

Potter Valley High 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)

School Contact Information	
School Name	Potter Valley High School
Street	10401 Main St.
City, State, Zip	Potter Valley CA, 95469
Phone Number	(707) 743-1142
Principal	Mindi Juszcak
E-mail Address	mjuszcak@mcoe.us
Web Site	
CDS Code	23-73866-2330041

District Contact Information	
District Name	Potter Valley Community Unified School District
Phone Number	(707) 743-2101
Superintendent	Damon Dickinson
E-mail Address	damon@mcoe.us
Web Site	www.pottervalleyschools.us

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

Potter Valley Community Unified School District was born out of a community commitment to local education. Once a part of Ukiah Unified Schools, community members came together in the late 1970's to fight for the right to form our own school district under local control. This dream became a reality in 1977-1978 when Potter Valley officially de-unified from Ukiah and formed Potter Valley Community Unified School District.

After over 39 years of operation, Potter Valley continues to proudly provide a high quality, local education for students, preschool through 12th grade.

We pride ourselves in providing a uniquely relational approach to education in contrast to the big-box schools that struggle to keep students from becoming a face in the crowd. As state and federal mandates and increased governmental intrusion place greater emphasis on data driven decision making and increased focus on student performance measured by high-stakes testing, the students, parents, and staff at Potter Valley Elementary School have committed themselves to making the necessary adjustments to meet these demands, but also to remain true to our roots and keep the best interest of students at the center of everything we do. Our motto, "Potter Valley Schools, a family rather than a factory approach to education," expresses this focus, and inspires all stakeholders to work hard to maintain a school where "Community" is more than just a word in our district name; it is a description of how we approach education.

For questions about our schools contact the school offices. Elementary Office 707-743-1115 Jr./Sr. High Office 707-743-1142

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

Grade Level	Number of Students
Grade 9	23
Grade 10	19
Grade 11	18
Grade 12	22
Total Enrollment	82

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2015-16)

Student Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	0
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.4
Asian	0
Filipino	0
Hispanic or Latino	24.4
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0
White	72
Two or More Races	1.2
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	65.9
English Learners	6.1
Students with Disabilities	7.3
Foster Youth	3.7

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	9.3	8.2	6.53	16.33
Without Full Credential	2	0	1	3
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
This School	100.0	0.0
All Schools in District	100.0	0.0
High-Poverty Schools in District	100.0	0.0
Low-Poverty Schools in District	0.0	0.0

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: September, 2015

The District is currently researching curriculum that is aligned with the Common Core Standards

Subject	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
Reading/Language Arts	Holt Language Arts 9, Holt Rinehart Winston - 2004 Holt Language Arts 10, Holt Rinehart Winston - 2004 Holt Language Arts 11, Holt Rinehart Winston - 2004 Holt Language Arts 12, Holt Rinehart Winston - 2004	Yes	0
Mathematics	Discovering Geometry, Key Curriculum Press - 2003 Algebra 1, McDougal Littell Algebra 2, McDougal Littell CPM, 2011 Mathematics for Business, Glencoe Adopted 2011 Algebra 3, Saxon Copyright 1985 Single Variable Calculus Concepts and Context, Brooks/Coll Copyright 2001	Yes	0
Science	Health, Glenco - 2003 Biology, Dynamics of Life, Glenco - 2000 EarthComm It's About Time - 2011 Chemistry, Visualizing Matter, Holt Rinehart Winston - 2000	Yes	0
History-Social Science	Modern World History, McDougal Littell - 2006 The Americans, McDougal Littell - 2006 American Government, Great Source - 2002 Economics, Paradigm - 2010	Yes	0
Foreign Language	Glenco McGraw Hill Buen Viaje-2008	Yes	0
Health	Health, Glencoe Copyright 2003, Adopted 2003	Yes	0
Visual and Performing Arts	Scripts vary		0

Subject	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
Science Laboratory Equipment (grades 9-12)	Biology, Glenco, Copyright 2011, Adopted 2011 Chemistry Visualizing Matter, Holdt, Rinehart Winston, Copyright 2000, Adopted 2000 Conceptual Physics, Scott Foresman, Copyright 2000, Adopted 200 Applied Anatomy & Physiology, Paradigm, Copyright 2008, Adopted 2009	Yes	0

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

The Elementary School was constructed in the 1950's and the Junior/Senior High School was built in 1981. The gymnasium, built in the 1950's is used by the Elementary, Junior High and Senior High schools. The stage was re-purposed in 2009 and transformed into a weight training facility that can be monitored while other activities are supervised in the gym.

School buildings and grounds are generally in good repair and students and staff work together to keep them clean and maintained. Students in our landscaping class do upkeep of lawns and flower beds and also construct various landscape projects annually.

Recent facilities improvements included re-roofing several buildings in the district, resurfacing the gym floor, removing trees that were causing damage to structures or sidewalks, and installing a back-up water storage system.

Routine site inspections are performed monthly by maintenance staff. The latest report showed no safety issues and several items in need of repair. Safety inspections are performed at least annually by the district's insurance company with the guidance and cooperation of our maintenance staff.

In the 2012-13 School Year the District has contracted Alameida Architecture to prepare a Facility Assessment and Master Plan. A copy of this plan is available on the district web-site.

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: February 5, 2016				
System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	X			
Interior: Interior Surfaces	X			
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	X			
Electrical: Electrical	X			
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	X			
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	X			
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	X			
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	X			

Overall Facility Rating (Most Recent Year)

Year and month of the most recent FIT report: February 5, 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
English Language Arts/Literacy		44	30	31	44	48
Mathematics		13	17	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
All Students	11	19	16	84.2	43.8
Female	11	13	12	92.3	50.0
White	11	15	12	80.0	41.7
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	11	11	9	81.8	33.3

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
All Students	11	19	16	84.2	12.5
Female	11	13	12	92.3	16.7
White	11	15	12	80.0	16.7
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	11	11	9	81.8	11.1

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)	38	50	47	34	55	50	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	20	17	85.0	47.1
Male	15	13	86.7	38.5
White	13	12	92.3	50.0
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	14	12	85.7	25.0

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.

Career Technical Education Programs (School Year 2015-16)

Potter Valley Schools have a rich tradition of providing high quality CTE courses. The seven period day provides all students the opportunity to take CTE courses, even if they are pursuing extra academic course work. We currently offer a broad spectrum of agricultural courses. Students are encouraged to attend a variety of career exploration events and the school hosts presentations by several vocational training and technical institutes. Several of our graduates have gone on to attend technical or career schools after high school.

Current CTE Courses include: Introduction to Agriculture, Agricultural Mechanics (including welding), Agricultural Applications in Farming, Landscaping, Woodworking.

Additionally the school works in partnership with the Mendocino County Office of Education to provide special education students with in-depth career and vocational exploration and experience through the Workability program. This includes career aptitude and interest exploration and formal job shadows or internships.

Career Technical Education Participation (School Year 2015-16)

Measure	CTE Program Participation
Number of pupils participating in CTE	19
% of pupils completing a CTE program and earning a high school diploma	25%
% of CTE courses sequenced or articulated between the school and institutions of postsecondary education	100%

Courses for University of California (UC) and/or California State University (CSU) Admission

UC/CSU Course Measure	Percent
2015-16 Pupils Enrolled in Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission	100
2014-15 Graduates Who Completed All Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission	17.7

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
9	31.2	31.2	12.5

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 are a vital part of our school and have many opportunities to be involved. We include parents in many decisions through participation in the School Site Council, community meetings, Athletic Boosters, field trips, fund raising events, and parent committees. Our active School Site Council has important responsibilities in the ongoing development and implementations of the Local Control Accountability Plan. Additionally, parents are welcomed in classrooms to assist with special projects and are utilized as chaperones on field trips. School administrators welcome parent phone calls and are readily available to meet with parents to discuss concerns or take input on school programs or projects.

Parents interested in meeting with teachers or administrators are encouraged to call the high school office at 707-743-1142 and speak with principal, Mindi Juszczak. Additionally, parent input is gathered for programs such as Title I, English Language Learners, and Special Education.

State Priority: Pupil Engagement

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Pupil Engagement State Priority (Priority 5):

- High school dropout rates; and
- High school graduation rates.

Dropout Rate and Graduation Rate (Four-Year Cohort Rate)

Indicator	School			District			State		
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Dropout Rate	3.80	0.00	15.00	7.10	0.00	14.30	11.40	11.50	10.70
Graduation Rate	92.31	95.24	80.00	89.29	95.45	80.95	80.44	80.95	82.27

Completion of High School Graduation Requirements - Graduating Class of 2015 (One-Year Rate)

Group	Graduating Class of 2015		
	School	District	State
All Students	89	90	86
Black or African American	0	0	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	100	100	78
Asian	0	0	93
Filipino	0	0	93
Hispanic or Latino	100	100	83
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0	85
White	75	77	91
Two or More Races	0	0	89
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	0	0	66
English Learners	100	100	54
Students with Disabilities	83	85	78

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
Suspensions	1.1	10.7	18.0	5.3	7.5	8.4	4.4	3.8	3.7
Expulsions	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1

School Safety Plan (School Year 2016-17)

The Comprehensive School Safety Plan was originally adopted in 1998. Since that time this plan has been used as a reference to guide board policy, administrative regulations, and site level planning and procedures.

Safety concerns are addressed weekly at Maintenance Operations Transportation and Safety Committee meetings. Concerns regarding safety, including those related to student behavior are addressed immediately. Students participate in fire, earthquake and lock-down 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
Program Improvement Status		Not In PI
First Year of Program Improvement		
Year in Program Improvement*		
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	1
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	100.0

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

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)

Subject	2013-14				2014-15				2015-16			
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms		
		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+
English	7	12	1		8	9			8	9		
Mathematics	7	12			8	9			8	9		
Science	16	3	1		8	8			8	8		
Social Science	11	6			19	3			19	3		

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

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	0.5	82
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	0	N/A
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	0	N/A
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0	N/A
Psychologist	0.2	N/A
Social Worker	0	N/A
Nurse	0.1	N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	0.1	N/A
Resource Specialist	.5	N/A
Other	0	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	\$11,727	\$1,807	\$9,920	\$48,962
District	N/A	N/A	\$4,606	\$49,572
Percent Difference: School Site and District	N/A	N/A	115.4	-4.1
State	N/A	N/A	\$5,677	\$60,705
Percent Difference: School Site and State	N/A	N/A	70.2	-21.9

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

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2015-16)

Categorical Funding Sources have restricted uses, but support the school in the mission of equitable services to all students.

Categorical funds are used in facilitating the development of the district’s Local Improvement Plan. School staff, school site councils, other site personnel, and advisory committees provide oversight of categorical funds. Advisory Committees, site instructional leaders, and project coordinators oversee the management of the English Learners Program, monitor and provide instructional support to all categorically funded programs under the new NCLB Reauthorization Act, and conduct needs assessments. The superintendent is responsible for monitoring the site level implementation of categorical programs and acting as a liaison for the district with the federal and state government and county agencies.

After school academic assistance was available to any student that needed help or was referred by a teacher.

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2014-15)

Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$33,000	\$40,430
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$49,016	\$58,909
Highest Teacher Salary	\$66,342	\$77,358
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)		\$94,634
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$89,674	\$97,839
Average Principal Salary (High)	\$89,674	\$100,453
Superintendent Salary	\$40,000	\$123,728
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	32%	32%
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	8%	6%

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

Advanced Placement (AP) Courses (School Year 2015-16)

Subject	Number of AP Courses Offered*	Percent of Students In AP Courses
Computer Science		N/A
English		N/A
Fine and Performing Arts		N/A
Foreign Language		N/A
Mathematics		N/A
Science		N/A
Social Science		N/A
All courses		

Cells with N/A values do not require data.

*Where there are student course enrollments of at least one student.

Professional Development (Most Recent Three Years)

In addition to the 4 days of professional development scheduled before the school year, there are 33 minimum days that are used for professional development. Teachers, administrators, and classified staff, can also participate in professional development outside of the district.