

Tulare County Court

School Accountability Report Card

Reported Using Data from the 2015-16 School Year

Published During 2016-17

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

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

DataQuest

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

Internet Access

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

About This School

Contact Information (School Year 2016-17)

School Contact Information	
School Name	Tulare County Court
Street	11200 Avenue 368,
City, State, Zip	Visalia, CA, 93278-5091
Phone Number	(559) 735-1639
Principal	Karon Valdivieso
E-mail Address	karonv@tcoe.org
Web Site	
CDS Code	54105465430061

District Contact Information	
District Name	Tulare County Office of Education
Phone Number	(559) 735-1640
Superintendent	Jim Vidak
E-mail Address	jimv@tcoe.org
Web Site	www.tcoe.org

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

The Tulare County Office of Education continues to operate the Court Schools in two adjacent Probation-provided facilities, the Juvenile Detention Facility and the Youth Facility. The Court Schools work in tandem with the Probation Department and Health and Human Services to provide incarcerated youth with an educational setting conducive to developing academic, social, and life skills needed to successfully transition to their home schools to complete their education.

The Court Schools have adopted the mission to facilitate high-risk students in becoming proficient in their both their academic and life skills to rejoin their communities as responsible citizens. Ongoing development of effective communication, ethical decision-making, and strong social skills will enable this transition.

Standards-based curriculum is provided to approximately 175 minors at the two schools. Students are provided opportunities to pass the General Education Development (GED) test. The academic program is geared toward individual needs as addressed in the student's Individual Learning Plan (ILP). In small classes of a maximum of 18 at JDF and not exceeding 20 at the Youth Facility, the certificated teaching staff presents lessons that accommodate diversity of academic and linguistic skills and learning styles while addressing state curricular standards. Embedded in the instruction is character education which is also reinforced by literacy studies. The English and Math consultants have enabled the instructors to provide all learners access to the curriculum and facilitate their participation. There is a strong emphasis on technological applications in the classrooms to promote improved computer literacy, investigate career opportunities, and enhance presentation skills.

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

Grade Level	Number of Students
Grade 7	2
Grade 8	3
Grade 9	8
Grade 10	22
Grade 11	42
Grade 12	66
Total Enrollment	143

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2015-16)

Student Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	3.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.4
Asian	0
Filipino	0
Hispanic or Latino	81.1
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0
White	11.2
Two or More Races	2.8
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	65
English Learners	28.7
Students with Disabilities	10.5
Foster Youth	4.2

A. Conditions of Learning

State Priority: Basic

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

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

Teacher Credentials

Teachers	School			District
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2016-17
With Full Credential	9	10	8	170
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	27
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence (with full credential)	0	0	0	0

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

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

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

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

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

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
This School	100.0	0.0
All Schools in District	84.1	15.9
High-Poverty Schools in District	56.7	43.3
Low-Poverty Schools in District	95.1	4.9

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

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

Year and month in which data were collected: September 2013

Subject	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
Reading/Language Arts	Based on literature recommended by the State Department of Education; standards-based literature texts (McDougal Littell, Fearon), grammar books (Holt Rhinehart, Winston), and composition (Houghton Mifflin); Computer applications such as Accelerated Reader, Learning 200, and Odyssey(Compass Learning); State-approved texts for English language learners (National Geographic)	Yes	0
Mathematics	State-adopted algebra texts (McDougal Littell). Four-year replacement policy. Accelerated Math libraries, Learning 2000, Odyssey, and other computer applications.	Yes	0
Science	State-adopted life and physical science texts (Prentice Hall), locally-adopted earth science ((Heath); simulated lab software; Local adopted biology books.	Yes	0
History-Social Science	Standards-based locally adopted texts for American and world histories, world geography, civics and economics (Glencoe, Prentice Hall).	Yes	0

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

The Court Schools are housed in two facilities which are operated by the Tulare County Probation Department. That entity is charged with the responsibility of the safety and security of all detained youth and in ensuring appropriate maintenance of those sites. The classrooms at the Youth Facility are large and receive natural sunlight; our furniture adequately meets our classroom needs; they have been repainted and recarpeted. At the Juvenile Detention Facility, completed in 2000, the classrooms are small and windowless providing limited desk space and room for computers. There are no classrooms with adjoining bathrooms or sinks. There are no planned capital improvements.

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)

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

Overall Facility Rating (Most Recent Year)

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

B. Pupil Outcomes

State Priority: Pupil Achievement

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

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

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

Subject	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standards (grades 3-8 and 11)					
	School		District		State	
	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16
English Language Arts/Literacy	8	7	39	29	44	48
Mathematics	2	2	22	16	34	36

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

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

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
All Students	8	12	8	66.7	
	11	55	36	65.5	9.4
Male	8	11	7	63.6	
	11	51	33	64.7	10.3
Hispanic or Latino	11	45	31	68.9	10.7
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	8	11	7	63.6	
	11	31	19	61.3	6.3
English Learners	11	17	9	52.9	12.5

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

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

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

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

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
All Students	11	56	37	66.1	3.1
Male	11	51	33	64.7	3.5
Hispanic or Latino	11	46	32	69.6	3.6
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	11	32	20	62.5	
English Learners	11	17	9	52.9	12.5

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

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

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

CAASPP Test Results in Science for All Students

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)	0	0		30	32	47	60	56	54

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

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

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

Student Group	Total Enrollment	# of Students with Valid Scores	% of Students with Valid Scores	% of Students Proficient or Advanced
All Students	46	40	87.0	
Male	39	33	84.6	
Hispanic or Latino	35	31	88.6	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	43	37	86.1	

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

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

Career Technical Education Programs (School Year 2015-16)

Career Technical Education is weaved into the English courses and supported by the Behavior Management Specialists. A work portfolio is developed by each student through on-line coursework.

Career Technical Education Participation (School Year 2015-16)

Measure	CTE Program Participation
Number of pupils participating in CTE	0
% of pupils completing a CTE program and earning a high school diploma	0
% of CTE courses sequenced or articulated between the school and institutions of postsecondary education	0

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

UC/CSU Course Measure	Percent
2015-16 Pupils Enrolled in Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission	0
2014-15 Graduates Who Completed All Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission	

C. Engagement

State Priority: Parental Involvement

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

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

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2016-17)

Parental contact includes attendance by parents of Special Education students at team meetings for the Individual Education Program (IEP). The teaching staff is always available to meet with parents to discuss educational needs, especially for those students in long-term programs; the Court School staff provides ongoing support to parents. Awards Assemblies are held at both facilities to recognize academic achievement. The educational program is introduced by students and staff to familiarize parents with the school's organization and objectives. We have informational parent meetings following those assemblies where parental representatives are elected to serve on the Court Schools School Site Council (SSC) and English Learners Advisory Council (ELAC). The organization of the School Site Council serves as an avenue of communication for parents through the submission of questions and concerns to the group for discussion. This advisory group develops the Single Plan for Student Achievement which targets weak academic areas and under-performing subgroups and then adjusts that plan to reflect disaggregated testing results. It is through this group and the Annual Review that program monitoring occurs to address current needs. Parents are invited to the monthly Local Control Accountability Plan meetings.

State Priority: Pupil Engagement

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

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

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

Indicator	School			District			State		
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Dropout Rate	13.20	12.80	10.20	13.20	12.80	10.20	11.40	11.50	10.70
Graduation Rate	81.57	82.64	85.36	81.57	82.64	85.36	80.44	80.95	82.27

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

Group	Graduating Class of 2015		
	School	District	State

State Priority: School Climate

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

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

Suspensions and Expulsions

Rate	School			District			State		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Suspensions	8.8	10.6	7.6	9.4	8.0	5.0	4.4	3.8	3.7
Expulsions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1

School Safety Plan (School Year 2016-17)

The elements of the School Safety Plan are reviewed and updated with staff yearly following discussion with Probation management and the assigned safety officers. Included in the plan are classroom management procedures, standards of professional demeanor, emergency facility procedures (crisis response, evacuation plans, disaster contingencies), mandatory child abuse reporting, sexual harassment policy, and other safe school strategies and programs. The Tulare County Office of Education paid for the installment/upgrade of camera systems within the facility to tape and record classroom incidents.

D. Other SARC Information

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

Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2016-17)

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status	Not in PI	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement		2011-2012
Year in Program Improvement*		Year 3
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	2
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	50.0

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

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)

Subject	2013-14			2014-15			2015-16					
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms		
		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+
English				15	12			15	12			
Mathematics				17	11	2		17	11	2		
Science				15	8			15	8			
Social Science				13	4			13	4			

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

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

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor	0	N/A
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	0	N/A
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	0	N/A
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0	N/A
Psychologist	.5	N/A
Social Worker	0	N/A
Nurse	0	N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	0	N/A
Resource Specialist	1.0	N/A
Other	2	N/A

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

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

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

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Supplemental/ Restricted	Basic/ Unrestricted	
School Site	6,854.00	0	6,854.00	96,236
District	N/A	N/A		
Percent Difference: School Site and District	N/A	N/A		
State	N/A	N/A	\$5,677	
Percent Difference: School Site and State	N/A	N/A	20.7	

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

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2015-16)

Behavior Management Specialists were hired for each site. They supported students with strategies to help them be successful at school which included behavior and anger management skills, study skills, and social skills.

Professional Development (Most Recent Three Years)

Teachers received support from English and Math consultants. The consultants presented best practices at in-services throughout the year. In addition each teacher received individual coaching in their classrooms, which included modeling lessons and team teaching. Teachers are also attending Common Core professional development classes. Specified professional development days focused on the implementation of Common Core. Teachers are also receiving technology professional development.