

Lyman Gilmore Middle School
School Accountability Report Card
Reported Using Data from the 2011-12 School Year
Published During 2012-13

Every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC), by February 1 of each year. The SARC contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school.

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

I. Data and Access

EdData Partnership Web Site

EdData is a partnership of the CDE, EdSource, and the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) that provides extensive financial, demographic, and performance information about California's public kindergarten through grade twelve school districts and schools.

DataQuest

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE DataQuest webpage at <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/> that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district, the county, and the state. Specifically, DataQuest is a dynamic system that provides reports for accountability (e.g., state Academic Performance Index [API], federal Adequate Yearly Progress [AYP]), test data, enrollment, high school graduates, dropouts, course enrollments, staffing, and data regarding English learners.

Internet Access

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

II. About This School

Contact Information (School Year 2012-13)

School Contact Information	
School Name	Lyman Gilmore Middle School
Street	10837 Rough and Ready Hwy.
City, State, Zip	Grass Valley, CA 95945
Phone Number	(530) 273-8479
Principal	John Baggett
E-mail Address	jbaggett@gvsd.k12.ca.us
CDS Code	29-66332-6027122

District Contact Information	
District Name	Grass Valley Elementary School District
Phone Number	(530) 273-4483
Web Site	www.gvsd.k12.ca.us
Superintendent	Mr. Eric Kent Fredrickson
E-mail Address	efredric@gvsd.k12.ca.us

School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2011-12)

This section provides information about the school, its programs and its goals.

Lyman Gilmore Middle School welcomes 500+ students each morning. With a dedicated teachers and staff, Gilmore hosts a wealth of academic and enrichment options. Electives include computer animation, Gilmore News Network, dance, band, art, choir, culinary arts, visual art, digital arts, and more. Academic options include Geometry and Algebra available in 8th grade, honors courses, and a learning center with multiple resources. We received a technology which provided the district with over \$200,000 to for iPads and staff development for our 5th and 6th graders. We plan to have an iPad for every student by the 2013-14 school year. Lyman Gilmore has been recognized as a California Distinguished School and a Title One Academic Achieving School. We live up to our mission statement, which reads, "Lyman Gilmore Middle School is a safe, nurturing, stimulating, and adventurous learning community dedicated to ensuring that all learners are respected, encouraged, and supported in their academic, social, and personal growth.

District Mission Statement

The Grass Valley School District is a multi-faceted community passionately committed to developing personal excellence and preparing each individual for the future through a strong academic program enhanced by a wide range of innovative choices in a responsive and safe environment.

Our other goals are ~

- We will acknowledge, project, and communicate our strengths and values throughout the community to enhance public image.
- We will actively involve families, schools, businesses, senior citizens, and the community at large to create a cooperative partnership that is enriching and mutually beneficial.
- We will create a cohesive and supportive school community.
- We will aggressively seek alternative funding sources for the Grass Valley School District.
- We will provide an articulated, quality educational program that defines what students should learn, know, and be able to do, with outcomes, which can be effectively assessed and reported.
- We will seek ways and means to increase the use of instructional technology as a learning and productivity tool.
- We will create an educational environment that addresses the social, emotional, and physical needs of our students.

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2011-12)

This section provides information on how parents can become involved in school activities, including contact information pertaining to organized opportunities for parent involvement.

Lyman Gilmore welcomes parent volunteers! We can always use help in classrooms, the playground, our library, and a multitude of programs and/or tasks. Parents who wish to help on our Site Council, PTC, or in some other way should contact the principal, John Baggett, at (530) 273-8479. Each year we also offer parent support through language classes, parenting classes, and support groups.

Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2011-12)

Grade Level	Number of Students
Grade 6	134
Grade 7	165
Grade 8	160
Total Enrollment	459

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2011-12)

Group	Percent of Total Enrollment	Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	2.6	White	75.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	Two or More Races	0.2
Asian	0.7	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	63
Filipino	0.9	English Learners	4.4
Hispanic or Latino	10	Students with Disabilities	6.5
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.7		

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)

Subject	2009-10				2010-11				2011-12			
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms		
		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+
English	21.41	5	7	0	25.3	5	14	4	24.1	6	18	2
Mathematics	25.69	2	9	2	23.3	6	11	2	22.2	7	4	2
Science	32.25	0	3	1	28.1	2	4	5	24.5	4	6	2
Social Science	27.6	1	3	1	28.2	3	7	5	27.1	3	4	3

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

III. School Climate

School Safety Plan (School Year 2011-12)

This section provides information about the school's comprehensive safety plan, including the dates on which the safety plan was last reviewed, updated, and discussed with faculty; as well as a brief description of the key elements of the plan.

The comprehensive Safety plan at Lyman Gilmore is regularly updated. Olweus, a research validated anti-bullying curriculum, was developed and implemented at all grade levels two years. Teachers have weekly classroom meetings using the program. Additionally, regular drills are held for fire (evacuation), lockdowns, and earthquakes. In collaboration with the Grass Valley Police Department, we are implementing the G.R.E.A.T. Program (Gang Resistance, Education, and Awareness Training) in 6th grade.

Suspensions and Expulsions

Rate*	School			District		
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Suspensions	34.87	28.34	49.32	18.74	13.54	24.12
Expulsions	0	0.6	.46	0	0.18	.18

* The rate of suspensions and expulsions is calculated by dividing the total number of incidents by the total enrollment (and multiplying by 100).

IV. School Facilities

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (School Year 2012-13)

This section provides information from the most recent Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) data (or equivalent), including:

- Description of the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of the school facility
- Description of any planned or recently completed facility improvements
- The year and month in which the data were collected
- Description of any needed maintenance to ensure good repair

Year and month in which data were collected: July 2011

Six years ago, Lyman Gilmore completed a \$2.5 million modernization project for safety and handicap accessibility. Additional improvements included the complete renovation of the MPR. Subsequently, improvements were made to the telephone/intercom system, the MPR lighting system, and the MPR speaker system. Additionally, the home economics cabinets were completely refurbished as part of an Eagle Scout project. We also added a motorized rear projection screen and a new projector for the Multi-Purpose room 2 year ago. In conjunction with the city of Grass Valley we received a Safe Routes to Schools grant and have updated our traffic pattern and improve our crosswalks, sidewalks and created bike lanes for our families and community that use our schools as a hub for community events.

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

This section provides information from the most recent Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) data (or equivalent), including:

- Determination of repair status for systems listed
- Description of any needed maintenance to ensure good repair
- The Overall Rating (bottom row)

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

V. Teachers

Teacher Credentials

Teachers	School			District
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2011-12
With Full Credential	28	29	29	100
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	0
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	0	0	0	---

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

Indicator	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

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

Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (School Year 2011-12)

The Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), also known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), requires that core academic subjects be taught by Highly Qualified Teachers, defined as having at least a bachelor's degree, an appropriate California teaching credential, and demonstrated core academic subject area competence. For more information, see the CDE *Improving Teacher and Principal Quality* webpage at: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/tq/>

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes in Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
This School	100	0
All Schools in District	99.41	0.59
High-Poverty Schools in District	100	0
Low-Poverty Schools in District	95.45	4.55

* High-poverty schools are defined as those schools with student eligibility of approximately 40 percent or more in the free and reduced price meals program. Low-poverty schools are those with student eligibility of approximately 25 percent or less in the free and reduced price meals program.

VI. Support Staff

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2011-12)

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor	0	0
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	.50	---
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	0	---
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	.68	---
Psychologist	.50	---
Social Worker	0	---
Nurse	.25	---
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	.40	---
Resource Specialist	0	---
Other	0	---

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

VII. Curriculum and Instructional Materials

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2012-13)

This section describes whether the textbooks and instructional materials used at the school are from the most recent adoption; whether there are sufficient textbooks and instruction materials for each student; and information about the school's use of any supplemental curriculum or non-adopted textbooks or instructional materials.

Year and month in which data were collected: August 2011

Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
Reading/Language Arts	Sufficient		0
Mathematics	Sufficient		0
Science	Sufficient		0
History-Social Science	Sufficient		0
Health	Sufficient		0
Visual and Performing Arts	Sufficient		0

VIII. School Finances

Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2010-11)

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Supplemental/ Restricted	Basic/ Unrestricted	
School Site	5,852	1,237	4,615	64,350
District	---	---	5,270	63,505
Percent Difference: School Site and District	---	---	-12.4	1.3
State	---	---	5,455	65,598
Percent Difference: School Site and State	---	---	-15.4	-1.9

* **Supplemental/Restricted** expenditures come from money whose use is controlled by law or by a donor. Money that is designated for specific purposes by the district or governing board is not considered restricted.

** **Basic/Unrestricted expenditures** are from money whose use, except for general guidelines, is not controlled by law or by a donor.

For detailed information on school expenditures for all districts in California, see the CDE Current Expense of Education & Per-pupil Spending webpage at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/ec/>. For information on teacher salaries for all districts in California, see the CDE Certificated Salaries & Benefits webpage at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/>. To look up expenditures and salaries for a specific school district, see the Ed-Data Web site at: <http://www.ed-data.org>.

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2011-12)

This section provides specific information about the types of programs and services available at the school that support and assist students. For example, this narrative may include information about supplemental educational services related to the school's federal Program Improvement (PI) status.

The figures shown in the following table reflect the direct cost of education services, per ADA, excluding food services, facilities acquisition and construction, and certain other expenditures. This calculation is required by law annually and compared with other districts statewide.

Lyman Gilmore provides many programs and specially funded supplemental services. Among them are:

- Special Education (Resource Program, Special Day Class, Speech and Language, Adaptive P. E., Occupational Therapy, Behavioral Therapy, One on One Aides) Although many of these funds from the past have been eliminated, swept or substantially reduced, our district and school supporting children and staff for these programs despite the lack of funds.
- Title 1
- English Learner Program
- After School Program
- After School Tutoring
- Conflict Managers
- Counseling
- GATE program
- Band, Choir, Dance, Drama, Cooking, Visual and Digital Arts

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2010-11)

Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$42,294	\$40,962
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$57,702	\$63,212
Highest Teacher Salary	\$72,426	\$80,545
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	\$93,402	\$102,057
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$98,895	\$106,108
Average Principal Salary (High)		\$110,838
Superintendent Salary	\$119,000	\$152,557
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	42%	40%
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	7%	6%

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

IX. Student Performance

The Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program consists of several key components, including:

- **California Standards Tests (CSTs)**, which include English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics in grades two through eleven; science in grades five, eight, and nine through eleven; and history-social science in grades eight, and nine through eleven.
- **California Modified Assessment (CMA)**, an alternate assessment that is based on modified achievement standards in ELA for grades three through eleven; mathematics for grades three through seven, Algebra I, and Geometry; and science in grades five and eight, and Life Science in grade ten. The CMA is designed to assess those students whose disabilities preclude them from achieving grade-level proficiency on an assessment of the California content standards with or without accommodations.
- **California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA)**, includes ELA and mathematics in grades two through eleven, and science for grades five, eight, and ten. The CAPA is given to those students with significant cognitive disabilities whose disabilities prevent them from taking either the CSTs with accommodations or modifications or the CMA with accommodations.

The assessments under the STAR Program show how well students are doing in relation to the state content standards. On each of these assessments, student scores are reported as performance levels.

For detailed information regarding the STAR Program results for each grade and performance level, including the percent of students not tested, see the CDE STAR Results Web site at <http://star.cde.ca.gov>.

Standardized Testing and Reporting Results for All Students - Three-Year Comparison

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced								
	School			District			State		
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
English-Language Arts	56	56	57	56	55	58	52	54	56
Mathematics	41	48	46	51	53	55	48	50	51
Science	61	65	62	60	62	59	54	57	60
History-Social Science	49	39	42	48	41	41	44	48	49

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

Standardized Testing and Reporting Results by Student Group - Most Recent Year

Group	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced			
	English-Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	History-Social Science
All Students in the LEA	58	55	59	41
All Student at the School	57	46	62	42
Male	53	49	60	35
Female	61	43	64	50
Black or African American				
American Indian or Alaska Native				
Asian				
Filipino				
Hispanic or Latino	49	37	41	41
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander				
White	58	49	64	40
Two or More Races	68	48	57	57
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	52	42	58	36
English Learners	21	11		
Students with Disabilities	30	24	42	
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services				

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

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

The California Physical Fitness Test (PFT) is administered to students in grades five, seven, and nine only. This table displays by grade level the percent of students meeting the fitness standards for the most recent testing period. For detailed information regarding this test, and comparisons of a school's test results to the district and state, see the CDE PFT webpage at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/pf/>.

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards
7	20.5	28.8	37.2

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

X. Accountability

Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of state academic performance and progress of schools in California. API scores range from 200 to 1,000, with a statewide target of 800. For detailed information about the API, see the CDE API webpage at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/>.

Academic Performance Index Ranks - Three-Year Comparison

This table displays the school's statewide and similar schools' API ranks. 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 ten percent of all schools in the state, while a statewide rank of 10 means that the school has an API score in the highest ten 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 ten 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	2009	2010	2011
Statewide	7	5	5
Similar Schools	3	2	3

Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group – Three-Year Comparison

Group	Actual API Change		
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
All Students at the School	-19	9	3
Black or African American			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Filipino			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			
White	-24	19	1
Two or More Races			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-19	10	33
English Learners			
Students with Disabilities			

* "N/D" means that no data were available to the CDE or LEA to report. "B" means the school did not have a valid API Base and there is no Growth or target information. "C" means the school had significant demographic changes and there is no Growth or target information.

Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group - 2012 Growth API Comparison

This table displays, by student group, the number of students included in the API and the 2012 Growth API at the school, district, and state level.

Group	2012 Growth API					
	School		District		State	
	# of Students	Growth API	# of Students	Growth API	# of Students	Growth API
All Students at the School	419	777	1,172	794	4,664,264	788
Black or African American	9		16	763	313,201	710
American Indian or Alaska Native	9		33	786	31,606	742
Asian	3		11	830	404,670	905
Filipino	4		9		124,824	869
Hispanic or Latino	48	729	150	705	2,425,230	740
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	2		3		26,563	775
White	320	786	907	808	1,221,860	853
Two or More Races	1		6		88,428	849
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	270	755	655	761	2,779,680	737
English Learners	19	606	62	635	1,530,297	716
Students with Disabilities	48	544	153	591	530,935	607

Adequate Yearly Progress

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

- Participation rate on the state's standards-based assessments in 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 CDE Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) webpage at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/>.

Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2011-12)

AYP Criteria	School	District
Made AYP Overall	No	No
Met Participation Rate: English-Language Arts	Yes	Yes
Met Participation Rate: Mathematics	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient: English-Language Arts	No	No
Met Percent Proficient: Mathematics	No	No
Met API Criteria	Yes	Yes
Met Graduation Rate (if applicable)	N/A	N/A

Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2012-13)

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 (ELA 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. For detailed information about PI identification, see the CDE PI Status Determinations webpage: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/tidetermine.asp>.

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status	In PI	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement	2010-2011	2011-2012
Year in Program Improvement	Year 3	Year 2
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	---	3
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	---	75

XII. Instructional Planning and Scheduling

Professional Development

This section provides information on the number of days provided for professional development and continuous professional growth in the most recent three year period. Questions that may be answered include:

- What are the primary/major areas of focus for staff development and specifically how were they selected? For example, were student achievement data used to determine the need for professional development in reading instruction?
- What are the methods by which professional development is delivered (e.g., after school workshops, conference attendance, individual mentoring, etc.)?
- How are teachers supported during implementation (e.g., through in-class coaching, teacher-principal meetings, student performance, and data reporting, etc.)?

Each year, teachers at Lyman Gilmore Middle School have three additional contract days beyond the instructional year for professional development. The District has budgeted for staff development, for use as course fees and related expenses. New teachers are required to participate in the BTSA program, which involves many additional hours spent in professional activities during their first two years of teaching. We received a technology grant of over \$200,000 of which at least 25% is and will be spent on staff development. In addition, Gilmore wrote and received a \$28,000 professional development grant to support teachers as we move toward every teacher teaching with an iPad and every student will have an iPad by 2013-14 school year.

All staff are regularly trained in emergency procedures, and universal precautions. Teachers also receive regular training in curricular materials and instructional strategies.