N/A
Resource Specialist	50%	N/A
Other		N/A

Note: Cells with N/A values do not require data.

\*One Full Time Equivalent (FTE) equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time.

### Expenditures per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2014-15)

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Supplemental/ Restricted	Basic/ Unrestricted	
School Site	\$11,983	\$4,683	\$7,300	\$61,512
District	N/A	N/A	\$6,988	\$62,872
Percent Difference: School Site and District	N/A	N/A	4.5	-2.2
State	N/A	N/A	\$5,677	\$67,348
Percent Difference: School Site and State	N/A	N/A	28.6	-8.7

Note: Cells with N/A values do not require data.

### Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2015-16)

Joe Hamilton School receives Title I funding. Money from Title 1 funding helps our students move into the 21st century technological skills and supports instruction in all academic standards.

### Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2014-15)

Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$41,602	\$42,063
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$63,093	\$64,823
Highest Teacher Salary	\$77,384	\$84,821
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	\$92,039	\$101,849
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$89,651	\$107,678
Average Principal Salary (High)	\$112,625	\$115,589
Superintendent Salary	\$152,069	\$169,152
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	33%	35%
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	6%	6%

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

### Professional Development (Most Recent Three Years)

The Del Norte Unified School District provides ongoing professional development opportunities. The major emphasis of our staff development focuses on planning and implementing Common Core Standards, GLAD Strategies, PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports), technology for the 21st Century, SIPPS instruction, Making Meaning, and Being a Writer. Staff meets weekly in PLC grade level groups. Staff meets monthly for ongoing training in ELA, Math, and PBIS strategies. District grade level meetings happen four times a year for ongoing trainings and discussions.