

(CDE use only)
Application #

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001
SINGLE SCHOOL DISTRICT PLAN

**To meet the requirements of the
Local Educational Agency Plan and Single Plan for Student Achievement**

**Mail original* and two copies to: California Department of Education
School and District Accountability Division
1430 N Street, Suite 6208
Sacramento, California 95814-5901**

(*subsequent amendments are approved by local board and kept on file; do not submit to CDE)

SSD Plan Information:

Name of Local Educational Agency (LEA): **PACIFIC VIEW CHARTER SCHOOL**

County/District Code: 12-629227

Dates of Plan Duration: July 1, 2014-June 30, 2015

Date of Local Governing Board Approval:

Director: **James Malloy**

Address: **2937 Moore Avenue**

City: **Eureka** Zip code: **95501**

Phone: **707-269-9490** Fax: **707-269-9491**

Signatures (Signatures must be original. Please use blue ink.)

The Director and governing board of the LEA submitting the application sign on behalf of all participants included in the preparation of the plan.

Printed or typed name of Director Date Signature of Director

Printed or typed name of Board President Date Signature of Board President

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TOPIC PAGE

Part I – Background and Overview

<i>Background</i>	4
<i>Descriptions of the Consolidated Application, the Local Educational Agency Plan, the Single Plan for Student Achievement, and the Categorical Program Monitoring Process</i>	5
<i>Development Process for the Single School District (SSD) Plan</i>	8
<i>Planning Checklist for SSD Plan Development</i>	12
<i>Federal and State Programs Checklist</i>	13
<i>District Budget for Federal Programs</i>	14
<i>District Budget for State Programs</i>	15

Part II – The Plan

<i>Needs Assessments</i>	16
<i>Academic Achievement</i>	
<i>Professional Development and Hiring</i>	
<i>School Safety</i>	
<i>Descriptions – Program Planning</i>	17
<i>District Profile</i>	18
<i>Local Measures of Student Performance</i>	28
<i>Performance Goal 1A Reading</i>	30
<i>Performance Goal 1B Writing</i>	33
<i>Performance Goal 2 Mathematics</i>	36
<i>Performance Goal 3 Social & Emotional</i>	39

<i>Performance Goal 4 Visual & Performing Arts.....</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Performance Goal 5 Highly Qualified Teachers.....</i>	<i>43</i>
<i>Additional Mandatory Title I Descriptions.....</i>	<i>48</i>

Part III – Assurances and Attachments

<i>Assurances.....</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Signatures.....</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>School Site Council Recommendations and Assurances.....</i>	<i>64</i>

Appendix

<i>Appendix A: California’s NCLB Performance Goals and Performance Indicators.....</i>	<i>65</i>
<i>Appendix B: Links to Data Web sites.....</i>	<i>67</i>
<i>Part IV: 2012 CST Results</i>	
<i>Appendix C: 2010-2012 CST Results:.....</i>	<i>68</i>
<i>Appendix D: Pacific View Charter School Academic Performance.....</i>	<i>122</i>
<i>Index Reports from 2009-2012:</i>	
<i> Pacific View Charter School Adequate Yearly Progress Reports from 2009-2012:</i>	
<i>Appendix E: WASC/CDE Self-Study Report Spring 2012 for School.....</i>	<i>138</i>
<i>Accreditation/Validation of Academic Programs</i>	
<i> Chapter I: Student/Community Profile:</i>	
<i> Chapter II: Analysis of Assessment/Profile Data Including-CST Results, CAHSEE Results and Critical Academic Needs Based on Assessment/Data Analysis:</i>	
<i>Appendix F: CaliQity (CQ) Online Curricula Options:.....</i>	<i>151</i>
<i>WASC/CDE School Wide Action Plan for Staff Development to Achieve Critical Academic Needs</i>	

Part I

Background and Overview

Background

The *No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001* embodies four key principles:

- stronger accountability for results;
- greater flexibility and local control for states, school districts, and schools in the use of federal funds;
- enhanced parental choice for parents of children from disadvantaged backgrounds; and
- a focus on what works, emphasizing teaching methods that have been demonstrated to be effective.

(Text of the legislation can be found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/fr/>.)

In May 2002, California's State Board of Education (SBE) demonstrated the state's commitment to the development of an accountability system to achieve the goals of NCLB by adopting five **Performance Goals**:

- 1. All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics, by 2013-14.**
- 2. All limited-English-proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- 3. By 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- 4. All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.**
- 5. All students will graduate from high school.**

In addition, 12 performance indicators linked to those goals were adopted (see Appendix A), as specified by the U.S. Department of Education (ED). Performance targets, developed for each indicator, were adopted by the SBE in May 2003.

Collectively, NCLB's goals, along with the performance indicators and targets, constitute California's framework for federal accountability. This framework provides the basis for

the state's improvement efforts, informing policy decisions by SBE, and implementation efforts by the California Department of Education (CDE) to fully realize the system envisioned by NCLB. It also provides a basis for coordination with California's Legislature and the Governor's Office.

Since 1995, California has been building an educational system consisting of five major components:

- rigorous academic standards
- standards-aligned instructional materials
- standards-based professional development
- standards-aligned assessment
- an accountability structure that measures school effectiveness in light of student achievement

As a result, California is well positioned to implement the tenets of NCLB.

State and federally funded initiatives aimed at improving student achievement must complement each other and work in tandem in order to have the greatest impact. In California, the state and federal consolidated applications, competitive grants, the state accountability system, the Categorical Program Monitoring process, the single **plan for student achievement, local educational agency (LEA) plans**, professional development opportunities, and technical assistance all are moving toward a level of alignment and streamlining. The result of this consolidation will be a cohesive, comprehensive, and focused effort for supporting and improving the state's lowest-performing schools and appropriate reporting mechanisms.

Descriptions of the Consolidated Application, the Local Education Agency Plan, the Single Plan for Student Achievement, and Categorical Program Monitoring

In order to meet legislative requirements for specific state and federal programs and funding, California currently employs four major processes: the Consolidated State Application, the Local Educational Agency Plan, the school-level Single Plan for Student Achievement, and Categorical Program Monitoring. **California is moving toward more closely coordinating and streamlining these processes to eliminate redundancies and make them less labor intensive for LEAs, while continuing to fulfill all requirements outlined in state and federal law.**

Below is a brief description of the ways in which these various processes currently are used in California.

The Consolidated Application (ConApp)

The ConApp is the **fiscal** mechanism used by the California Department of Education to distribute categorical funds from various state and federal programs to county offices, school districts, and charter schools throughout California. Annually, in June, each LEA submits Part I of the ConApp to document participation in these programs and provide assurances that the district will comply with the legal requirements of each program. Program entitlements are determined by formulas contained in the laws that created the programs.

Part II of the ConApp is submitted in the fall of each year. It contains the district entitlements for each funded program. Out of each state and federal program entitlement, districts allocate funds for indirect costs of administration, for programs operated by the district office, and for programs operated at schools.

The Local Educational Agency Plan (LEA) Plan

The approval of the LEA Plan by the local school board and the State Board of Education is a requirement for receiving federal funding subgrants for NCLB programs. The LEA Plan includes specific descriptions and assurances as outlined in the provisions included in NCLB. In essence, LEA Plans describe the actions that LEAs will take to ensure that they meet certain **programmatic** requirements, including student academic services designed to increase student achievement and performance, coordination of services, needs assessments, consultations, school choice, supplemental educational services, services to homeless students, and other services as required. In addition, LEA Plans summarize assessment data, school goals and activities from the *Single Plans for Student Achievement* developed by the LEAs schools.

The Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)

State law requires that school-level plans for programs funded through the Consolidated Application be consolidated in a *Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA)* (*Education Code* Section 64001), developed by school site councils with the advice of any applicable school advisory committees. LEAs allocate NCLB funds to schools through the Consolidated Application for Title I, Part A, Title III (Limited English Proficient), and Title V (Innovative Programs/Parental Choice). LEAs may elect to allocate other funds to schools for inclusion in school plans. The content of the school plan includes school goals, activities, and expenditures for improving the academic performance of students to the proficient level and above. The plan delineates the actions that are required for program implementation and serves as the school's guide in evaluating progress toward meeting the goals.

Role of School Site Council

The California *Education Code (EC)*¹ requires the school site council to develop a SPSA for ConApp programs operated at the school or in which the school participates. In addition, Pupil Retention² and School and Library Improvement Block Grant programs³ operated at the school must be included in the SPSA. The school site council must approve the plan, recommend it to the local governing board for approval, monitor implementation of the plan, and evaluate the results. At least annually, the school site council must revise the plan, including proposed expenditures of funds allocated to the school through the ConApp, and recommend it to the local governing board for approval.

Composition of School Site Council

Composition of the school site council is specified in the California *Education Code* as follows:

- The school site council shall be composed of the principal and representatives of: teachers selected by teachers at the school; other school personnel selected by other school personnel at the school;⁴ parents of students attending the school selected by such parents; and, in secondary schools, students selected by students attending the school.
- **At the elementary level**, the school site council shall be constituted to ensure parity between (a) the principal, classroom teachers, and other school personnel; and (b) parents or other community members selected by parents. In schools with fewer than three teachers, this requirement may be met by establishing a school site council that is composed of equal numbers of school staff and parents or other community members selected by parents.
- **At the secondary level**, the school site council shall be constituted to ensure parity between (a) the principal, classroom teachers, and other school personnel, and (b) equal numbers of parents or other community members selected by parents and students.
- **At both the elementary and secondary levels**, classroom teachers shall comprise the majority of persons represented under subdivision (a) of this section.

¹ *EC* Section 64001(a), (d)

² *EC* Section 41507

³ *EC* Section 41572

⁴ For example, counselors, psychologists, social workers, nurses, instructional aides, library personnel, and clerks employed at the school

Categorical Program Monitoring (CPM)

State and federal law require CDE to monitor the implementation of categorical programs operated by local educational agencies. This state-level oversight is accomplished in part by conducting on-site reviews of eighteen such programs implemented by local schools and districts. Through CPM, the state monitors one-fourth of all school districts each year. Monitoring visits are conducted by state staff and local administrators trained to review one or more of these programs. The purpose of the review is to verify **compliance** with requirements of each categorical program, and to ensure that program funds are spent to increase student achievement and performance.

Development Process for the Single School District (SSD) Plan

LEAs must develop a single, coordinated, and comprehensive plan that describes the educational services for all students that can be used to guide implementation of federal- and state-funded programs, the allocation of resources, and reporting requirements. The development of such a plan involves a continuous cycle of assessment, parent and community involvement, planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. The duration of the Plan should be five years. ***The Plan should be periodically reviewed and updated as needed, but at least once each year.***

This SSD Plan template is an effort to further align and streamline the planning requirements for single school districts, which includes direct-funded charter schools. This document incorporates the required elements of both the SPSA and the LEA Plan. Use of this template meets all state and federal requirements for plans for categorical programs. More detailed information regarding the SPSA can be found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/le/singleplan.asp>. The complete guide and template for the LEA Plan can be found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/le/>.

In developing the SSD Plan, the SSD will review its demographics, test results, performance, and resources. Given that the majority of such information is readily available in the School Accountability Report Card (SARC), the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) performance results, the Academic Performance Index (API) results, and other data sources, the SSD will find the data easy to access via the Internet. (See Appendix B for links to each of the web sites containing student and staff demographic information, SARC, STAR, and API data.) **The SSD is expected to gather and review information from these resources and use it to inform the planning process.**

The SSD Plan can serve as a summary of all existing state and federal programs and establish a focus for raising the academic performance of all student groups to achieve state academic standards. In the context of this Plan, improvements in instruction,

professional development, course offerings, and counseling and prevention programs are means of achieving specific academic and support services goals for all groups of students, including identified under-performing student groups. **State and federal laws require that school site administrators, teachers, and parents from the SSD (which includes direct-funded charter schools) must be consulted in the planning, development, and revision of the SSD Plan.**

The SSD Plan can be completed through the use of a single template following the six steps outlined below. Because the SSD Plan combines the LEA Plan with the SPSA, it becomes the responsibility of the school site council to develop, approve and recommend the SSD Plan to the local governing board for approval.

Step One: Measure the Effectiveness of Current Improvement Strategies

Analyze Student Performance

Conduct a comprehensive data analysis of student achievement, including multiple measures of student performance. Identify all relevant assessments and apply thoughtful analyses of current educational practices to establish benchmarks aimed at raising academic performance for all students, especially identified student groups.

Tables of data for your schools and district are available online:

- API Reports - <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap>
- Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) data - <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr>
- LEA Accountability Reports of Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English learners - <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/acct.asp>
- Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Reports – <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay>

Analyze Current Educational Practices, Professional Development, Staffing, and Parental Involvement

Identify, review, and analyze data and related information on factors such as educational practices, parent and community involvement, professional development, support services, and resources that have an impact on student learning.

Over the past several years, CDE has developed several self-assessment tools that schools and districts can use to evaluate these factors and others needed to support academic student achievement:

- The Academic Program Survey (APS) – school-level survey of status of implementation of the nine essential program components (not required for single school districts)
- District Assistance Survey (DAS) – district-level survey of status of implementation of nine essential program components
- Least Restrictive Environment Assessment – examines educational practices for students with disabilities
- English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment (ELSSA) – designed to improve outcomes for English learners

These tools can be found under Improvement Tools in the Virtual Library on the CDE web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/vl/improvtools.asp>.

(See Part II, Needs Assessment, for further details.)

Step Two: Seek Input from Staff, Advisory Committees, and Community Members

The school site council must seek the input of teachers, administrators, councils, committees, parents, and community members (e.g., school health council, committees for Limited English Proficient students, state compensatory education, gifted and talented education, special education, etc.). The most effective plans are those supported by the entire LEA community. The integration of existing program plans, such as Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program, High Priority Schools Grant Program, Alternative Education Programs, Focus on Learning: Secondary School Accreditation, and others does not eliminate any program requirements. The combined process must include the requirements of every program involved.

Step Three: Develop or Revise Performance Goals

Using the five NCLB performance goals and indicators (see Appendix A), develop local performance targets that are: a) derived from school and student subgroup performance data and analysis of related, scientifically based educational practices; b) attainable in the period specified in this Plan and consistent with statewide targets for all students and subgroups; c) specific to the participants (i.e., students, teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals); and d) measurable.

Step Four: Revise Improvement Strategies and Expenditures

For all categorical programs, identify the participants, expected performance gains, and means of evaluating gains. Indicate specific improvements and practical monitoring of their implementation and effectiveness.

Identify available resources. Aside from fiscal resources available through federal and state funding, programmatic resources are available on the CDE Web site at

<http://www.cde.ca.gov>. The ConApp provides funding for the following programs: Title I, Parts A and D; Title II, Part A; Title III, Part A; Title IV, Part A; Title V, Part A; Title VI, subpart 2 (Rural Low-Income); School Safety and Violence Prevention; Cal-SAFE; Peer Assistance Review; Tobacco-Use Prevention; Economic Impact Aid; and Middle and High School Supplemental Counseling Program.

Step Five: Local Governing Board Approval

The SSD Plan must be approved by the local governing board prior to submittal to CDE. Ensure that all required signatures are affixed. The SSD Plan must be reviewed and updated annually, and all subsequent amendments should be approved by the local governing board and kept on file with the original SSD Plan.

Step Six: Monitor Implementation

To verify achievement of performance targets, monitor areas such as: a) assignment and training of highly qualified staff; b) identification of participants; c) implementation of services; d) provision of materials and equipment; e) initial and ongoing assessment of performance; and f) progress made toward establishing a safe learning environment.

The analysis of data (student, school-wide, support services, professional development) is part of the ongoing program monitoring and evaluation. When results are **not** as expected, it may be helpful to consider the following: a) How are performance targets and activities based on student performance and factual assessment of current educational practices? b) How educationally sound is the Plan to help reach the targets? c) How timely and effectively is the Plan being implemented? d) If the Plan has not been implemented as written, what were the obstacles to implementation?

You may use the checklist on the next page to indicate planning steps as they are completed.

**PLANNING CHECKLIST
FOR SSD PLAN DEVELOPMENT**
(Optional)

✓	SSD Plan – Comprehensive Planning Process Steps
	1. Measure effectiveness of current improvement strategies
	2. Seek input from staff, advisory committees, and community members
	3. Develop or revise performance goals
	4. Revise improvement strategies and expenditures
	5. Local governing board approval
	6. Monitor Implementation

FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS CHECKLIST

Check (√) all applicable programs operated by the LEA. In the “other” category, list any additional programs that are reflected in this Plan.

Federal Programs		State Programs	
X	Title I, Part A	X	Economic Impact Aid (EIA) – State Compensatory Education
	Title I, Part B, Even Start		EIA – Limited English Proficient
	Title I, Part C, Migrant Education		After-School Education and Safety Programs
	Title I, Part D, Neglected/Delinquent	X	School and Library Improvement Block Grant
X	Title II, Part A, Subpart 2, Improving Teacher Quality		Child Development Programs
X	Title II, Part D, Enhancing Education Through Technology		Educational Equity
	Title III, Limited English Proficient		Gifted and Talented Education
	Title III, Immigrants		High Priority Schools Grant Program
	Title IV, Part A, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities		Tobacco Use Prevention Education (Prop 99)
	Title V, Part A, Innovative Programs – Parental Choice		Immediate Intervention/ Under performing Schools Program
	Adult Education		School Safety and Violence Prevention Act (AB1113, AB 658)
	Career Technical Education		Healthy Start
	McKinney-Vento Homeless Education		Dropout Prevention and Recovery Act: School Based Pupil Motivation and Maintenance Program (SB 65)
	<i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Special Education</i>		English Language Acquisition Program
	21 st Century Community Learning Centers		Community Based English Tutoring
	Other (describe):	X	Art/Music Block Grant
	Other (describe):		School Gardens
	Other (describe):		Other (describe):
	Other (describe):		Other (describe):

DISTRICT BUDGET FOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Please complete the following table with information for your district.

Programs	Prior Year District Carryovers	Current Year District Entitlements	Current Year Direct Services to Students at School Sites (\$)	Current Year Direct Services to Students at School Sites (%)
Title I, Part A	0	68,012	68,012	100%
Title I, Part B, Even Start				
Title I, Part C, Migrant Education				
Title I, Part D, Neglected/Delinquent				
Title II Part A, Subpart 2, Improving Teacher Quality	9,632	5,415	15,047	100%
Title II, Part D, Enhancing Education Through Technology	74		74	100%
Title III, Limited English Proficient				
Title III, Immigrants				
Title IV, Part A, Safe and Drug-free Schools and Communities				
Title V, Part A, Innovative Programs – Parental Choice				
Adult Education				
Career Technical Education				
McKinney-Vento Homeless Education				
IDEA, Special Education		41,187	41,187	100%
21 st Century Community Learning Centers				
Other (describe)				
TOTAL	9,706	114,614	124,246	100%

DISTRICT BUDGET FOR STATE PROGRAMS

Please complete the following table with information for your district.

Categories	Prior Year District Carryovers	Current Year District Entitlements	Current Year Direct Services to Students at School Sites (\$)	Current Year Direct Services to Students at School Sites (%)
EIA – State Compensatory Education				
EIA – Limited English Proficient				
School and Library Improvement Block Grant				
After School Education and Safety Program				
Child Development Programs				
Educational Equity				
Gifted and Talented Education				
Tobacco Use Prevention Education – (Prop. 99)				
High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSG)				
School Safety and Violence Prevention Act (AB 1113)				
Healthy Start				
Dropout Prevention and Recovery Act: School-based Pupil Motivation and Maintenance Program (SB 65)				
English Language Acquisition Program				
Community Based English Tutoring				
Other (describe)				
TOTAL				

Part II

The Plan

Needs Assessment

The passage of NCLB imposes a number of significant new requirements on LEAs as conditions for funding provided at the state and local levels. Among these are reporting requirements designed to facilitate accountability for improving **student academic performance, teacher quality, and school safety**. As such, a needs assessment to determine strengths and weaknesses in these areas must be conducted.

In determining specific areas of need to be addressed in the SSD Plan, the SSD should review its demographics, test results, and resources. The majority of such information is readily available on the SSD's School Accountability Report Card (SARC), the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) performance results, the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) results, the Academic Performance Index (API) results, California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS), DataQuest, and other data sources. This data is easily accessible via the Internet (see Appendix B for links to each of the Web sites that contain student and staff demographic information, SARC, STAR, CELDT, and API data). The SSD is expected to gather and review its own information from these resources to determine strengths and needs and to shape the planning process.

The Sample School and Student Performance Data Forms provided with the suggested template for the SPSA are also attached to this document in Appendix F. These forms are provided for convenience only; their use is not required. The forms simply provide a suggested format for arraying the data that needs to be reviewed.

Academic Performance

The needs assessment should include a focus on the academic areas highlighted in California's Performance Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5 (see Appendix A for a full listing of all of California's Performance Goals and Indicators), including:

- Statewide standards, assessment, and accountability
- Local assessments and accountability
- Coordination and integration of federal and state educational programs
- The LEA academic assessment plan

Teacher Quality

Another component of the needs assessment should examine local needs for professional development and hiring. LEA teachers and administrators should participate in this process to identify activities that will provide:

- teachers with the subject matter knowledge and teaching skills to provide all students the opportunity to meet challenging state academic achievement standards, and
- principals with the instructional leadership skills to help teachers provide all students the opportunity to meet the state's academic achievement standards.

School Safety and Prevention

The LEA needs assessment also focuses on Performance Goal 4 (see Appendix A). It is based on an evaluation of objective data regarding the incidence of violence, alcohol, tobacco, and other illegal drug use in the elementary and secondary schools and the communities to be served. It includes the objective analysis of the current conditions and consequences regarding violence, alcohol, tobacco, and other illegal drug use, including delinquency and serious discipline problems, among students who attend such schools (including private school students who participate in the drug and violence prevention program). This analysis is based on ongoing local assessment or evaluation activities (Sec. 4115 (a)(1)(A). *California's Healthy Kids Survey* may also provide useful information in this area. The Survey is available at http://www.wested.org/pub/docs/chks_survey.html.

Descriptions – Program Planning

Once local strengths and needs are identified as a result of examining and evaluating current district-level data, specific descriptions can be written of how program goals will be implemented to improve student academic achievement. **On the pages that follow, the SSD will provide descriptions and information about how it plans to address the requirements of NCLB and the SPSA based upon results of the needs assessment.** Collectively, these descriptions, along with the Assurances in Part III of this document, comprise the SSD Plan.

District Profile

Pacific View Charter School District School Accountability Report Card Reported for School Year 2011-2012 Published During 2011-2012

School		District	
School Name	Pacific View Charter School	District Name	Pacific View Charter School
Street	2937 Moore Avenue	Phone Number	(707) 269-9490
City, State, Zip	Eureka , CA 95501	Web Site	www.humboldt.k12.ca.us/pacificview
Phone Number	707-269-9490	Director	James Malloy
Principal	Virginia Hall	E-mail Address	jmalloy@humboldt.k12.ca.us
E-mail Address	vhall@humboldt.k12.ca.us	CDS Code	12-62927-1230150

School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2012-2013)

This section provides information about the school's goals and programs.

Pacific View serves approximately 225 students each year with a staff of 15 teachers and 6 support staff. We are a WASC accredited California public school. The curriculum adheres to the California State Standards and utilizes a variety of teaching methods and styles. Each class is unique. Our teaching staff values the strength of student mentoring and peer collaboration.

Pacific View Charter School Mission Statement: Improving the lives of all students through programs focused on nurturing and education while supporting parental choice and attention to individualized instruction.

Pacific View Charter School is committed to providing the best education for our students by making positive use of our unique characteristics as a small rural school. Students enjoy small class size where every student is recognized as an individual with talents. Successful students feel competent about what they can do. The school stresses basic skills and the application of those skills aligned to state content standards in a developmentally appropriate approach. The development of skills extends to social skills and growth of students as positive, contributing members of their community.

- We will instill the joy and value of learning in all students
- We will provide a balanced curriculum including language arts, social studies, science, mathematics, physical education, and the arts by using a hands-on approach that encourages individual creativity.
 - We will provide an environment that encourages the development of personal and group responsibilities including positive social skills and effective self-management strategies.
 - We will create a climate that values individual and cultural differences.
- We will foster positive, open and effective partnerships with families and community, as we believe this teamwork is essential for the success of each student.

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2012-2013)

This section provides information about opportunities for parents to become involved with school activities.

PVCS communicates with parents in a monthly newsletter, we hold a yearly community dinner, and we have a community garden.

Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2012-2013)

This table displays the number of students enrolled in each grade level at the school.

Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	3
Grade 1	2
Grade 2	1
Grade 3	0
Grade 4	3
Grade 5	4
Grade 6	5
Grade 7	13
Grade 8	22
Ungraded Elementary	0
Grade 9	27
Grade 10	20
Grade 11	26
Grade 12	32
Ungraded Secondary	0
Total Enrollment	159

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2012-2013)

This table displays the percent of students enrolled at the school who are identified as being in a particular group.

Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
White (non-Hispanic Ethnicity)	79 %
White (Hispanic Ethnicity)	21%
Black (non-Hispanic Ethnicity)	4 %
Native American Indian or Alaskan Native (non-Hispanic Ethnicity)	13%
Native American Indian or Alaskan Native (Hispanic Ethnicity)	0%
Other Pacific Islander (non-Hispanic Ethnicity)	1%
Asian (non-Hispanic Ethnicity)	1%
Samoan (non-Hispanic Ethnicity)	0%
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	67%
English Learners	2%
Students with Disabilities	30%

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution

This table displays by grade level the average class size and the number of classrooms that fall into each size category (a range of total students per classroom).

Grade Level	2010-2011			2011-2012			2012-2013					
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms		
		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+
2	4	X			0	X			0	X		
3	4	X			0	X			0	X		
4	4	X			0	X			0	X		
5	7	X			3	X			2	X		
6	7	X			6	X			4	X		
7	13	X			15	X			9	X		
8	20	X			11	X			20	X		
9	15	X			11	X			16	X		
10	10	X			6	X			13	X		
11	10	X			9	X			16	X		
12	5	X			2	X			5	X		

School Climate

School Safety Plan (School Year 2012-2013)

This section provides information about the school's comprehensive safety plan.

Pacific View Charter School is a safe place for children to learn and grow. The school implements a strong social curriculum in which behavior and discipline issues are addressed with a systematic approach followed by all staff.

Students and parents understand acceptable rules of behavior and consequences.

Safety reviews are done each month at staff meetings. The plan was updated Fall, 2010.

School Facilities

Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (School Year 2012-2013)

This section provides information about the condition of the school's grounds, buildings, and restrooms, and a description of any planned or recently completed facility improvements.

- The Pacific View Charter School District provides supervision before and after school every school day from 8:00-3:30.
- Guest and volunteers check into the school office before entering the school grounds.
- The school buildings provide adequate space for students. The school consists of 9 classrooms, 1 art studio, 1 weight room, 2 resource rooms and 3 computer labs.
- The facility upgrades completed in April / May 2009 – upgrades included installation of new carpeting in all buildings, complete remodeling of two classrooms and main office and installation and painting of new siding on main building
- Playground perimeter is fenced with three locking gates. All buildings have alarms installed that utilize an outside company for monitoring.
- The governing board ensures students a clean and safe school. The entire facility is cleaned twice weekly. School buildings, equipment and playground areas are monitored for safety and repair on a regularly scheduled basis.
- Each classroom has state of the art technology with a computer ratio of one computer for every four students.
- The age appropriate libraries are in each classroom so students have daily access to grade appropriate library books.

School Facility Good Repair Status (School Year 2012-13)

This table displays the results of the most recently completed school site inspection to determine the school facility's good repair status.

Item Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
Gas Leaks	x			
Mechanical Systems	x			
Windows/Doors/Gates (interior and exterior)	x			
Interior Surfaces (walls, floors, and ceilings)	x			
Hazardous Materials (interior and exterior)	x			
Structural Damage	x			
Fire Safety	x			
Electrical (interior and exterior)	x			
Pest/Vermin Infestation	x			
Drinking Fountains (inside and outside)	x			
Restrooms	x			
Sewer	x			
Playground/School Grounds	x			
Roofs	x			
Overall Cleanliness	x			

Overall Summary of School Facility Good Repair Status (School Year 2012-13)

This table displays the overall summary of the results of the most recently completed school site inspection.

Item Inspected	Facility Condition			
	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
Overall Summary	Exemplary			

Teachers

Teacher Credentials

This table displays the number of teachers assigned to the school with a full credential, without a full credential, and those teaching outside of their subject area of competence. Detailed information about teacher qualifications can be found at the [DataQuest](#) Web site.

Teachers	School			District
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2010-11
With Full Credential	12	14	11	N/A
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	0	0	0	N/A

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

This table displays the number of teacher misassignments (teachers assigned without proper legal authorization) and the number of vacant teacher positions (not filled by a single designated teacher assigned to teach the entire course at the beginning of the school year or semester). Note: Total Teacher Misassignments includes the number of Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners.

Indicator	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

Core Academic Classes Taught by No Child Left Behind Compliant Teachers (School Year 2012-2013)

This table displays the percent of classes in core academic subjects taught by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) compliant and non-NCLB compliant teachers at the school, at all schools in the district, at high-poverty schools in the district, and at low-poverty schools in the district. More information on teacher qualifications required under NCLB can be found at the [NCLB](#) Web site.

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by NCLB Compliant Teachers	Taught by Non-NCLB Compliant Teachers
This School	100.0	0.0
All Schools in District	100.0	0.0
High-Poverty Schools in District	100.0	0.0
Low-Poverty Schools in District	0.0	0.0

Support Staff

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2012-2013)

This table displays, in units of full-time equivalents (FTE), the number of academic counselors and other support staff who are assigned to the school and the average number of students per academic counselor. One FTE equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time.

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor	.5	25
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)		N/A
Library Media Services Staff (paraprofessional)		N/A
Psychologist		N/A
Social Worker		N/A
Nurse		N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist		N/A
Resource Specialist (non-teaching)	1.5	N/A
Other	.5	N/A

Curriculum and Instructional Materials

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2012-2013)

This table displays information about the quality, currency, and availability of the standards-aligned textbooks and other instructional materials used at the school, and information about the school's use of any supplemental curriculum or non-adopted textbooks or instructional materials.

Core Curriculum Area	Quality, Currency, and Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials	Percent of Pupils Who Lack Their Own Assigned Textbooks and Instructional Materials
Reading/Language Arts	All texts are state aligned and in good quality.	0%
Mathematics	All texts are state aligned and in good quality.	0%
Science	All texts are state aligned and in good quality.	0%
History-Social Science	All texts are state aligned and in good quality.	0%
Foreign Language	All texts are state aligned and in good quality.	0%
Health	All texts are state aligned and in good quality.	0%
Visual and Performing Arts	All texts are state aligned and in good quality.	0%
Science Laboratory Equipment (grades 9-12)	All texts are state aligned and in good quality.	0%

School Finances

Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2012-2013)

This table displays a comparison of the school's per pupil expenditures from unrestricted (basic) sources with other schools in the district and throughout the state, and a comparison of the average teacher salary at the school site with average teacher salaries at the district and state levels. Detailed information regarding school expenditures can be found at the [Current Expense of Education](#) Web page and teacher salaries can be found on the [Certificated Salaries and Benefits](#) Web page.

Level	Total Expenditures Per Pupil	Expenditures Per Pupil (Supplemental)	Expenditures Per Pupil (Basic)	Average Teacher Salary
School Site	1984388		11332	38500
District	1984388		11332	38500
Percent Difference - School Site and District	0		0	0
State	49199640837		8736	
Percent Difference - School Site and State				

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2012-2013)

This section provides information about the programs and supplemental services that are available at the school and funded through either categorical or other sources.

Pacific View Charter School District provides high quality standards based instruction to all K-6 students. The Management Team meets throughout the school year to identify individual student needs. The staff and Board have a strong commitment to educating the "whole child".

Categorical Programs revenue provides fund for part time instructional aides, music teacher, art teacher, technology aide, and PE teacher.

The district has a part time Speech therapist through special education funding.

Through the CORE Academic program the district is able to offer homework invention for students at risk of retention.

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2012-2013)

This table displays district-level salary information for teachers, principals, and superintendents, and compares these figures to the state averages for districts of the same type and size. The table also displays teacher and administrative salaries as a percent of a district's budget, and compares these figures to the state averages for districts of the same type and size. Detailed information regarding salaries may be found on the [Certificated Salaries and Benefits](#) Web page.

Category	District Amount	State Average For Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	38500	
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	38500	
Highest Teacher Salary	38500	
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)		
Average Principal Salary (Middle)		
Average Principal Salary (High)	53045	
Superintendent Salary	30000	
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	33.36%	
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	8.12%	

Student Performance

California Standards Tests

The California Standards Tests (CSTs) show how well students are doing in relation to the state content standards. The CSTs include English-Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics in grades 2-11; science in grades 5, 8 and 9 through 11; and history-social science in grades 8, and 10-11. Student scores are reported as performance levels. Detailed information regarding CST results for each grade and performance level, including the percent of students not tested, can be found on the [Standardized Testing and Reporting \(STAR\) Results](#) Web page.

Pacific View Charter School CST Results for All Students – Three Year Comparison Included in Section IV of this Plan

California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2011-12)

The California Physical Fitness Test is administered to students in grades 5, 7, and 9 only. This table displays by grade level the percent of students meeting the healthy fitness zone on all six fitness standards for the most recent testing period. Detailed information regarding this test, and comparisons of a school's test results to the district and state levels may be found on the [Physical Fitness Testing](#) Web page.

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Healthy Fitness Zones
5	100%
7	92%
9	86%

Accountability

Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of the academic performance and progress of schools in California. API scores range from 200 to 1,000, with a statewide target of 800. Detailed information about the API can be found at the [API](#) Web page.

API Ranks - Three-Year Comparison

This section displays the school's statewide and similar schools API ranks. These ranks are published when the Base API is released each March. The statewide API rank ranges from 1 to 10. A statewide rank of 1 means that the school has an API score in the lowest 10 percent of all schools in the state, while a statewide rank of 10 means that the school has an API score in the highest 10 percent of all schools in the state. The similar schools API rank reflects how a school compares to 100 statistically matched "similar schools." A similar schools rank of 1 means that the school's academic performance is comparable to the lowest performing 10 schools of the 100 similar schools, while a similar schools rank of 10 means that the school's academic performance is better than at least 90 of the 100 similar schools.

API Rank	2010	2011	2012
Statewide	N/A	N/A	N/A
Similar Schools	N/A	N/A	N/A

API Changes by Student Group - Three-Year Comparison

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

Group	Actual API Change			Growth API Score
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012
All Students at the School	<7>	8	See	17
African American			Appendix	
American Indian or Alaska Native				
Asian				
Filipino				
Hispanic or Latino				
Pacific Islander				
White (not Hispanic)	24	<5>		
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	<17>	N/A		25
English Learners				
Students with Disabilities				

Adequate Yearly Progress

The federal NCLB act requires that all schools and districts meet the following Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) criteria:

- Participation rate on the state's standards-based assessments in English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics
- Percent proficient on the state's standards-based assessments in ELA and mathematics
- API as an additional indicator
- Graduation rate (for secondary schools)

Detailed information about AYP, including participation rates and percent proficient results by student group, can be found at the [AYP](#) Web page.

AYP Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2011-2012)

This table displays an indication of whether the school and the district made AYP overall and whether the school and the district met each of the AYP criteria.

AYP Criteria	School	District
Overall	Yes	Yes
Participation Rate - English-Language Arts	Yes	Yes
Participation Rate - Mathematics	Yes	Yes
Percent Proficient - English-Language Arts	Yes	Yes
Percent Proficient - Mathematics	Yes	Yes
API	Yes	Yes
Graduation Rate	N/A	N/A

Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2012-2013)

Schools and districts receiving federal Title I funding enter Program Improvement (PI) if they do not make AYP for two consecutive years in the same content area (English-language arts or mathematics) or on the same indicator (API or graduation rate). After entering PI, schools and districts advance to the next level of intervention with each additional year that they do not make AYP. Detailed information about PI identification can be found at the [AYP](#) Web page.

Instructional Planning and Scheduling

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status	In PI	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement	05/06	N/A
Year in Program Improvement	5	5
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	1	1
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	100	50

Professional Development

This section provides information on the annual number of school days dedicated to staff development for the most recent three-year period.

The Pacific View Charter School encourages staff member's participation in professional development opportunities. The Humboldt County Office of Education is a resource for most of these opportunities. Yet staff members are encouraged to attend workshops pertinent to needs wherever the workshop is held.

Local Measures of Student Performance (*other* than State-level assessments)

As Per NCLB Section 1112 regarding Local Educational Agency Plans, each LEA must provide the following descriptions in its Plan:

The following chart is a description of high-quality student academic assessments, in addition to the academic assessments described in the State Plan under section 1111(b) (3), that the local educational agency uses to:

- a) determine the success of students in meeting the State student academic achievement standards and provide information to teachers, parents, and students on the progress being made toward meeting student academic achievement standards;
- b) assist in diagnosis, teaching, and learning in the classroom in ways that best enable low-achieving students to meet State student achievement academic standards and do well in the local curriculum;
- c) determine what revisions are needed to projects under this part so that such children meet the State student academic achievement standards; and
- d) identify effectively students who may be at risk for reading failure or who are having difficulty reading, through the use of screening, diagnostic, and classroom-based instructional reading assessments.