

EL MOLINO HIGH SCHOOL



Focus on Learning Self-Study Report

Joint Process
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
California State Department of Education

Frank Anderson and Doria Trombetta
Co-Principals
Dani Barese and Doria Trombetta
Self-Study Coordinators

7050 Covey Road
Forestville, California 95436
January 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I Student/Community Profile and Supporting Data and Findings	
Community	3
Accreditation History	5
School Purpose and Expected Student Learning Results	5
Status of Student Performance	6
Student Profile	7
Faculty/Staff Profile	13
Financial Profile	16
Student Performance Data	18
Process and Perception Data	42
Self-Study Participants	49
Chapter II Student/Community Profile – Overall Summary from Analysis of Findings	
Implications of the Data with Respect to Student Performance	53
Critical Academic Needs	54
Important Questions Raised by the Analysis of Data	55
Chapter III Progress Report	
Significant Developments since March 2000	57
Implementation and Monitoring of the Schoolwide Action Plan	59
Report on Schoolwide Action Plan Process	62
Chapter IV Self-Study Findings	
Organization: Vision/Purpose, Governance, Leadership/Staff, Resources	82
Standards-based Student Learning: Curriculum	90
Standards-based Student Learning: Instruction	97
Standards-based Student Learning: Assessment and Accountability	104
School Culture and Support for Student Personal and Academic Growth	111
Chapter V Schoolwide Action Plan	
Action Plan #1	122
Action Plan #2	124
Action Plan #3	140
Action Plan #4	143
Action Plan #5	147
Follow-up Process	153
Appendix	
Graduation Requirements	156
2004-2005 Site Budget Allocations	157
2004-2005 School Improvement Plan Budget	162
2005-2006 Site Budget Allocations	163
2005-2006 School Improvement Plan Budget	169
October 2005 CBEDS Report	170
2005-2006 Spring Semester Master Schedule	174
2005-2006 Room Use Chart	196

Chapter I

STUDENT/COMMUNITY PROFILE

Community

El Molino High School is located in western Sonoma County, in the small unincorporated town of Forestville. Our 41-acre campus sits in the heart of a world-renowned wine-producing region. Our geographical location incorporates the best of rural living with the urban amenities afforded by Santa Rosa, located twelve miles from El Molino. El Molino High School serves a geographic area of 60 square miles extending from Sebastopol to Fort Ross, from Santa Rosa to the Pacific Ocean. Towns encompassed by our attendance area include Fort Ross, Cazadero, Graton, Guerneville, Occidental, Monte Rio, and Bodega, as well as parts of Sebastopol and a small section of Santa Rosa. Eighty-five percent of our students commute long distances to school each day. Most students use the school bus service. While long commutes and the availability of transportation sometimes limit participation, a large number of students participate in a variety of athletics and activities.

El Molino students are economically, culturally and socially diverse. Our minority population is approximately 18% of our student body. These students are mainly Hispanic. The majority of our students are from middle income families. However, a number of our students come from affluent families and 23% of our students are enrolled in the Free and Reduced Lunch Program. Politically and socially our students represent families that span the range from conservatism to those practicing alternative lifestyles. We consider this diversity to be one of the strengths of El Molino High School because students from many backgrounds are blended to create an accepting school culture.

Nine schools from nine small elementary school districts send students to El Molino High School. This is both a challenge and a strength. Students begin their freshman year with different educational experiences, both in terms of curricular background and school culture. This diversity of elementary school experience enriches our student body as students come from different educational cultures. Since freshmen come from small schools, they are immediately exposed to a variety of new people and quickly develop new friendships associated with their curricular, social and athletic interests. Throughout their four years at El Molino students are increasingly unified as members of the El Molino freshman, sophomore, junior or senior classes no longer identified by their former school or area. Pride in our school is a community tradition. We have developed a school culture that focuses on academic success, combined with athletic participation, multidimensional student activities and service learning. Several graduates have returned to El Molino as members of the faculty and administration.

Parents and community members support El Molino through their participation in four organizations: Boosters, Site Council, Friends of Music and Project Graduation. Members of each of these organizations work with faculty and staff members to

strengthen curricular and extra curricular programs. Parents also form special groups to accomplish specific goals, the most recent being the El Molino Lights up the Field Committee that successfully raised funds for the purchase and installation of lights for our football field. Parents serve on districtwide committees such as the Budget Advisory Group, the Graduation Requirements Committee, and the Parcel Tax Committee.

Cooperative efforts with the local community have created and continue to support several career path programs, including Culinary Arts, Drafting, Civil Engineering, Electronic Communications, and Agriculture. In 2004-2005 viticulture was added to our school to program with the support of many local businesses. Our career pathways combine academic core and elective classes with career/vocational classes. These programs represent an effort to meet the needs of our students, many of whom concurrently participate in more than one program.

We believe that all students have the right to live and learn in a healthy and safe environment that fosters success. We take pride in our safe, clean and secure campus. We maintain a strictly monitored closed campus. Our Emergency Preparedness Plan was written in collaboration with the Sonoma County Sheriff's Department, the Forestville Fire Department, and the Sonoma County Office of Education. We have high standards for student behavior that we work with parents to achieve. The administrators, counselors and health technician work together to identify students with poor attendance to recognize health or substance abuse problems. Together with parents and community agencies we seek remedies. Our Impact Program (which has been a part of El Molino for over fifteen years) is an early intervention program designed to identify students with emotional, physical, and/or behavioral problems that affect academic, social, and emotional functioning; the program seeks to remove barriers to learning. The Impact core team consists of counselors, administrators, teachers, health, and student services personnel. By focusing on awareness education, prevention, treatment, and positive alternatives, the program helps to increase self-esteem, decision-making skills, and refusal skills to build resiliency in all students. With the leadership of two dedicated teachers, parents have partnered with students and teachers, the personnel from several Sonoma County agencies, local hospital staff members, and the California Highway Patrol to present two Every Fifteen Minutes programs to El Molino students in the past five years.

Accreditation History

This is the eighth time El Molino has been involved in the WASC accreditation process since the founding of the school in 1964. El Molino has been awarded a full term of accreditation in 1968, 1973, 1978, 1984, 1988, 1994, and 2000.

School Purpose and Expected Student Learning Results

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of El Molino High School is to provide a high quality education through which students will gain the confidence, knowledge and skills to maximize potential and achieve lifelong goals.

EXPECTED SCHOOLWIDE LEARNING RESULTS

1. Students will demonstrate appreciation of diversity and show courtesy and respect for others.
 2. Students will make informed judgments and understand and accept responsibility for their actions based on those judgments.
 3. Students will understand the elements and behaviors essential to lifelong social, physical and emotional well being.
 4. Students will practice social skills that will allow them to live as responsible, productive members of society.
 5. Students will set appropriate goals and strive to achieve them.
 6. Students will exhibit independent thinking, problem-solving, analytical, calculation, and data analysis skills.
 7. Students will communicate confidently and clearly in a broad range of situations.
 8. Students will understand the nature of society's institutions.
 9. Students will appreciate the creative process and the arts as a mode of human communication.
 10. Students will work collaboratively as effective team members.
 11. Students will use a variety of technologies to enhance their personal and professional lives.
 12. Students will demonstrate proficient skills and knowledge according to national, state, and local standards.
 13. Students will make informed choices about the transition to future educational and career options.
- (June 2000)

Status of Student Performance

- El Molino is a Targeted Assistance Title 1 School.
- El Molino has met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the past three years. We have met all categories of AYP criteria.
- El Molino has met the Academic Performance Index (API) growth target for two of the past three years. We have tested between 100% and 97% of El Molino students. We met our target in 2002-2003 and 2004-2005, but not in 2003-2004.
- El Molino students have performed above state average on the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) for the past three years. Our current passing rate for the Class of 2007 is lower than that of the Class of 2006. There was a significant decline in the current passing rate for Hispanic students in the Class of 2007, but not for English Learners.
- El Molino's SAT scores have varied over the past three years but have remained above state and national averages. In 2003 our total SAT score was 1096, in 2004 it was 1151, in 2005 this year it was 1090. Each year the math and verbal scores have been balanced. The number of test takers has grown from 83 in 2003 to 90 in 2005.
- El Molino's Advanced Placement (AP) scores have remained consistent. In the past three years, El Molino students have taken AP tests in 24 subjects. Eighteen or more students each year have taken the test in nine academic areas. Other students have participated in independent study with El Molino teachers to prepare for AP tests. The number of AP tests taken by El Molino students grew from 237 in 2003 to 284 in 2004. The number fell to 258 in 2005. In both 2003 and 2004 the percentage of passing scores was approximately 80%. In 2005 the percentage dropped to 77%.

Student Profile

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA:

Number of Students Enrolled					
	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>Total</u>
2002-03	300	278	243	261	1,082
2003-04	302	276	258	248	1,084
2004-05	286	291	262	255	1,094
Fall 2005	256	259	261	263	1,039

Total enrollment remained consistent from the 2002-2003 and 2004-2005 school years. These figures include the Russian River Ramparts (RRR) independent study program. The numbers at RRR have remained relatively steady. Total enrollment fell 56 students in the beginning of the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of Students Enrolled - Nuevo Leon					
	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>Total</u>
2002-03	0	6	7	9	22
2003-04	1	0	14	4	19
2004-05	0	4	3	10	17
Fall 2005	1	8	8	0	17

Enrollment in Nuevo Leon has seen a minor decline since the 2002-2003 school year.

Number of Students Enrolled by Gender 2004-2005					
	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>Total</u>
Male	150	140	137	117	544
Female	132	145	117	109	503
Total	282	285	254	226	1047
Fall 2005					
Male	133	142	122	134	531
Female	123	117	139	129	508
Total	256	259	261	263	1039

Gender-based enrollment figures that show a small majority of male students in our student population.

Number of Students Enrolled by Gender, Nuevo Leon 2004-2005					
	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>Total</u>
Male	0	2	0	8	10
Female	0	2	3	2	7
Total	0	4	3	10	17
Fall 2005					
Male	1	3	5	0	9
Female	0	5	2	0	7
Total	1	8	7	0	16

Nuevo Leon tends to enroll a few more males students than females.

Number of Students Enrolled by Ethnicity								
	African-American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/Latino	Pacific Islander	White not Hispanic	Multiple/No Response
2002-03	13	17	13	4	127	1	900	22
2003-04	13	11	13	2	133	1	866	60
2004-05	15	13	13	2	125	0	850	85
Fall 2005	10	11	6	1	129	1	787	94

Our most populous non-white sub-group is Hispanic/Latino.

Number of Students Enrolled by Ethnicity - Nuevo Leon								
	African-American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/Latino	Pacific Islander	White not Hispanic	Multiple/No Response
2002-03	1	1						20
2003-04	1				2	1	14	1
2004-05	1				3		12	1
Fall 2005					1		14	2

Enrollment figures by ethnicity for Nuevo Leon appear consistent with the enrollment of the El Molino campus.

Number of Students Enrolled by Primary Language								
	English	Spanish	Cantonese	French	German	Punjabi	Other Non-English	Total
2002-03	919	41	0	0	0	1	0	961
2003-04	945	66	1	0	1	1	0	1014
2004-05	1009	76	1	2	2	0	1	1091
Fall 2005	890	85	1	0	2	0	1	979

There has been a very steady increase in the number of students whose primary language is Spanish.

Number of English Learner Students		
	EL Students	
2002-03	56	
2003-04	54	
2004-05	45	LEP Only
Fall 2005	53	LEP Only

In comparing the data of the above chart with the data considering students enrolled by primary language, it would appear that a large percentage of students whose primary language is Spanish are also classified as English Learners. It appears that in 2002-2003 EL students were enrolled from primary language groups other than Spanish.

Number and Percent of EL Students Reclassified						
	2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
	School	District	School	District	School	District
Total EL Eligible	56	126	54	118	50	
# Reclassified	2	9	0	2	7	
% Reclassified	3.6	7	0	1.69	14	

There was a decrease in the percentage of EL students who have been reclassified in 2003-2004, but a rise in 2004-2005.

Number and Percent of Dropouts by Grade Level									
		Grade 9	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 11	Grade 12	Grade 12
		Dropout	Enroll	Dropout	Enroll	Dropout	Enroll	Dropout	Enroll
2002-03	#	1	300	0	278	3	243	8	261
	%	0%		0%		1%		3%	
2003-04	#		286		291		262		255
	%								
2004-05	#	0	256	0	259	1	261	21	263
	%	0%		0%		0%		8%	

The number of students dropping out increases from 9th to 12th grade. However, the number of students who drop out in relation to the grade level enrollment is small.

Number and Percent of Students Receiving Free/Reduced Lunch		
	Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent of Enrollment
2003-04	245	22.6
2004-05	236	21.7
Fall 2005	201	19.4

An average of approximately 21% of our student population qualified for free/reduced lunch the past three years.

Number of Students Participating in Athletics		
	Males	Females
2002-03	316	219
2003-04	320	209
2004-05	341	252
Fall 2005	159	124

There is a consistent imbalance in gender participation in sports, however we do better than California as a whole in the male/female ratio. And although enrollment dropped, participation in athletics increased.

DISCIPLINE:

Number of Students Suspended									
	African American/ Black	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic /Latino	Pacific Islander	White not Hispanic	Multiple/ No Response	Total
2002-03	1	1		1	7		80	1	91
2003-04	4	3			20	1	89	6	123
2004-05					9		43		52

Aside from the spike in the Hispanic/Latino column for the 2003-04 school year the pattern of suspensions mirrors the enrollment figures for the school, with each ethnic group's suspension figures accounting for approximately 4-8% of the population of that ethnic group for the school. These figures include Nuevo Leon students.

Number of Students Suspended					
	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>Total</u>
2002-03	36	25	10	20	91
2003-04	48	36	21	18	123
2004-05	15	15	14	8	52

The spike in suspensions is shown on this chart as well. Students in the 9th and 10th grades seem to be suspended at a higher rate than their upperclassmen peers (with the exception of the 2004-05 year which so far shows a more consistent level of suspensions across grade levels).

Number and Percent of Suspensions and Expulsions, School and District						
	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
	School			District		
# Suspensions	91	123	52			
% Suspensions	11%	18%	5%			
# Expulsions	7	9	5			
% Expulsions	1%	1%	1%			

Given the number of suspensions each year, only a very small percentage of those offenses resulted in expulsions. (1%)
 *The data calculated using end of the year enrollment figures include Nuevo Leon (2002-2003 = 1002 students 2003-20-04 = 998 students 2004-2005 = 1042 students.)

Number of Suspensions Shown by Reason for Suspension

<u>Event</u>	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Caused, attempted to cause, or threatened to cause physical injury; Willfully used force or violence upon the person of another, except in self- defense	20	61	24
Possession of a weapon or dangerous object	3	8	4
Possession of/use of/sales or furnishing of a controlled substance; Offered, arranged or negotiated to sell a controlled substance.	24	47	12
Attempted/committed robbery or extortion.	0	1	0
Attempted/caused damage to school or private property.	0	1	1
Attempted/ stole school property	9	4	0
Committed an obscene act/engaged in habitual profanity/vulgarity.	17	2	2
Possession of / offered arranged/ negotiated to sell paraphernalia.	6	1	5
Disruption of school activities; defiance of authority.	*	28	8
Total	79	153	56

Number of Expulsions Shown by Reason for Expulsion

<u>Event</u>	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Drug/Alcohol	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Possession of a weapon or dangerous object	5	7	3
Drug Sale	1	1	0
Damage to private property	1	0	0
Physical injury / alcohol official	1	0	0
Drug paraphernalia	0	1	1
Total	8	9	4

The spike in suspensions for 2003-2004 was for disruption of school activities and defiance of authority. Most offenses revolve around controlled substances and violence. *This item was not delineated as a single suspendable offense for this year 20(02-2003). These numbers include Nuevo Leon students.

MISCELLANEOUS:

Average Class Size				
Department	Average class size 2002-03	Average class size 2003-04	Average class size 2004-05	Average class size Fall 2005
English (Grade 9)	19.6	21.3	20.8	19.3
English (Grade 10)	28.3	28	33	28.8
English (Grade 11)	31.4	33	29.5	28.9
English (Grade 12)	32	35.3	35.6	29.3
Mathematics	25	25.6	27.4	27.8
Science	29.1	32.3	34.5	32.4
Social Studies	31	32.7	32.7	33.2
Foreign Language	28.1	29.6	30.6	28.0
Fine Arts	32.5	33.3	33.4	36.5
Practical Arts	24.6	28.8	31.3	28.8
Physical Education	44.1	48.3	46.8	48.2

Although class size here seems to remain consistent, it is important to note that many of these figures reflect Class Size Reduction, Title 1, and ROP classes that lower class size for specific programs. Many classes have shown a steady increase in class size over the last 3 years. The Master Schedule by Course and Period yields a more comprehensive picture of class size. Three years ago we started to use Parcel Tax funds to lower class size in the elective areas. The addition of nine sections funded by Parcel Tax has served to lower class size; however, the funds diverted to lower class size are no longer available to support other program needs.

Technology Resources				
	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	Fall 2005
Computers	236	242	246	238
Students per computer	22	22.3	22.4	22.9
Classrooms connected to Internet	48	48	48	48

This chart shows that we have not made any significant changes in our technology resources in the past 3 years

Faculty/Staff Profile

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA:

Number of Staff Members		
	Certificated	Classified
2002-03	57	25
2003-04	55	27
2004-05	54	23
Fall 2005	50	20

There has been a steady decrease in staff members both certificated and classified over the past 3 years.

Education Level of Certificated Staff							
	Doctorate	Master's (+30)	Master's	Bachelor's (+30)	Bachelor	Total Staff	Staff Highly Qualified
2002-03	6	14	6	27	3	56	-
2003-04	5	14	7	26	2	54	-
2004-05	5	12	6	28	2	53	34
Fall 2005	5	10	8	26	2	51	33

This chart shows that the majority of our staff is in the Bachelor's +30 category. Currently, more than half of our staff can be considered "highly qualified."

Number of Teachers by Years of Experience in Education						
	over 35 years	35 to 30 years	29 to 20 years	19 to 10 years	9 to 5 years	4 or less years
2004-05	2	12	14	17	10	2
2005-06	4	8	12	16	6	4

There is a very wide spread concerning staff experience in the district and school.

Support Staff		
	Number	Full Time Equivalent
Counselors (certificated/classified)	3.4	3.0/.40
Library Media	1	1.0
Technology	1	1.0
Health Assistant	1	1.0
Career Advisor	1	.50
Instructional Assistants	6	4.13

We have small support staff. We have reduced from two campus supervisors to none in the past two years.

Teacher Credential Status and Years in Teaching				
	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	Fall 2005
Fully Credentialed	50	49	48	49
Pre/Interns	1	0	0	1
Waivers	1	0	2	0
Total Teachers	52	49	50	50

The majority of our teachers are fully credentialed.

Number of Teachers with CLAD/BCLAD/SDAIE Certification				
	Full Certification	SDAIE	In Training	Total
2002-03	6		unknown	6
2003-04	10		unknown	10
2004-05	14		8	22
Fall 05	14	3	11	28

There has been a steady increase in the number of teachers with CLAD/BCLAD certification, however it would appear half of our total teachers are uncertified.

Number of paraprofessionals who have met/will meet NCLB requirements by 2006			
	Employees	Met	Will Meet
Library Staff	1		1
Career	1	1	
Instructional Assts.	6	6	

By 2006 all of our current paraprofessionals will have met NCLB requirements.

Number of Certificated Staff by Ethnicity									
	African-American/Black	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/Latino	Pacific Islander	White not Hispanic	Multiple/No Response	Total
2002-03					4		51		55
2003-04					4		53		57
2004-05					4		49	1	54
Fall 2005					4		46		50

The vast majority of our staff is white with a small percentage being Hispanic/Latino. The ratio appears to mirror that of the White to Hispanic ratio seen in our student enrollment.

Number of Classified Staff by Ethnicity									
	African-American/Black	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/Latino	Pacific Islander	White not Hispanic	Multiple /No Response	Total
2002-03				1	7		17		25
2003-04				1	7		19		27
2004-05					5		17	1	23
Fall 2005					5		15		20

The same dynamic exists in the classified staff as in the certificated staff with a higher percentage of Hispanic/Latino classified staff members.

Certificated Staff by Gender		
Male		27
Female		27
Total		54

We have an equal amount of male and female certificated staff members.

Classified Staff by Gender		
Male		9
Female		14
Total		23

We have a larger number of female classified staff members than male.

Teachers Teaching Outside of Credential Area		
2002-03		8
2003-04		5
2004-05		5
Fall 2005		5

Only a small percentage of our teachers are teaching outside of their credential area. These teachers are reviewed at the District level and the assignments are approved by the Board of Education.

Financial Profile

Expenditures per ADA		
	District	Average of All Districts in Sonoma County
2002-03	\$7,876	\$6,961
2003-04	\$7,921	\$7,093
2004-05	\$8,184	\$7,376

This chart shows that our district expenditure per ADA were slightly higher than average of all districts in Sonoma County.

Site Budget Unrestricted			
	<u>2003-2004</u>	<u>2004-2005</u>	<u>2005-2006</u>
General Fund Allocation	\$130,730	\$115,750	\$78,525
Lottery	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$18,537
TOTAL	\$145,738	\$130,750	\$97,062
<u>Distribution:</u>			
Maintenance & Operations	\$46,637	\$45,807	\$36,638
Instructional	\$86,661	\$72,213	\$47,690
Athletic/Safety Equipment	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,500
Equipment Replacement (frozen)	\$4,990	\$5,230	\$5,230
TOTAL	\$145,738	\$130,750	\$97,062

District allocations to the site have been reduced each year for the past three years. The small increase in the allocation of lottery funds did not make up for the reduction of the General Fund allocation. El Molino's site allocation in 2005-2006 is 33.3% smaller than in 2003-2004.

Site Budget Parcel Tax			
	<u>2003-2004</u>	<u>2004-2005</u>	<u>2005-2006</u>
Parcel Tax Allocation	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$100,000

We have received \$90,000 in Parcel Tax allocations for many years. This year a new higher Parcel Tax was passed and our allocation increased. For the past three years the funds have all been spent on elective sections to maintain offerings and decrease class size.

Site Budget Restricted			
	<u>2003-2004</u>	<u>2004-2005</u>	<u>2005-2006</u>
3010 Title I Basic Grant	\$126,753	\$140,889	\$152,666
3550 Carl Perkins (VEA)	\$ 21,198	\$ 19,504	\$15,741
4035 NCLB Title II Teacher Quality	\$ 20,395	\$ 23,697	\$22,976
4045 NCLB Title II Technology	\$ 2,138	\$ 2,000	\$1,888
4110 Title V Innovative Strategies	\$ 3,677	\$ 2,367	\$2,459
4203 Title III LEP	\$ 4,168	0	\$3,311
7010 Ag Incentive	\$ 8,730	\$ 8,181	\$7,937
7140 GATE	\$ 8,445	\$ 6,270	\$7,518
7156 Instructional Materials	\$ 42,808	\$ 48,100	\$41,880
7395 School & Library Improvement (Prior years 6296/7265)	\$ 1,702/\$ 46,304	\$ 480/\$ 44,083	\$41,482
TOTAL	\$286,318	\$295,571	\$297,858

While the total number of dollars we receive in unrestricted funds to El Molino has increased slightly over the past three years, the source of these funds has changed. For example, we have received less money in School Improvement and Carl Perkins each year for the past three years. These funds support classroom programs and innovative improvements to program. NCLB Title II Teacher Quality funds have increased. Title I funds have increased and this increase has allowed for program expansion.

Student Performance Data

OUTCOME DATA:

Graduation Rate			
School Year	Number in Senior Class	Number of Graduates	Percent Graduating
2002-03	261	255	98
2003-04	248	223	90
2004-05	255	231	91

A high percentage of students in the Senior class graduates each year.

Graduation Rate			
Class of	Entering Freshmen	Graduating Seniors	% of Class
2003	272	255	94
2004	308	223	72
2005	250	231	92

These figures indicate the number of students who graduated from El Molino High School. Students who left El Molino usually move to another school district from which the majority presumably graduate.

Number of Students Meeting University of California A-G Requirements									
	African-American/Black	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/Latino	Pacific Islander	White not Hispanic	Multiple/No Response	Total
2002-03	1	0	4	0	3	0	48	0	56
2003-04	0	0	1	2	5	0	49	0	57
2004-05	0	0	0	0	5	0	61	0	66

The number of students meeting UC requirements has risen slightly over the past 3 years. However, when compared to the enrollment figures, it appears that 5% of white students and 2% of Hispanic students met requirements in 2002-2003, 6% of white students and 4% of Hispanic students in 2003-2004, and 7% of white students and 4% of Hispanic students in 2004-2005.

Number of Students Enrolled in Algebra I					
	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	Total
2002-03	121	26	10	2	159
2003-04	133	51	13	21	218
2004-05	122	58	26	41	247
Fall 2005	161	85	57	25	328

Enrollment in Algebra 1 has risen significantly over the past 3 years, most significantly in 12th grade. This is due to the requirement that all students pass algebra to graduate from high school. The information indicates that after 2004-2005 (the first year seniors knew that they had to pass Algebra to graduate) students are enrolling in Algebra earlier in their high school careers.

Number of AP Passing Scores (3, 4, and 5)

	2002-2003		2003-2004		2004-2005	
	# of students taking test	# of students with passing scores	# of students taking test	# of students with passing scores	<i># of students taking test</i>	# of students with passing scores
Biology	35	27	21	13	32	23
Calculus AB	25	23	25	23	28	24
Calculus BC	5	5	9	8	6	4
Chemistry	--	--	18	7	18	7
Comp Sci A	3	2	1	0	1	1
Comp Sci AB	--	--	4	3	--	--
Econ - Mac	1	1	7	1	--	--
Econ - Mic	1	1	2	2	--	--
Engl/Lang Comp	23	23	26	20	22	19
Eng/Lit Comp	28	18	34	31	32	27
Env. Science	1	1	--	--	--	--
European Hist.	3	3	3	2	3	2
French Lang.	11	9	5	3	5	5
French Lit.	--	--	1	1	--	--
Gov't & Pol US	28	25	30	24	26	23
Physics B	20	18	10	10	15	8
Physics C-E&M	--	--	11	10	--	--
Physics C-Mech	--	--	13	18	3	3
Psychology	--	--	6	5	11	10
Span. Lang.	13	7	19	18	16	10
Statistics	2	2	6	5	3	2
Studio Art-Draw	3	3	1	0	1	1
Studio Art-Design	1	1	1	1	4	3
US History	34	23	31	23	32	27
Total	237	192	284	228	258	199

The number of students taking AP tests had risen for several and then fell last year. Since the number enrolled has dropped, this may signal a more realistic enrollment protocol. The percentage of passing scores based on number of students taking tests has remained consistent at about approximately 80.

Advanced Placement Enrollment and Testing Participation

	# Enrolled in AP classes (duplicated count)	# Exams Taken	Percent Tested
2002-03	506	237	47%
2003--04	504	284	56%
2004-05	339	258	76%

The number of students enrolled in AP courses who take the AP exams for those courses has risen significantly in the past three years.

College SAT Scores for 2003

	Total	Gender	
		Male	Female
# Test Takers	83	37	46
Average Verbal Score		545	
Average Math Score		551	

College SAT Scores for 2004

	Total	Gender	
		Male	Female
# Test Takers	88	43	45
Average Verbal Score		573	
Average Math Score		578	

College SAT Scores for 2005

	Total	Gender	
		Male	Female
# Test Takers	90	38	52
Average Verbal Score		542	
Average Math Score		548	

The number of SAT test takers is fairly equal in gender. Our Average Verbal and Math scores rose by about 30 points in each category for 2004, but dropped by about the same amount in 2005. It also shows that a small percentage of our total student population take the SAT. This may be because of the large numbers of student who enroll in the Santa Rosa Junior College.

Achievement for Title 1 Students (Reading/Language Arts), 2002-2003

9th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	52	24	13	54
Females	25	10	7	70
Males	27	14	7	50
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	1	0	0
Asian / Pacific Islander	1	1	1	100
Hispanic	18	6	2	33
Black	2	1	1	100
White	30	15	9	60
English Learners	15	3	2	67
Migrant	10	3	1	33
RSP, Learning Disability	17	9	3	33
Physical Disability	3	2	1	50
Economic Disadvantage	28	18	10	56

In 2002-2003 female students achieved in Language Arts at a 20% higher rate than males in Title 1 in the 9th grade. English Learners who were not migrant student out performed white students. (Additional comments follow the next chart.)

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Mathematics)
2002-2003**

9th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	52	24	14	58
Females	25	15	8	53
Males	27	9	6	67
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	1	1	100
Asian / Pacific Islander	1	1	1	100
Hispanic	18	9	7	78
Black	2	-	-	-
White	30	13	5	38
English Learners	15	7	5	71
Migrant	10	6	5	83
RSP, Learning Disability	17	9	5	56
Physical Disability	3	3	2	67
Economic Disadvantage	28	16	11	69

In 2002-2003 in mathematics in 9th grade Title 1, male students outperform females by approximately 15%. Hispanics outperformed whites by approximately 40%. This would appear to suggest that while EL status is a factor in the language test, it is not in the mathematics test. Migrant students scored very low on the language test, but scored considerably higher in mathematics; English Learners scored well on both tests. It is unclear what accounts for the underperformance of White students in mathematics.

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Reading/Language Arts)
2002-2003**

10th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	27	19	6	32
Females	10	5	1	20
Males	17	14	5	36
American Indian or Alaskan Native	-	-	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	11	5	1	20
Black	-	-	-	-
White	16	14	5	36
English Learners	9	3	1	33
Migrant	6	2	1	50
RSP, Learning Disability	11	10	3	30
Physical Disability	-	-	-	-
Economic Disadvantage	8	4	2	50

In 10th grade Title 1 Language, Male students outperformed females by 16%. Migrant students performed better in 10th grade than in 9th, while Hispanic and white achievement percentages dropped.

Achievement for Title 1 Students (Mathematics) 2002-2003				
10th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	27	5	5	100
Females	10	5	5	100
Males	17	-	-	-
American Indian or Alaskan Native	-	-	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	11	4	4	100
Black	-	-	-	-
White	16	1	1	100
English Learners	9	4	4	100
Migrant	6	3	3	100
RSP, Learning Disability	11	1	1	100
Physical Disability	-	-	-	-
Economic Disadvantage	8	3	3	100

All Title 1 students met or exceeded grade level standards in 10th grade.

Achievement for Title 1 Students (Reading/Language Arts) 2002-2003				
11th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	20	12	7	58
Females	5	2	1	50
Males	15	10	6	60
American Indian or Alaskan Native	-	-	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	6	1	0	0
Black	-	-	-	-
White	14	11	7	64
English Learners	9	1	0	0
Migrant	6	1	0	0
RSP, Learning Disability	11	8	5	63
Physical Disability	1	1	1	100
Economic Disadvantage	8	4	2	50

In 11th grade, male students again out performed females, this time by 10%. However, there was a significant drop in the number of female students served.

Achievement for Title 1 Students (Mathematics) 2002-2003				
11th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	20	3	3	100
Females	5	2	2	100
Males	15	1	1	100
American Indian or Alaskan Native	-	-	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	6	3	3	100
Black	-	-	-	-
White	14	-	-	-
English Learners	9	3	3	100
Migrant	6	3	3	100
RSP, Learning Disability	11	-	-	-
Physical Disability	1	-	-	-
Economic Disadvantage	8	3	3	100

The three 11th grade Title 1 mathematics students meet or exceeded grade level standards.

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Reading/Language Arts)
2003-2004**

9th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	62	35	29	83
Females	27	13	12	92
Males	15	22	17	77
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	1	1	100
Asian / Pacific Islander	0	-	-	-
Hispanic	13	2	1	50
Black	1	1	1	100
White	46	31	26	84
English Learners	10	2	2	100
Migrant	2	-	-	-
RSP, Learning Disability	19	13	9	69
Physical Disability	2	2	2	100
Economic Disadvantage	15	10	5	50

A high percentage of 9th grade Title I students met or exceeded grade level standards in Reading/Language Arts (83%). Females out-performed males by 15%. the economically disadvantaged category showed a significant number of students (50%) not meeting or exceeding grade level standards.

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Mathematics)
2003-2004**

9 th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	62	28	20	71
Females	27	14	9	64
Males	15	14	11	79
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	2	1	50
Asian / Pacific Islander	0	-	-	-
Hispanic	13	7	4	57
Black	1	-	-	-
White	46	19	15	79
English Learners	10	6	2	33
Migrant	2	2	1	50
RSP, Learning Disability	19	2	2	100
Physical Disability	2	2	2	100
Economic Disadvantage	15	8	3	38

A high percentage of 9th grade Title I students met or exceeded grade level standards in Math (71%). Males out-performed females by 15%. The largest group meeting or exceeding math standards were the "white" students (79%) and the lowest were the English Learners (33%).

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Reading/Language Arts)
2003-2004**

10th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	37	20	9	45
Females	14	7	4	57
Males	23	13	6	46
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	1	1	100
Asian / Pacific Islander	2	-	-	-
Hispanic	18	7	4	57
Black	2	2	0	0
White	14	10	6	60
English Learners	14	3	3	100
Migrant	6	-	-	-
RSP, Learning Disability	8	5	2	40
Physical Disability	1	1	0	0
Economic Disadvantage	22	12	7	58

A low percentage of 10th grade Title I students met or exceeded grade level standards in Reading/Language Arts (45%). Females out-performed males by 11%. All English Learners tested met or exceeded grade level standards. The economically disadvantaged showed slightly higher percentages passed (58%).

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Mathematics)
2003-2004**

10th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	37	6	4	67
Females	14	4	3	75
Males	23	2	1	50
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	-	-	100
Asian / Pacific Islander	2	-	-	-
Hispanic	18	6	4	67
Black	2	-	-	-
White	14	1	1	100
English Learners	14	5	3	60
Migrant	6	4	2	50
RSP, Learning Disability	8	2	1	50
Physical Disability	1	-	-	-
Economic Disadvantage	22	4	2	50

A high percentage of 10th grade Title I students met or exceeded grade level standards in Math (67%). Females out-performed males by 25%. Hispanic (67%) and English Learners (60%) showed the most gains.

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Reading/Language Arts)
2003-2004**

11 th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	25	15	9	60
Females	6	2	2	100
Males	19	13	7	54
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	-	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	0	-	-	-
Hispanic	7	3	3	100
Black	0	-	-	-
White	18	12	6	58
English Learners	6	3	3	100
Migrant	3	-	-	-
RSP, Learning Disability	10	4	2	50
Physical Disability	1	1	0	0
Economic Disadvantage	5	3	3	100

A high percentage of 11th grade Title I students met or exceeded grade level standards in Reading/Language Arts (60 %). Females out-performed males by 46%. Hispanics, English Learners and Economically Disadvantaged did very well (100%).

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Mathematics)
2003-2004**

11th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	26	4	100	83
Females	6	3	1	33
Males	19	1	1	100
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	-	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	0	-	-	-
Hispanic	7	3	1	33
Black	1	1	1	100
White	18	1	1	100
English Learners	6	3	1	33
Migrant	2	-	-	-
RSP, Learning Disability	10	-	-	-
Physical Disability	1	-	-	-
Economic Disadvantage	5	2	2	100

A high percentage of 11th grade Title I students met or exceeded grade level standards in Math (83%). The economically disadvantaged did very well (100%).

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Reading/Language Arts)
2003-2004**

12 th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	5	2	2	100
Females	4	2	2	100
Males	1	-	-	-
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	-	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	0	-	-	-
Hispanic	5	2	2	100
Black	0	-	-	-
White	0	-	-	-
English Learners	5	2	2	100
Migrant	4	1	1	100
RSP, Learning Disability	0	-	-	-
Physical Disability	0	-	-	-
Economic Disadvantage	5	2	2	100

All 12th grade Title I students evaluated met or exceeded grade level standards in Reading/Language Arts in all categories.

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Mathematics)
2003-2004**

12 th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	5	3	2	67
Females	4	2	2	100
Males	1	1	0	0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	-	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	0	-	-	-
Hispanic	5	3	2	67
Black	0	-	-	-
White	18	12	6	58
English Learners	5	3	2	67
Migrant	4	3	2	67
RSP, Learning Disability	0	-	-	-
Physical Disability	0	-	-	-
Economic Disadvantage	5	3	2	67

All categories showed positive rates of meeting or exceeding standards.

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Reading/Language Arts)
2004-2005**

9 th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	52	26	20	80
Females	21	13	11	85
Males	31	13	9	69
American Indian or Alaskan Native	-	-	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	14	7	4	57
Black	2	2	1	50
White	36	17	13	76
English Learners	10	4	4	100
Migrant	2	2	1	50
RSP, Learning Disability	18	9	5	56
Physical Disability	1	-	-	-
Economic Disadvantage	20	10	6	60

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Mathematics)
2003-2004**

9 th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	52	24	15	63
Females	21	15	11	73
Males	31	9	4	44
American Indian or Alaskan Native	-	-	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	14	8	6	75
Black	2	-	-	-
White	36	16	12	75
English Learners	10	6	3	50
Migrant	2	1	0	0
RSP, Learning Disability	18	6	4	67
Physical Disability	1	1	1	100
Economic Disadvantage	29	10	5	5

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Reading/Language Arts)
2004-2005**

10 th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	34	23	22	96
Females	14	8	7	88
Males	20	15	14	93
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	2	2	100
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	9	4	3	75
Black	-	-	-	-
White	23	17	17	100
English Learners	7	4	3	75
Migrant	3	2	1	50
RSP, Learning Disability	9	2	1	50
Physical Disability	-	-	-	-
Economic Disadvantage	10	7	6	85

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Mathematics)
2003-2004**

10 th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	34	7	2	29
Females	14	3	1	33
Males	20	4	1	25
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	1	0	0
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	9	4	2	50
Black	-	-	-	-
White	23	2	0	0
English Learners	7	3	1	33
Migrant	3	1	1	100
RSP, Learning Disability	9	2	1	50
Physical Disability	-	1	-	-
Economic Disadvantage	10	4	2	50

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Reading/Language Arts)
2004-2005**

11 th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	19	14	11	79
Females	6	4	4	100
Males	13	10	7	70
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	1	0	0
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	7	6	5	83
Black	-	-	-	-
White	11	7	6	86
English Learners	5	4	3	75
Migrant	2	1	1	100
RSP, Learning Disability	7	7	7	100
Physical Disability	2	2	2	100
Economic Disadvantage	7	6	4	67

**Achievement for Title 1 Students (Mathematics)
2003-2004**

11 th Grade	Total Served	Number Evaluated	Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Percent
ALL	19	1	1	100
Females	6	1	1	100
Males	13	-	-	-
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	-	-	-
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	7	1	1	100
Black	-	-	-	-
White	11	-	-	-
English Learners	5	1	1	100
Migrant	2	1	1	100
RSP, Learning Disability	7	-	-	-
Physical Disability	2	-	-	-
Economic Disadvantage	7	1	1	100

**Physical Fitness Test Results
2004-2005**

Number of students tested:	264		
	<u>within healthy fitness zone</u>	<u>not in healthy fitness zone</u>	
Aerobic Capacity	68.50%	31.50%	
Body Composition	75%	25%	
Abdominal Strength	97%	3%	
Trunk Strength	99%	1%	
Flexibility	84%	16%	
Upper Body Strength	89.50%	10.50%	
	<u>Four or less</u>	<u>Five of six</u>	<u>Six of six</u>
Number of Fitness Standards Achieved:	35%	28%	37%

Sixty-five percent of the students tested met five or six Fitness Standards. Aerobic capacity seems to be the area of greatest student need to improve, followed by body composition.

API / AYP:

State Accountability: Academic Performance Index									
	% students tested	# students tested	API Growth	API Base	Growth Target	Growth	School-wide	Comparable Improvement (CI)	Schoolwide & CI
2002-03	99	696	734	702	5	32	Yes	Yes	Yes
2003-04	97	704	728	739	3	-11	No	No	No
2004-05	100	711	726	722	4	4	Yes	Yes	Yes

We have been successful in testing a high percentage of our students each year. We have made our growth target in two of the past three years. Our API scores and growth has fluctuated between a high of +32 points in 2002-2003 and a low of -11 in 2003-2004. We met our target in 2004-2005 with +4 growth. We are not certain if these scores reflect the talent of students in a particular class, different approaches the administration of the test, changes in population, and/or changes in curriculum and instruction.

**Federal Accountability:
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)**

	Percent Proficient	Participation Rate	API	Graduation Rate
<u>2002-03</u>				
Made AYP:				
English	yes: 64.2%	yes: 96.5%	yes: 734	yes: 94.8%
Mathematics	yes: 62.7%	yes: 95.8%	(+32)	
<i>No numerously significant subgroup population</i>				
<u>2003-04</u>				
Made AYP:				
English	yes: 68.1%	yes: 98%	yes: 728	yes: 93.8%
Mathematics	yes: 69.1%	yes: 97%	(-11)	
<i>No numerously significant subgroup population</i>				
<u>2004-05</u>				
Made AYP:				
English	yes:	yes:	yes: 726	yes:
Mathematics	yes:	yes:	(+4)	
<i>One numerously significant subgroup population: Socio-economically Disadvantaged. The subgroup met the growth target</i>				

El Molino has made AYP each year. In 2004-2005 we had a numerically significant sub-group, Socio-economically Disadvantaged, for the first time.

CST:

Comparison of 2003 - 2006 CST Scores – English Language Arts

	All Students																							
	% in Advanced				% in Proficient				% in Basic				% in Below Basic				% in Far Below Basic				% Not Meeting Standards			
	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06
Grade 9																								
School	26	15	30	---	35	37	31	---	24	30	20	---	9	12	13	---	7	6	7	---	40	48	40	--
State	14	12	20	---	24	25	23	---	31	31	28	---	19	18	19	---	12	14	11	---	62	63	64	--
Grade 10																								
School	16	30	11	---	29	25	21	---	33	19	29	---	14	16	18	---	7	10	21	---	54	45	68	--
State	11	14	14	---	22	21	22	---	30	30	30	---	22	21	19	---	14	14	15	---	66	65	64	--
Grade 11																								
School	24	12	25	---	27	35	28	---	26	25	24	---	13	15	13	---	10	13	15	---	49	53	48	--
State	11	10	13	---	21	22	23	---	29	30	27	---	19	19	17	---	20	19	20	---	68	68	64	--

Our pattern of scores is similar to the state scores, however approximately half of our students are considered by the state as not meeting standards in English Language Arts

Comparison of 2003 - 2006 CST Scores - Social Science
All Students

	% in Advanced				% in Proficient				% in Basic				% in Below Basic				% in Far Below Basic				% Not Meeting Standards			
	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06
Grade 10																								
School	11	15	11	---	21	30	21	---	39	24	29	---	13	13	18	---	16	18	21	---	68	55	68	---
State	10	10	14	---	17	17	23	---	28	28	25	---	17	19	18	---	28	25	20	---	73	72	69	---
Grade 11																								
School	22	15	20	---	27	25	26	---	22	29	26	---	18	18	13	---	11	14	14	---	51	61	53	---
State	12	11	14	---	22	21	23	---	32	32	25	---	21	20	18	---	13	15	20	---	66	67	63	---

In Grade 10 World Civilizations, we have not shown the same growth as have the average students in the state. In Grade 11 United States History El Molino students have scored consistently above the average score for state students but have not shown a steady pattern of growth.

Comparison of 2003 - 2006 CST Scores
All Students Algebra I

	% in Advanced				% in Proficient				% in Basic				% in Below Basic				% in Far Below Basic				% Not Meeting Standards			
	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06
Grade 9																								
School	2	2	2	---	29	23	34	---	49	44	36	---	14	28	18	---	6	4	4	---	69	76	67	---
State	2	1	0	---	17	14	7	---	32	29	29	---	34	43	45	---	15	13	18	---	81	85	92	---
Grade 10																								
School	0	0	0	---	8	6	4	---	35	43	42	---	54	38	51	---	4	13	18	---	93	94	96	---
State	0	0	0	---	8	6	4	---	26	23	24	---	43	52	49	---	22	19	22	---	91	94	95	---
Grade 11																								
School	---	0	0	---	---	6	3	---	---	24	26	---	---	65	43	---	---	6	20	---	0	95	97	---
State	0	0	3	---	6	4	16	---	23	18	30	---	45	55	37	---	25	23	14	---	93	96	96	---

Our pattern of scores is consistent with that of the state. 25% of our 9th graders met standards, far above state average. Poorer results in 10th and 11th grades reflect that fact that most students who do not take Algebra in 9th grade were not at grade level when they entered high school.

Comparison of 2003 - 2006 CST Scores

All Students Mathematics (Summative)

	% in Advanced				% in Proficient				% in Basic				% in Below Basic				% in Far Below Basic				% Not Meeting Standards			
	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06
Grade 9																								
School	--	0	--	---	--	91	--	---	--	9	--	---	--	0	--	---	0	--	---	0	9	--	---	
State	10	31	21	---	9	30	41	---	3	12	24	---	2	6	12	---	76	21	2	---	81	39	39	--
Grade 10																								
School	---	12	33	---	---	24	33	---	---	34	0	---	---	22	33	---	---	7	0	---	0	63	33	--
State	15	21	12	---	26	38	31	---	14	26	28	---	8	12	24	---	37	3	5	---	59	41	57	--
Grade 11																								
School	19	10	7	---	55	38	56	---	13	29	32	---	6	17	5	---	6	6	0	---	25	52	37	--
State	13	11	13	---	31	28	32	---	24	30	27	---	22	26	22	---	9	6	5	---	55	62	54	--

our percentage of students meeting standards is higher than the state percentage in each year in each grade, our scores for 10th graders fell in 2005 while state scores improved. Our 11th grade scores dipped in 2004, but improved in 2005.

Comparison of 2003 - 2006 CST Scores - Biology/Life Sciences

All Students

	% in Advanced				% in Proficient				% in Basic				% in Below Basic				% in Far Below Basic				% Not Meeting Standards			
	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06
Grade 9																								
School	11	11	14	---	43	41	34	---	30	34	37	---	11	10	10	---	4	4	5	---	45	48	52	--
State	15	12	6	---	31	28	21	---	31	38	43	---	14	14	20	---	19	9	10	---	64	61	73	--
Grade 10																								
School	5	8	5	---	36	28	29	---	45	39	43	---	6	16	15	---	8	9	8	---	59	64	66	--
State	8	6	10	---	24	20	20	---	38	43	39	---	19	19	20	---	12	12	11	---	69	74	70	--
Grade 11																								
School	53	26	32	---	37	22	4	---	7	39	44	---	3	9	0	---	0	4	20	---	10	52	64	--
State	13	10	9	---	21	20	23	---	32	38	41	---	19	19	18	---	15	13	9	---	66	70	68	--

About half of 9th and 11th grade students met standards, which is about 20% better than the state average. The highest number of students who rate advanced or proficient are 9th graders. More than half of 10th graders do not meet standards, which is consistent with the state average. In 2005 11th grade STAR scores have declined in the last three years.

Comparison of 2003 - 2006 CST Scores - Chemistry

All Students

	% in Advanced				% in Proficient				% in Basic				% in Below Basic				% in Far Below Basic				% Not Meeting Standards			
	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06
Grade 9																								
School	---				---				---				---				---				---			
State	16	14	---	---	26	27	---	---	36	31	---	---	11	14	---	---	11	14	---	---	58	59	0	---
Grade 10																								
School	2	11	10	---	22	41	27	---	52	34	55	---	18	10	5	---	5	4	3	---	75	48	63	---
State	13	10	9	---	26	26	24	---	41	41	42	---	12	15	17	---	7	9	8	---	60	65	67	---
Grade 11																								
School	0	13	33	---	17	14	28	---	49	52	35	---	11	13	5	---	23	9	0	---	83	74	40	---
State	10	6	6	---	21	17	16	---	42	42	43	---	16	21	22	---	11	14	12	---	69	77	77	---

Scores improved dramatically from 2002-2003 to 2003-2004. However, the scores while the scores continued to improve for 11th grades, they dropped again for 10th graders in 2004-2005. Our scores still exceed the state average.

Comparison of 2003 - 2006 CST Scores - Physics

All Students

	% in Advanced				% in Proficient				% in Basic				% in Below Basic				% in Far Below Basic				% Not Meeting Standards			
	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06
Grade 9																								
School	---				---				---				---				---				---			
State	2	2	---	---	8	9	---	---	32	31	---	---	27	28	---	---	31	30	---	---	90	89	0	---
Grade 10																								
School	*	*	50	---	*	*	50	---	*	*	0	---	*	*	0	---	*	*	0	---	---	---	0	---
State	7	6	8	---	16	16	18	---	33	32	32	---	20	21	19	---	24	25	22	---	77	78	53	---
Grade 11																								
School	24	21	15	---	27	38	53	---	32	29	29	---	11	3	3	---	3	9	0	---	46	41	32	---
State	13	14	12	---	26	27	28	---	38	36	36	---	13	13	14	---	10	10	10	---	61	59	60	---

59% of students are proficient or advanced in Physics, up from 51%. In 2005, ALL 10th graders scored proficient or better. 68% of 11th graders scored advanced or proficient in 2005, up from 59%. This far exceeds the state average.

Because of the importance of the California Standards Test in assessing student performance and success, the data shown in the above comparison is analyzed in two other formats for each California Standards Test: (1) the percentage of students scoring at reported levels by year, and (2) the percentage of students scoring not proficient and proficient by year.

Percent of Students Scoring at Reported Levels on the California Standards Tests, 2005						
		Far Below Basic	Below Basic	Basic	Combined Proficient / Advanced	Total
English-Language Arts						
	Grade 9	7.00%	13.00%	20.00%	61.00%	100%
	Grade 10	21.00%	18.00%	29.00%	32.00%	100%
	Grade 11	15.00%	9.00%	24.00%	53.00%	100%
History-Social Science						
	All					0%
	Grade 9					0%
	Grade 10	21.00%	18.00%	29.00%	32.00%	100%
	Grade 11	14.00%	14.00%	26.00%	46.00%	101%

Percent of Students Scoring at Reported Levels on the California Standards Tests, 2004						
		Far Below Basic	Below Basic	Basic	Combined Proficient / Advanced	Total
English-Language Arts						
	Grade 9	6.00%	12.00%	30.00%	52.00%	100%
	Grade 10	10.00%	16.00%	19.00%	55.00%	100%
	Grade 11	13.00%	15.00%	25.00%	47.00%	100%
History-Social Science						
	Grade 9					0%
	Grade 10	18.00%	13.00%	24.00%	45.00%	100%
	Grade 11	14.00%	18.00%	29.00%	40.00%	101%

Percent of Students Scoring at Reported Levels on the California Standards Tests, 2003						
		Far Below Basic	Below Basic	Basic	Combined Proficient / Advanced	Total
English-Language Arts	Grade 9	7.00%	9.00%	24.00%	61.00%	101%
	Grade 10	7.00%	14.00%	33.00%	45.00%	99%
	Grade 11	10.00%	13.00%	26.00%	51.00%	100%
History-Social Science	Grade 9					0%
	Grade 10	16.00%	13.00%	39.00%	32.00%	100%
	Grade 11	11.00%	18.00%	22.00%	49.00%	100%

Percent of Students Scoring Not Proficient and Proficient on California State Standards Tests				
2004-2005		Combined Total - Far Below Basic/Below Basic/Basic	Combined Total - Proficient/Advanced	Total
English-Language Arts	Grade 9	40	61	100
	Grade 10	68	32	100
	Grade 11	53	48	100
Mathematics (Summative)	Grade 9	--	--	100
	Grade 10	33	66	99
	Grade 11	37	63	100
Algebra I	Grade 9	67	34	101
	Grade 10	96	4	100
	Grade 11	95	3	101
Social Science	Grade 10	68	32	100
	Grade 11	53	46	101

Percent of Students Scoring Not Proficient and Proficient on California State Standards Tests				
2003-2004		Combined Total - Far Below Basic/Below Basic/Basic	Combined Total - Proficient/Advanced	Total
English-Language Arts	Grade 9	48	52	100
	Grade 10	45	55	100
	Grade 11	53	47	100
Mathematics (Summative)	Grade 9	9	91	100
	Grade 10	63	36	100
	Grade 11	80	20	100
Algebra I	Grade 9	76	25	100
	Grade 10	94	6	100
	Grade 11	95	6	100
Social Science	Grade 10	55	45	100
	Grade 11	61	40	100

Percent of Students Scoring Not Proficient and Proficient on California State Standards Tests				
		Combined Total - Far Below Basic/Below Basic/Basic	Combined Total - Proficient/Advanced	Total
English-Language Arts	Grade 9	40	61	100
	Grade 10	54	45	100
	Grade 11	49	51	100
Mathematics (Summative)	Grade 9			0
	Grade 10			0
	Grade 11	25	74	100
Algebra I	Grade 9	69	31	100
	Grade 10	93	8	100
	Grade 11	*	*	*
Social Science	Grade 10	68	32	100
	Grade 11	51	49	100

CAHSEE:

Percent of Students Who Have Passed the California High School Exit Examination in Language Arts			
	<u>Class of 2006</u>	<u>Class of 2007</u>	<u>Class of 2008</u>
	% Passed	% Passed	% Passed
School - All Students	89	79	
Statewide-All Students	75	76	
Gender (School Only)			
Male	85	74	
Female	92	84	
Race/Ethnicity (School Only)			
African American/Black	-		
American Indian/Alaskan Native	-		
Asian	-		
Filipino	-		
Hispanic/Latino	64	50	
Pacific Islander	-		
White not Hispanic	93	87	
Multiple/No Response	-		
Language Fluency (School Only)			
English Only	92	85	
Re-designated FEP	-		
EL	29	27	
Economic Status (School Only)			
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	--	91	
Economically Disadvantaged	-	56	
Unknown	-	63	

A high percentage of students have passed the High School Exit Exam in language arts. This achievement data seems to contradict data from the CST. There was a significant percentage decline for Hispanic population, as a wide disparity between the scores of non-economically and economically disadvantages students.

Percent of Students Who Have Passed the California High School Exit Examination in Mathematics

	Class of 2006	Class of 2007	Class of 2008
	% Passed	% Passed	% Passed
School - All Students	95	80	
Statewide-All Students	74	74	
		Gender (School Only)	
Male	96	82	
Female	95	79	
		Race/Ethnicity (School Only)	
African American/Black	-		
American Indian/Alaskan Native	-		
Asian	-		
Filipino	-		
Hispanic/Latino	90	53	
Pacific Islander	-		
White not Hispanic	97	86	
Multiple/No Response			
		Language Fluency (School Only)	
English Only	96	85	
Re-designated FEP	-		
EL	-	27	
		Economic Status (School Only)	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	--	89	
Economically Disadvantaged	-	62	
Unknown	-	67	

Ninety five percent of our students from the Class of 2006 passed the Exit Exam in mathematics, far higher than the state average. The pass rate fell significantly for the students in the Class of 2007. The scores for both classes again contradict the CST data where students are dramatically underperforming. In mathematics there is no significant gap between white and Hispanic students. There is a large gap between the achievement of non-economically and economically disadvantaged students.

CELDT:

Number and Percent of English Learners by Proficiency Level (CELDT)												
	<u>Advanced</u>		<u>Early Advanced</u>		<u>Intermediate</u>		<u>Early Intermediate</u>		<u>Beginning</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2002-03	9	13	14	20	17	24	14	20	16	23	70	100
2003-04	17	28	4	7	10	17	14	23	15	25	60	100
2004-05	15	30	7	14	10	20	12	24	6	12	50	100

Number and Percent of English Learners by Proficiency Level (CELDT)										
2002-03										
	Grade 9		Grade 10		Grade 11		Grade 12		Total Tested	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Advanced	2	9	1	8	2	13	4	20		9
Early Advanced	5	23	3	23	2	13	4	20		14
Intermediate	7	32	2	15	2	13	6	30		17
Early Intermediate	3	14	0	0	6	40	5	25		14
Beginning	5	23	7	54	3	20	1	5		16
Total	22	100	13	100	15	100	20	100		70

Number and Percent of English Learners by Proficiency Level (CELDT)										
2003-04										
	Grade 9		Grade 10		Grade 11		Grade 12		Total Tested	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Advanced	6	33	4	21	4	25	3	18		17
Early Advanced	4	22	4	21	6	38	0	0		14
Intermediate	1	6	2	11	1	6	6	35		10
Early Intermediate	3	17	4	21	2	13	5	29		14
Beginning	4	22	5	26	3	19	3	18		15
Total	18	100	19	100	16	100	17	100		70

Number and Percent of English Learners by Proficiency Level (CELDT)

2004-05

	Grade 9		Grade 10		Grade 11		Grade 12		Total Tested
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Advanced	1	11	3	25	2	13	6	43	12
Early Advanced	4	44	2	17	4	27	1	7	11
Intermediate	2	18	4	33	3	20	1	7	10
Early Intermediate	1	11	2	17	2	13	1	7	6
Beginning	1	11	2	17	2	13	1	7	6
Total	9	100	12	100	15	100	14	100	50

It is difficult to analyze the meaning of the number and percent of English Learners because of the mobility of the students in this program. The students represented by the numbers in a given year may be the same students as in the previous year, or may be new students. It is clear that the total number of EL students has dropped. This is because the EL program at the other school in our district expanded to meet the needs of more students. As a result, fewer students who live in the attendance area of the other school come to El Molino for EL program support.

Process and Perception Data

Student Survey Results

Curriculum

When analyzing the curriculum at El Molino High School the students found that class sizes ranging from twenty to twenty-five students were most conducive to learning because teachers cannot get around to more than twenty-five students in one class period and any extra number of students may create distractions and additional disruptions. We also found that both the core and elective curricula are successful in helping students to reach their vocational and educational goals; however, it was felt that not all students are able to participate in appropriately rigorous curriculums because only AP and honors classes are particularly challenging. At El Molino, students are disappointed with the lack of communication between students and faculty regarding class placement, and graduation and college entrance standards.

Instruction

In the field of instruction, the students found that although teachers employ a wide variety of resources such as technology in their instruction, students are rarely required to use resources outside of textbooks and lectures to acquire knowledge. It was felt that often teachers and students lack the resources necessary to further their instruction and education. Limited textbooks and computer access in addition to an outdated learning environment hold us back from achieving our full potential. Students felt that homework, particularly in the English and history departments, is not rigorous enough and often feel like busy-work. We also agreed that our teachers rarely return corrected homework within a reasonable time period. Though not well informed of the statewide standards, students felt that the course work in one year left them well prepared for the next. Also, students felt that most of the time, instead of going to faculty and teachers for help, we collaborate with fellow students.

Assessment

When discussing assessment, the students felt that often they were not fairly evaluated in class due to preconceptions regarding a student's ability made by teachers. We also found that although we are strongly encouraged to use assessment results to modify our learning in order to achieve greater success, nearly one third of students didn't take the initiative to actually use the feedback. We were disappointed that school wide assessment results were rarely reported to the entire school community on a regular basis. Overall, students were impressed by the curriculum and assessment presented in all departments, especially in mathematics.

Organization

Students feel safe at El Molino and feel that on campus there is a high degree of school pride and unity. We also have a beautiful campus and are happy with the new lockers. We have a very good and cooperative staff who is interested in the welfare of the students. However, we feel that class size has become a serious threat to the quality of teaching. There are classes where kids sit on the floor, and many teachers don't have

enough time to sufficiently instruct each individual student. Students also feel that they didn't have say in governance and the decision-making of the school but they do not care or have the time in to do so. The staff respects the school and keeps the grounds clean, but most of the students have a problem picking up their trash. El Molino has no graffiti, but the campus is not as clean due to excessive amounts of litter and a lack of custodial support. We are not happy with the starting time, but would rather the hours stay the same than have school let out later. Overall, students are happy with the organization of El Molino.

Culture

When examining the culture at El Molino High School the students found that though we have a college and career center, teachers and staff are reluctant to help us in choosing a path for our futures. Students don't feel that the financial resources available to El Molino are sufficient, but do agree that if in need we can find financial support on campus. We don't feel like the El Molino school culture includes support and high expectations for all students; it is felt that often teachers and administrators "give up" on struggling students. Advanced students, however, feel encouraged and supported by the staff. Students don't feel free to talk to adults at school about personal problems. Many students aren't aware that we have a therapist. However, we are fortunate to have an active and effective peer support program at El Molino. The main protest students have regarding campus culture is the lack

Parent Survey Results

The overall observation of the parent's survey is a high degree of satisfaction with the school, a caring staff, supportive administration, and the positive environment available to all students to succeed. Yet it is not clear that all students are taking advantage of these services and not all parents feel comfortable connecting with the school.

Organization

Positive feedback: Staff and school administration are making a strong effort seen by high scores for staff is caring (81%) and making guidance available (79%). 76% of parents agree that El Molino is a great school. It is hard to get 76% of adults to agree on anything, so that is a strong result and a compliment to the school! 74% agree the campus is clean and the environment is good with 69% of parents agreeing that students have equal opportunity to achieve.

Areas to improve: Class size is a MAJOR issue and one that is recognized as not within local administration's control. Parents don't understand ESLRs (Expected Schoolwide Learning Results) but neither do the students. They are written in vague general terms much like a mission and vision statement for a corporation. 92% of parents are clear on graduation requirements and that is far more critical to their students' time at El Molino. We recommend improving the communications of the mission and ESLRs and suggest a more graphical approach to the targets El Molino is trying to hit in their mission and ESLRs (attached with this report).

Curriculum

Positive feedback: 90% of parents want a class size of 20-25. A high % of staff and students do also. There is strong agreement from parents that El Molino provides solid curriculum (78%) and an opportunity for all students to participate (75%).

Areas to improve: Other than the class size, the next highest concern for parents (29%) is that the elective curriculum is not sufficient to help all students. While we acknowledge the strong academic curriculum with AP classes and solid test results, we question whether the balance of vocational opportunities presented to students should be reviewed. Some % of students will enter the work world either part time or full time after high school. Are they as prepared as the students in AP classes are prepared to begin college? Opportunities to improve vocational counseling at El Molino could be done by local organizations such as North Coast Builders Exchange, Sheriffs, Fire Departments, retail stores, small business owners, and SRJC vocational programs. We recognize the funding is not there to grow new vocational programs on campus but job shadowing, mentoring, and presentations on vocational opportunities coming from El Molino alumni, and businesses in the community could have a strong influence in preparing the students for the future.

Instruction

Positive feedback: Parents strongly agree (94%) that students have the opportunity to participate in a challenging curriculum yet the highest area for disagreement (35%) is that students have access to support to assure academic success. 34% of parents say that students aren't participating in this strong, available curriculum. The opportunity (94%), expectations (92%), and access (81%) for students are all in strong agreement with parents. Additionally 73% agree that the teachers use strategies to actively engage the students.

Areas to improve: The conclusion is that the curriculum is there for strong students but not all students and not all parents are taking advantage of it. So we are left with the question why some students do not. We recommend the administration look to other schools for best practices to draw in unresponsive kids to increase participation in this strong and available curriculum. We encourage a look at how the counseling department currently bridges the gaps. 33% of parents disagree that collaboration among students, parents, and community is happening. An additional 18% had no opinion or not enough information to agree or disagree. The largest no opinion vote (37%) was that the school collaborates with the community to enhance teaching and learning and 22% disagreed. Both these statements leave us with over half of parents having difficulty with the close working relationship between the school, parents and the community. More work needs to be done to communicate the successes and more effort to bridge the gaps.

Assessment and Accountability

Positive feedback: Scoring was mostly in the middle or no opinion. The strongest agreement (64%) came for the teachers employing a variety of strategies to evaluate students.

Areas to improve: Over 50% of parents disagreed or had no opinion on the reporting of assessment results. This is an area for improved communications using Lion Lines, web, -

e-mail etc. The other area of interest is the agreement (51%) that the school and district regularly evaluate the performance of individual students, yet 26% disagree that students are encouraged to use personal assessment results to improve. It seems there may be a disconnect between the testing, communicating the tests to the community, and communicating the tests results in a meaningful way to each student so they can improve. We recommend further look at the process of reviewing results with individual students and what curriculum changes are made because of those meetings.

School Culture and Student Support

Positive feedback: A high % of parents agree that the expectations are high (76%), the facilities are available (73%), and students have access to opportunities (72%). This is a credit to the staff and administration. Additionally the parents agree (70%) that the school has a reputation of high expectations for its teachers. This culture promotes a positive learning environment.

Areas to improve: As we saw in other areas of the survey, again parents disagree that all students have access to appropriate support (35%) with another 16% no opinion. This leaves 50%+ either dissatisfied or not knowledgeable enough to form an opinion. Could this be lack of counseling, mentoring, or tutoring or those students just aren't making use of these available resources. This needs further troubleshooting. We also acknowledge that 32% disagreed that the administration employs a wide range of strategies to encourage parents and the community to be involved. Another 22% had no opinion on this issue. As parents, we see low attendance at some back-to-school nights, parent support teams like Boosters, Project Grad, and special invites for parent to participate are too common. This is an area that needs improvement for the sake of the school and the students.

Teacher Survey Results

Faculty Input/Analysis:

The following analysis is based on the selection of the top five items of agreement as perceived strengths and the bottom five items of disagreement as perceived weaknesses for each of the six categories.

Organization

The "Organization" category has five of the most prominent responses of all six categories. The responses show that we feel the "teaching staff is caring and interested in the welfare of the students: (98%), that "I am happy at this school" (97%), that "the administration is approachable when a problem arises" (93%), that "El Molino is a great high school" (92%), and that "class size has become a serious threat to the quality of teaching" (89%). This strongly shows the feeling of "family" and security that most individuals feel at El Molino. The big reservation is "class size." The bottom of this category has a very wide range of "lows" with no common theme as with the top responses. Teachers felt the school district does not "...take the next step in communicate this all the way up the line" (53%). Teachers do not believe "I consistently send Student Council members to...Student Council meetings" (52%). Teachers do not want "...the starting time to be later and to get out later" (46%). Teachers do not

“...often refer to ESLRs when preparing...lesson plans” (43%). Teachers do not feel “Staff members feel supported by the district” (40%).

Curriculum

The faculty has faith in the programs at El Molino. Most faculty and staff members feel the students have equal opportunity to succeed after high school through the diverse curriculum provided during their years at our school (provided class size being reasonable). Teachers believe “A class size of 20-25 is most conducive to learning” (88%). Teachers feel “The El Molino community has access to information regarding curriculum and pathways” (87%). Teachers believe “Students have the opportunity, based on academic needs, to move between curricular pathways and levels” (85%), and that “The curriculum offered is conducive to post high school success” (83%). We believe “Students have equal access to curriculum offerings” (40%). The bottom of the category had the common theme of “class size” that ranked high in two of the thirteen questions. Teachers do not believe “A class size of 32-35 is most conducive to learning” (59%) and only 22% believe “A class size of 26-31 is most conducive to learning.” Less than one third believe “...curriculum in your classes is aligned to the...Standards or Frameworks” (31%). Some teachers do not feel “Curricular materials (including textbooks) are appropriate and current” (22%) and do not feel “All students participate in an appropriately rigorous curriculum” (19%).

Instruction

Teachers’ responses to questions relating to Instruction were also mixed at both the high and low ends. The most agreement was that “The results of State testing are reported to the entire school and community on a regular basis” (96%). Next the faculty agreed that “...the budget crisis affected your program/classes (87%); answers ranged from “severely” (55%) to “somewhat” (32%). The third area of agreement was that “The school library/media center helps students...” (86%) and “Teachers utilize a variety of strategies and resources...” (86%). Teachers felt that “Students are evaluated in a variety of ways” (85%). Items that did not gain consensus included “Teacher assessment is based on standards for instruction” (36%) and “I follow state standards when designing curriculum” (27%). Also, some faculty and staff felt the school and district did not “regularly review students’ progress towards accomplishing the expected school-wide learning results” (25%). Some members did not feel “The curriculum of each teacher is supported by the counselors” (22%). Finally, some members did not feel “Collaboration about teaching and learning occurs between faculty members and students” (22%). Generally, the teachers seem to support the idea that teachers are using a variety of strategies and resources along with a number of assessments are being successful in helping students. Most teachers use curriculum based upon state standards and that collaboration takes place among faculty members. The library and testing results seem to be positive elements even though people feel we are severely affected by a budget crisis.

Assessment and Accountability

This category reflects the fact that teachers are using a wide variety of assessment strategies, those results are reported to the entire community regularly which then seems to stimulate students to modify their learning. All of this is seen as driven by the

California Standards Test which influences the school's program development and resource allocation. Teachers felt that "Assessment results are reported to the entire community on a regular basis" (81%), "Teachers employ a variety of assessment strategies to evaluate students" (76%), "Teachers employ a variety of assessment strategies to modify their curriculum and instructional practices" (75%), and that "Students are encouraged to use assessment results to modify their learning..." (72%). A smaller majority of teachers felt that "The assessment of student performance on the California Standards Tests drive the school's program..." (59%). A minority of teachers felt that "The assessment of expected school-wide learning results drives the school's program..." (37%) or that "The school and district regularly review student progress towards accomplishing the expected student learning results" (28%).

Expected School-wide Learning Results

Teacher responses to the questions about ESLRs reflected the feeling that El Molino students make informed choices about future education and career goals by setting appropriate goals prior to and by their senior year. They do this by having access to technology, learning to communicate confidently, and learning to work collaboratively all by their senior year. These responses were made clear by teachers beliefs that "By the end of their senior year, El Molino students set appropriate goals and strive to achieve them" (78%), "By the end of their senior year, El Molino students work collaboratively as effective members" (78%), and "By the end of their senior year, El Molino students demonstrate that they make informed choices about future education and career goals" (83%). It is interesting to note that the teachers who did not agree with the preceding statements had strong disagreement in each case (14-15%).

School Culture and Student Support

Answers from this section reflect the feeling that the school's culture is characterized by trust professionalism, and high expectations for all students. Also, the school community encourages commitment, participation, collaboration, and shared responsibility by providing a safe environment with a clearly stated vision/purpose. These feeling are supported by responses such as: "...School culture is characterized by trust, professionalism, high expectations..." (93%), "El Molino offers students a safe environment..." (93%), "The school leadership makes decisions and initiates activities which encourage commitment, participation, collaboration, and shared responsibility..." (88%), "... (The) school culture includes care and high expectations for all students" (87%), and "El Molino has a clearly stated vision or purpose..." (85%). There was less agreement in several diverse areas. Teachers did not believe that "The financial resources available to El Molino are sufficient..." (23%), that "The school leadership employs a wide range of strategies to encourage parental...involvement" (17%), that "The human resources available to El Molino are sufficient..."(17%), that "The facilities available to El Molino are sufficient..." (17%), or that "English Learners have access to sufficient resources..."(17%).

Staff Member Survey Results

It may be interesting to note that for the most part classified personnel answered the questions very similarly to teaching faculty. Many of the questions, particularly those in the curriculum section did not pertain to classified employees. The summary of the staff member survey is divided into two sections: perceived strengths and perceived weaknesses.

Strengths

The members of the staff, both certificated and classified, work very well together. There is a lot of collaboration and learning between staff, students, and faculty. The Classified Staff has buy-in and support for the school policies. El Molino has a full time Librarian. Students all have an opportunity to use Technology in academic and personal lives

Students demonstrate that they can make informed choices about careers and further education.

El Molino is a clean and safe environment in which to learn. (However, this may be on the decline do to lack campus supervisors and reduced number of custodians.)

Weaknesses

The biggest problem is the lack of financial resources and many of the weaknesses have to do with lack of money. These include reduced support for technology. There is a need for one additional full-time RSP Aide to cover all the classes. Class size is a big problem. We no longer have a full time Career center person. We no longer have campus supervisors and fewer custodians and grounds keepers.

There is little Staff development for classified employees. Instructional aides do not have time communicate with teachers and other staff member due to lack of prep periods.

Self-Study Participants

Leadership Team

- Dani Barese, Teacher, Co-Self-Study Coordinator, Focus Group Co-Chairperson, Standards-based Student Learning: Instruction
- Doria Trombetta, Co-Principal, Co-Self-Study Coordinator
- Frank Anderson, Co-Principal
- Beverly Pearce, Vice Principal (2004-2005)
- Adam Schiabile, English Department Chairperson (2004-2005), Technology Support, Vice Principal (2005-2006)
- Pam Porter/Carin Johnson, English Department Co-Chairpersons (2005-2006)
- Mary McGowan/Andi Entwood, Fine Arts Department Co-Chairpersons (2004-2005)
- Kent Wilson, Fine Arts Department Co-Chairperson (2005-2006)
- Michelle Larkin, Foreign Language Department Chairperson
- Larry Deis, Mathematics Department Chairperson; Focus Group Co-Chairperson, Organization
- Dan Mucklin, Science Department Chairperson
- Ron Ruiz, Social Studies Department Chairperson
- Martin Curtis, Vocational Education Department Chairperson
- Shelli Saenz, Special Education Department Chairperson
- Mark Ballard, Support Staff Committee Chairperson, Technology
- Bill Dry, Parent Committee Chairperson
- Lily Hanson, Student Committee Chairperson (Hal Roa, Student Committee Advisor)
- Joan Vreeburg, Teacher, Focus Group Chairperson, Standards-based Student Learning: Assessment and Accountability
- Jean Erbland, Counseling Department Chairperson (2005-2006), Counselor, Focus Group Co-Chairperson, School Culture and Support for Student Personal and Academic Growth
- Carin Johnson, English Department Co-Chairperson (2005-2006), Focus Group Co-Chairperson, School Culture and Support for Student Personal and Academic Growth
- Ray Teurfs, Teacher, Focus Group Co-Chairperson, Organization
- John Grech, Focus Group Co-Chairperson, Standards-based Student Learning: Instruction
- Doug Pepe, Counseling Department Chairperson (2004-2005), Focus Group Chairperson, Standards-based Student Learning: Assessment and Accountability

Home Groups

(1) English Department

Carin Johnson/Pam Porter, Chairpersons

Dani Barese, George Castagnola, Laura Malcolm, Bill Olzman

Colleen Pettis, Ginger Riley, Adam Schaible (2004-2005), Mark Somers, Lynn Stewart, Steve Sumner, John Thomas

- (2) Fine Arts Department**
Kent Wilson, Co-Chairperson
Colleen Pettis, Pam Porter, Ginger Riley,
Mark Somers, Steve Sumner, Kent Wilson
- (3) Foreign Language Department**
Michelle Larkin, Chairperson
Carol Bass (2004-2005), Luke Dahlen (2005-2005), Miguel Crawford, Carol Stone
- (4) Mathematics Department**
Larry Deis, Chairperson
Martin Curtis, Ruben Escamilla, Sue Julian (2005-2006), Leslie Grassl,
Kim Greco, Larry Lefor, Ray Teurfs
- (5) Physical Education Department**
Tracy Kunst, Chairperson
Mike Roan
- (6) Science Department**
Dan Mucklin, Chairperson
Kim Greco, Bruce Norwitt (2004-2005), Nick Stoll, Dawn Stornetta,
Joan Vreeburg
- (7) Social Studies Department**
Ron Ruiz, Chairperson
Dani Barese, George Castagnola, Alberto del Calvo, John Grech,
Bill Olzman, Kent Wilson, Eric Wycoff (2005-2006)
- (8) Vocational Education Department**
Martin Curtis, Chairperson
Seth Freisen (2005-2006), Sue Julian, John Novak, Pam Porter,
Dennis Richardson (2005-2006), Hal Roa (2004-2005), Rochelle Rose, Adam Schaible (2004-2005)
- (9) Special Education Department**
Shelli Saenz, Chairperson
Mark DeVincenzi (2004-2005), Carol Klemmer, Doug Thomson
- (10) Counseling Department**
Jean Erbland, Chairperson
Doug Pepe, Brenda Walker
- (11) Support Staff Committee**
Mark Ballard, Chairperson
Debbie Demeduc, Marian Doyle-Landis, Lynn Schunert, Eva Atwell,
Lori Bruhner, Christine Garman
- (12) Parent/Community Committee**
Jim Dry, Chairperson
Shelley Brown, Fran Bryn, Jim Deis, Helen Miller, Mo Renfro,
Elaine Sundberg, Jim Walton, Kathy Yerger
- (13) Student Committee**
Lily Hanson, ASB Co-President, Student Committee Chairperson (Hal Roa Advisor) Stephanie Au, Isabelle Garson, Alandrea Martin, Alex Narbutas

Focus Groups

Organization

Larry Deis, Teacher, Mathematics Department and Ray Teurfs, Teacher,
Mathematics Department, Co-Chairpersons
Doria Trombetta, Administrator
Bill Olzman, Teacher, English and Social Studies Departments
Mary McGowan, Teacher, Fine Arts Department
Carol Stone, Teacher, Foreign Language Department
Larry Deis, Teacher, Mathematics Department
Dawn Stornetta, Teacher, Science Department
Elsa Binder, Teacher, Social Studies Department/Student Leadership (2004-2005)
Rochelle Rose, Teacher, Vocational Education Department
Doug Thomson, Teacher, Special Education Department
Brenda Walker, Counselor
Debbie Demeduc, Support Staff
Marian Doyle-Landis, Support Staff
Jim Walton, Community member
Jim Deis, Community member
Alex Narbutas, Student Committee member

Standards-based Student Learning: Curriculum

Doug Pepe, Counselor, Chairperson
Beverly Pearce, Administrator (2004-2005)
Pam Porter, Teacher, English, Fine Arts, and Vocational Education Departments
Ginger Riley, Teacher, English and Fine Arts Departments
Miguel Crawford, Teacher, Foreign Language Department
Ruben Escamilla, Teacher, Mathematics Department
Tracy Kunst, Teacher, Physical Education Department
Dan Mucklin, Teacher, Science Department
George Castagnola, Teacher, English and Social Studies Departments
John Novak, Teacher, Vocational Education Department
Lynn Schunert, Support Staff, Special Education Department
Fran Bryn, Parent/Community member
Isabelle Garson, Student Committee member

Standards-based Student Learning: Instruction

Dani Barese, Teacher, English and Social Studies Departments and
John Grech, Teacher, Social Studies Department Co-Chairpersons
Doria Trombetta, Administrator
Mark Somers, Teacher, English and Fine Arts Departments
Colleen Pettis, Teacher, English and Fine Arts Departments
Andi Entwood, Teacher, Fine Arts Department
Leslie Grassl, Teacher, Mathematics Department
Kim Greco, Teacher, Mathematics and Science Departments
Mark De Vincenzi, Teacher, Special Education Department (2004-2005)

Martin Curtis, Teacher, Mathematics and Vocational Education Departments
Eva Atwell, Support Staff, Special Education Department
Helen Miller, Parent/Community Committee member
Stephanie Au, Student Committee member

Standards-based Student Learning: Assessment and Accountability

Joan Vreeburg, Teacher, Science Department, Chairperson
Frank Anderson, Administrator
John Thomas, Teacher, English Department
Steven Sumner, Teacher, English and Fine Arts Departments
Larry Lefor, Teacher, Mathematics Department
Nick Stoll, Teacher, Mathematics and Science Departments
Don Squires, Teacher, Social Studies and Vocational Education
Departments
Hal Roa, Teacher, Vocational Education Department (2004-2005)
Carol Klemmer, Teacher, Special Education Department
Lori Bruhner, Support Staff member
Elaine Sundberg, Parent/Community Committee member
Alandrea Martin, Student Committee member

School Culture and Support for Student Personal and Academic Growth

Jean Erbland, Counselor and Carin Johnson, Teacher, English, Co-Chairpersons
Frank Anderson, Administrator
Lynn Stewart, Teacher, English Department
Margaret Girouard, Teacher, English and Mathematics Departments (2004-2005)
Kent Wilson, Teacher, Fine Arts Department
Carol Bass, Teacher, Foreign Language Department (2004-2005)
Michelle Larkin, Foreign Language Department
Hunk Danielsen, Teacher, Physical Education Department (2004-2005)
Bruce Norwitt, Teacher, Mathematics and Science Departments (2004-2005)
Alberto del Calvo, Teacher, Social Studies Department
Sue Julian, Teacher, Vocational Education Department
Shelli Saenz, Teacher, Special Education Department
Christine Garman, Support Staff member
Shelley Brown, Parent/Community Committee member
Mo Renfro, Parent/Community Committee member
Lily Hanson, Student Committee member

Chapter II

STUDENT/COMMUNITY PROFILE-

Overall Summary from Analysis of Profile Data

Implications of the Data with Respect to Student Performance

- (1) The middle and lower achieving students are not achieving success in raising their level of proficiency on CST test scores.
- (2) The academic program for higher achieving students is strong and leads to student success as evidenced by AP, SAT, and STAR test scores.
- (3) The CST and CAHSEE test scores for English Learners and Disadvantaged students are below those of English only and non-disadvantaged students. The achievement of Disadvantaged students who are part of the Title 1 program is equal to non-disadvantaged students in the Title 1 program.
- (4) El Molino students' test scores (CST, CAHSEE, AP, SAT) are consistently above state average. While these scores fluctuate slightly from year to year they have remained steady. Significant growth is not made in the past three years.
- (5) While there has been a steady increase in the number of teachers with CLAD, BCLAD, and/or SDAIE certification, almost one half of our teachers remain uncertified.
- (6) El Molino's unrestricted allocation to the Site Budget is 33.3% lower in 2005-2006 than it was in 2003-2004. El Molino's restricted allocation is 4% higher due to an increase in Title 1 funding. Allocations for other restricted programs have decreased.
- (7) El Molino's demographic profile has shown some changes. In 2002-2003 Spanish was the primary language of 4.3% of the students. In October 2005 Spanish was the primary language of 8.6% of the students. In 2002-2003 El Molino's dropout rate was 3%. In 2004-2005 El Molino's drop-out rate was 8%. Part of this change involves the drop out rate of our Russian River Ramparts Independent Study Program.
- (8) The Expected Student Learning Results (ESLRs) are used in curriculum planning by only 43% of teachers, and only 34% of the parents and students indicated that they were familiar with them. The ESLRs should reflect the agreement of the El Molino High School community of what each student should achieve by graduation.
- (9) Communication between groups in the school community is not strong. El Molino staff members have not felt supported by the District. Students feel that they do not have a say in the governance and decision making of the school. Parents

feel that the school does not communicate test results, strategies for parental involvement, and information about student support services. A discrepancy exists in the way parents, students and teachers evaluate certain curricular and program weaknesses and strengths.

- (10) Students (69%) and parents (78%) feel that students have access to curricular choices.

Critical Academic Needs

- (1) The academic program for middle/lower achieving students needs to be strengthened to motivate students and to allow students to achieve greater academic success
 - (a) Varied teaching strategies must be employed so that all students can learn.
 - (b) Elective programs should meet all students' needs.
 - (c) Career path classes need relevant and appropriately rigorous curriculum as well as up to date facilities and equipment.
 - (d) More academic opportunities should be offered for EL students.
 - (e) Diverse instructional materials and other resources are needed to meet the needs of all students.
 - (f) Specific grade level objectives need to be established.
- (2) Large class size is a serious threat to student learning. Larger classes are not conducive to the best delivery of curriculum. This is an important factor in raising the achievement levels of students who score below the Proficient level on California Standards Tests.
- (3) Achievement of success in mastering California State Standards must be a goal for all students. For this to be possible, standards-based instructional materials and textbooks must be available to each student in each core class. Teacher training should focus on standards based instruction. At the same time, current and appropriate instructional materials and textbooks must be available for students in advanced and elective class so that they too can increase proficiency and success on college entrance and AP exams.
- (4) We must develop the capability of reviewing individual student scores for the purpose of tracking individual progress. Individual student progress must be communicated to students, parents, counselors and teachers in order to develop a plan which will lead to student success. This could be accomplished with appropriate software and technical support.
- (5) Communication needs to improve between several constituencies within the school community so that members of each component of the school community are working together toward the goal of success for each student.

Important Questions Raised by the Analysis of the Student Performance, Demographic and Perception data:

- (1) How do we attain the resources necessary to meet the critical needs?
- (2) How do we review student scores for the purpose of tracking individual student progress?
- (3) How do we blend teaching higher level skills with teaching to basic standards to meet the needs of all students?
- (4) The issue of minimum class size is unclear. Why did 53% of staff members cite minimum class size as a threat to academic programs?
- (5) Why do staff members not feel supported by the District? Would the results have been different if one question had asked about the Board and another had asked about the District? Would the results of the surveys if given at the present time?
- (6) Why do students and parents feel that they are not familiar with the school's ESLRS?
- (7) Why do so few students take advantage of tutoring in spite of the fact that parents want struggling students to do so? Parent and student surveys seem to indicate that both groups understand that tutoring is available.
- (8) Is the perception accurate that more students are failing classes and a greater number of students seem unmotivated?
- (9) What can we do to improve communication with parents and the community so that they know what is available at El Molino and that they are invited to collaborate with the school staff? Are parents seeing deficiencies in our programs that we are missing?
- (10) What about students who want to be challenged but don't get into the challenging classes for various reasons, such as schedule, class size, staffing ratios, AP class entrance requirements?
- (11) What motivation is there for lower achievers to become more proficient? What driving force is there for lower achievers to work to be successful?
- (12) How can CAHSEE and CST scores be incorporated into an element necessary for students to accomplish in order to move from grade to grade and to graduate?
- (13) How can the results of the STAR test accurately measure student learning at a school? Not all students take the test, nor do all students try to succeed on the tests. Achieving students often opt out with parental permission. Some students do

not try as they have no motivation to do well and know that there are no consequences for poor performance.

- (14) How does lack of attendance affect grades, success, and being placed in lower level classes? Do lower achieving students need remediation or motivation to attend school? How can good attendance be encouraged?
- (15) What happens to students who want to challenge themselves but are not accepted into AP or accelerated classes, cannot enroll because of scheduling problems, or class size limits?