

## School Accountability Report Card School Year 2002–03

School Information		District Information	
<b>School</b>	ROOSEVELT JUNIOR HIGH	<b>District</b>	SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS
<b>Principal</b>	Dr. Julie Martel	<b>Superintendent</b>	Alan D. Bersin
<b>Address</b>	3366 Park Blvd. San Diego, CA 92103	<b>Address</b>	4100 Normal Street San Diego, CA 92103
<b>Phone</b>	(619) 293-4450	<i>For additional copies</i>	
<b>Fax</b>	(619) 497-0918	<b>Contact</b>	Communications Office
<b>Web Site</b>	<a href="http://www.sandi.net/comm/schools/mid/roosevelt.htm">www.sandi.net/comm/schools/mid/roosevelt.htm</a>	<b>Phone</b>	(619) 725-5578
<b>Email</b>	<a href="mailto:roosec@mail.sandi.net">roosec@mail.sandi.net</a>	<b>Fax</b>	(619) 725-5576
		<b>Web Site</b>	<a href="http://www.sandi.net/research/sarcs">www.sandi.net/research/sarcs</a>
<b>CDS Code</b>	37-68338-6059703	<b>Email</b>	<a href="mailto:pio@mail.sandi.net">pio@mail.sandi.net</a>

### School Description and Mission Statement

*“The mission of San Diego City Schools is to improve student achievement by supporting teaching and learning in the classroom.”*

Roosevelt Middle School is an international studies magnet school, located at the northeast edge of Balboa Park. Roosevelt was built in 1922 and reconstructed in 1974 on the original site. Roosevelt has 1,063 students enrolled in school year 2003–04. About 39 percent of the students are English Learners (ELs). The student population is naturally integrated and comes from the many diverse neighborhoods surrounding the school: downtown, Golden Hills, North Park, Hillcrest, and Mission Hills. At Roosevelt Middle School, we understand the urgency to improve our students’ abilities in literacy and mathematics. We understand that we are all teachers of reading in our curriculum areas. At Roosevelt, we are committed to the following goals:

- A safe, orderly environment for teaching and learning.
- Strong teacher and student leadership to promote teaching and learning.
- Recognition of students’ academic success.
- High citizenship standards and positive social interaction.
- Parent and community involvement.
- Development of career and educational goals.
- Learning opportunities through better attendance.
- Extracurricular activities to enrich the students’ educational experience.
- Teaching technology through the use of the design cycle method.
- A recognized International Baccalaureate Middle Years Program.

### Opportunities for Parent and Community Involvement

<b>Contact Person Name</b>	Allison Brown	<b>Contact Person Phone Number</b>	(619) 293-4450 ext 124
<p>We are committed to obtaining community resources for our school and invite all constituencies within our community to assist us in the education of our students.</p> <p>The district held its first Parent Congress of the 2002–03 school year on October 9. The Parent Congress is composed of a parent delegate from each school and is designed to provide parents information about student achievement, gather input from parents, and consult with them about educational issues. It meets four times a year.</p> <p>Roosevelt is committed to increasing parent and community involvement at our school. We have offered several workshops for parents to learn how to help students with homework, prepare students for college, and help their children make smart decisions in life. Monthly parent meetings are held during which each department makes curriculum and informational presentations in order to help parents learn how to help their children achieve academic success. Parent and community members are active in our School Site Council (SSC) and Site Governance Team (SGT). These committees use the shared decision-making process during monthly meetings</p>			

with the goal of improving student achievement. Parent volunteers meet weekly to assemble Friday Mail that goes home to keep families informed about school activities. We encourage parents and community members to volunteer in classrooms, assist in our library, help with Friday Mail, and to mentor or tutor individual students. Roosevelt is proud to be a partner of the Friends of Roosevelt, an organization that helps us buy library books, funds our “6 to 6” extended school day program, and supports our students and the school in many ways. We have several other formal business partners, including the Navy Fleet Industrial Supply Center, the San Diego Zoo, the Uptown Optimists, and Healthy Start, all of which contribute greatly to the success of our school. If you would like to get involved, please call Allison Brown at (619) 293-4450 ext 124.

## I. Demographic Information

### Student Enrollment, by Grade Level

Grade Level	Enrollment as of September 28, 2002
Ungraded Elementary	14
6	197
7	405
8	298
9	273
Ungraded Secondary	5
TOTAL	1,192

### Student Enrollment, by Racial/Ethnic Group

Racial/Ethnic Category	Number of Students	Percent of Total	Racial/Ethnic Category	Number of Students	Percent of Total
African American	233	19.5	Indochinese	17	1.4
Asian	17	1.4	Native American	7	0.6
Filipino	19	1.6	Pacific Islander	12	1.0
Hispanic	678	56.9	White (Not Hispanic)	209	17.5

## II. School Safety and Climate for Learning

### School Safety Plan

Date of Last Review/Update	January 1, 2003	Date Last Discussed with Staff	March 3, 2003
<p>All district schools have developed a comprehensive school safety plan that meets state requirements. The safety plan includes disaster procedures, procedures for safe entry and exit of students, procedures for serious disciplinary problems, a sexual harassment policy, child abuse reporting procedures, school dress codes, and school discipline policies.</p>			

### School Programs and Practices that Promote a Positive Learning Environment

Roosevelt’s programs for students include “6 to 6” extended school day (before- and after-school care); academic tutoring, including extended-day reading and math; and extracurricular sports, music, and art. We have a student and family resource center, including counseling, case management, mentoring, and health insurance application assistance. We also have a well-defined discipline policy. The general climate in the classrooms and on campus is positive. We have a schoolwide Behavior Management Discipline Plan that also includes conflict mediation, parent shadowing, and numerous incentive programs. We motivate students through numerous incentive programs. Our attendance has steadily improved. Our new telephone system allows us to contact parents or guardians to inquire about the absentees. We have recognized that one of the first steps in reducing the dropout rate is to help students experience success at each level in middle school. Our school’s Gifted and Talented Education (GATE), special education, English as a Second Language (ESL)/English Language Development (ELD), and “6 to 6” programs nurture and enrich the students’ learning environment. Roosevelt’s future plans include a Candidate School, International Baccalaureate Middle Years Program, an Enhancing Science Education Through Technology grant, and a L.E.A.F. (Linking Education, Activity, and Fitness) grant program.

## Suspensions and Expulsions

Rates of suspension and expulsion per 100 students are the total number of incidents divided by the school's CBEDS enrollment for the given year, multiplied by 100. The district comparison rates reported are the expected rates for the school's enrollment and grade-level composition based on actual districtwide experience. Because suspension and expulsion rates vary greatly by grade level and since any given two schools are not likely to have identical enrollment numbers per grade, schools will have different district comparison rates.

	2001		2002		2003	
	School	District	School	District	School	District
Suspensions (number)	326	13,122	436	14,527	404	13,148
Suspensions (rate per 100 students)	29.13	21.43	38.69	21.43	33.89	19.39
Expulsions (number)	6	443	11	361	11	354
Expulsions (rate per 100 students)	0.54	0.87	0.98	0.68	0.92	0.66

## Safety, Cleanliness, and Adequacy of School Facilities

Adult supervision is provided in the classrooms and outside areas before and after school, during recess and lunch, and during passing time between classes. Each school has a Crisis Response Box that includes its state-mandated comprehensive school safety plan. Under the direction of the principal (or site administrator), specific school building security procedures are implemented by staff. In addition, various district offices support district schools by reviewing and disseminating safety requirements and information, coordinating numerous safety-related services, and providing training and assistance.

Roosevelt's supervision team includes all teachers and selected instructional aides (assigned). They participate in the daily supervision of students before, during, and after school. All areas of the campus are supervised daily, including the grounds and the outside perimeter of our campus. In addition, our auxiliary staff (administrators, security aides, and the campus police officer) provide supervision and enforce the discipline policy of the school throughout the day.

All visitors are required to sign in at the administration office to receive permission and identification badges prior to entering the school campus. All gate entrances are secured and monitored by security staff. To ensure optimum safety for students, staff, and visitors, there is a selected gate entrance that permits only authorized vehicles to drive on campus during designated hours.

Roosevelt's grounds and facilities are well kept. With the assistance of Proposition MM, several of our buildings and classrooms have been remodeled, rooms have been painted, and new flooring and white boards have been installed. In addition, we have completed interior and exterior painting; repaired and replaced damaged ceiling tiles; repaired and replaced door and window assemblies; repaired asphalt and concrete paving; updated irrigation and fencing; repaired and replaced carpeting; and repaired the existing heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning system. We have a new sprinkler system that extends across our campus. During the summer of 2004, an elevator will be added to the northeast corner of our 300 building, our library and counseling center will be remodeled, and two new computer labs and three new science classrooms will be added.

Our staff and students strive to keep our campus clean and graffiti free, and our custodial staff work to ensure that our campus promotes a positive learning environment.

## III. Academic Data

### Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR)

Through the California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program, students in Grades 2–11 are tested annually in various subject areas. Currently, the STAR program includes California Standards Tests (CST) in English Language Arts and Mathematics in Grades 2–11, and Science (Grades 9–11) and History-Social Science (Grades 8, 10, and 11); and a norm-referenced test, which tests Reading, Language, Mathematics (Grades 2–11), Spelling (Grades 2–8), and Science (Grades 9–11 only).

### California Standards Tests (CST)

The California Standards Tests show how well students are doing in relation to state content standards. Student scores are reported as performance levels. The five performance levels are Advanced (exceeds state standards), Proficient (meets standards), Basic (approaching standards), Below Basic (below standards), and Far Below Basic (well below standards). Students scoring at the Proficient or Advanced level have met state standards in that content area. Statewide data, reported by grade level for 2003, are accurate within one percentage point. Detailed information regarding results for each grade and proficiency level and for subgroups in 2001 and 2002 can be found at the California Department of Education web site at [star.cde.ca.gov](http://star.cde.ca.gov).

### CST, English Language Arts

Percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standard)

Grade Level	School			District			State		
	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
6	14.4	20.4	19.8	29.7	29.9	35.8	31	30	36
7	19.0	16.9	20.6	29.4	32.3	33.9	32	33	36
8	19.2	19.1	25.0	30.7	31.0	31.8	32	32	30
9	14.6	14.1	18.3	30.8	34.1	38.9	28	33	38

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

### CST, Mathematics

Percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standard)

Grade Level	School			District			State		
	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
6		19.7	20.4		29.2	31.2		32	34
7		13.8	13.7		28.6	28.4		29	30
8		10.4	14.3		13.4	15.3		26	29
9		5.6	3.6		13.4	13.0		22	23

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

### CST, Science

Percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standard)

Grade Level	School			District			State		
	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
9		1.1	1.4		9.5	9.0		33	29

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

### CST, History/Social Science

Percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standard)

Grade Level	School			District			State		
	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
8			19.1			24.5			27
9		9.3			24.3			24	

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

### 2003 CST Subgroups, English Language Arts

Percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standard)

Grade Level	Male	Female	English Learner	Non English Learner	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Non Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Students With Disabilities	Students Without Disabilities
6	9.7	32.4	4.2	31.6	14.9	32.6	0.0	23.9
7	15.7	25.5	2.6	32.2	14.1	33.9	13.2	21.7
8	23.9	26.0	4.9	33.0	19.6	32.8	9.7	26.9
9	12.0	24.0	1.4	26.1	15.6	22.3	4.5	19.8

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

Data for Migrant Education Services is not available

### 2003 CST Subgroups, Mathematics

Percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standard)

Grade Level	Male	Female	English Learner	Non English Learner	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Non Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Students With Disabilities	Students Without Disabilities
6	18.3	23.0	5.6	31.6	17.4	28.3	3.4	23.9
7	13.3	14.1	2.6	20.9	9.5	22.2	7.7	14.6
8	18.9	10.4	5.0	18.3	12.7	16.5	0.0	16.1
9	2.9	4.2	1.6	4.5	2.3	5.5	4.8	3.5

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

Data for Migrant Education Services is not available

### 2003 CST Subgroups, Science

Percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standard)

Grade Level	Male	Female	English Learner	Non English Learner	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Non Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Students With Disabilities	Students Without Disabilities
9	1.0	1.7	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	1.5

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

Data for Migrant Education Services is not available

### 2003 CST Subgroups, History/Social Science

Percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standard)

Grade Level	Male	Female	English Learner	Non English Learner	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Non Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Students With Disabilities	Students Without Disabilities
8	18.0	20.1	3.8	25.2	13.9	26.5	3.4	20.9

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

Data for Migrant Education Services is not available

### 2003 CST Racial/Ethnic Groups, English Language Arts

Percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standard)

Grade Level	African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic	Indochinese	Native American	Pacific Islander	White (Not Hispanic)
6	12.5	—	—	17.3	—	—	—	34.8
7	18.9	—	—	11.2	—	—	—	47.2
8	24.5	—	—	14.5	—	—	—	51.7
9	14.0	—	—	14.5	—	—	—	31.9

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

### 2003 CST Racial/Ethnic Groups, Mathematics

Percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standard)

Grade Level	African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic	Indochinese	Native American	Pacific Islander	White (Not Hispanic)
6	9.4	—	—	19.4	—	—	—	30.4
7	10.8	—	—	6.7	—	—	—	33.8
8	11.9	—	—	11.2	—	—	—	25.9
9	2.4	—	—	2.5	—	—	—	7.0

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

### 2003 CST Racial/Ethnic Groups, Science

Percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standard)

Grade Level	African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic	Indochinese	Native American	Pacific Islander	White (Not Hispanic)
9	0.0	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	4.7

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

## 2003 CST Racial/Ethnic Groups, History/Social Science

Percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standard)

Grade Level	African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic	Indochinese	Native American	Pacific Islander	White (Not Hispanic)
8	12.2	—	—	11.4	—	—	—	43.9

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

## Norm-Referenced Tests (NRT)

Reading and mathematics results from the SAT 9 (2001 and 2002) and CAT/6 (2003) tests are reported for each grade level as the percentage of tested students scoring at or above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile (the national average). School results are compared to results at the district and state levels. Results from the CAT/6 should not be directly compared to those for the SAT 9. Detailed results for subgroup performance on the SAT 9 in 2001 and 2002 can be found at the California Department of Education web site at [star.cde.ca.gov](http://star.cde.ca.gov).

## NRT, Reading

Percentage of students scoring at or above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile

Grade Level	School			District			State		
	SAT 9	SAT 9	CAT/6	SAT 9	SAT 9	CAT/6	SAT 9	SAT 9	CAT/6
	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
6	35.9	35.4	31.7	47.5	49.2	44.2	47	48	45
7	40.1	33.8	31.9	47.6	48.3	44.8	48	48	45
8	38.4	40.7	35.1	51.2	51.7	40.9	50	49	41
9	21.2	14.1	37.3	37.5	36.7	51.4	35	34	50

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

## NRT, Mathematics

Percentage of students scoring at or above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile

Grade Level	School			District			State		
	SAT 9	SAT 9	CAT/6	SAT 9	SAT 9	CAT/6	SAT 9	SAT 9	CAT/6
	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
6	31.0	45.1	37.3	51.6	54.8	48.9	57	60	51
7	34.7	23.4	30.3	46.8	49.8	44.4	50	52	46
8	30.4	28.7	32.7	42.9	45.9	44.2	49	50	48
9	30.9	30.9	27.7	52.8	53.2	44.2	51	52	46

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

## 2003 CAT/6 Subgroups, Reading

Percentage of students scoring at or above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile

Grade Level	Male	Female	English Learner	Non English Learner	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Non Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Students With Disabilities	Students Without Disabilities
6	26.1	38.9	15.5	44.1	26.4	46.5	6.9	37.0
7	26.9	37.0	8.6	47.0	25.8	44.8	21.6	33.5
8	28.9	40.7	7.2	46.5	28.6	44.4	9.7	38.2
9	26.2	47.1	6.9	51.3	31.1	46.2	27.3	38.3

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

Data for Migrant Education Services is not available

### 2003 CAT/6 Subgroups, Mathematics

Percentage of students scoring at or above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile

Grade Level	Male	Female	English Learner	Non English Learner	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Non Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Students With Disabilities	Students Without Disabilities
6	35.5	39.7	23.6	47.9	35.5	42.2	10.3	43.1
7	27.5	33.2	12.8	41.6	24.3	42.4	14.6	32.5
8	36.6	29.3	20.3	37.7	27.4	40.4	3.6	36.0
9	27.7	27.7	14.9	33.3	21.8	36.8	0.0	30.3

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

Data for Migrant Education Services is not available

### 2003 CAT/6 Racial/Ethnic Groups, Reading

Percentage of students scoring at or above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile

Grade Level	African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic	Indochinese	Native American	Pacific Islander	White (Not Hispanic)
6	22.6	—	—	28.1	—	—	—	43.5
7	33.8	—	—	23.4	—	—	—	52.1
8	36.7	—	—	21.1	—	—	—	66.7
9	34.1	—	—	33.3	—	—	—	51.2

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

### 2003 CAT/6 Racial/Ethnic Groups, Mathematics

Percentage of students scoring at or above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile

Grade Level	African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic	Indochinese	Native American	Pacific Islander	White (Not Hispanic)
6	34.4	—	—	34.0	—	—	—	47.8
7	29.6	—	—	21.8	—	—	—	52.1
8	20.8	—	—	28.4	—	—	—	52.6
9	19.5	—	—	26.7	—	—	—	38.6

“—” indicates N ≤ 10

## District Assessment

### Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA)

The DRA is used to identify students in Grades K–3 who are reading below grade level and need support and intervention. The DRA is conducted during a one-on-one reading conference in which a child reads specially selected texts to the teacher. The assessment is administered three to four times a year to determine a student’s instructional reading level and to document progress over time. The DRA is used to identify students in need of support and intervention. Data reported are for all students—English-speaking and English learners.

### Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (SDRT)

#### Analytical Reading Inventory (ARI) and Informal Reading Inventory (IRI)

The SDRT is used to identify students in Grades 4–11 who are reading below grade level and need support and intervention. The SDRT is administered in a group setting and assesses vocabulary, comprehension, and scanning skills. For students reading significantly below grade level on the SDRT, the ARI (Grades 4–8) and IRI (Grades 9–10) are used to reevaluate students and identify appropriate supports and interventions. Data reported are for English-speaking students.

Percentage of students meeting or exceeding the district standard

Grade Level	Reading			Writing			Mathematics		
	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
6	65.3	50.6	51.6						
7	78.3	56.5	53.2						
8	54.0	58.1	70.5						
9	48.3	42.1	48.1						

## 2003 California Fitness Test

Percentage of students meeting fitness standards (scoring in the healthy fitness zone on all six fitness standards)

Grade Level	School			District			State		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
7	38.8	34.0	43.7	26.0	24.4	27.6	27.8	26.0	29.6
9	36.0	31.9	39.8	23.8	25.7	21.7	24.8	26.2	23.3

## Academic Performance Index (API)

The API is a score on a scale of 200 to 1000 that annually measures the academic performance and progress of individual schools in California. On an interim basis, the state has set 800 as the API score that schools should strive to meet.

**Growth Targets:** The annual growth target for a school is five (5) percent of the distance between its base API and 800. Actual growth is the number of API points a school gained between its base and growth years. Schools that reach their annual targets are eligible for awards. Schools that do not meet their targets and have a statewide API rank of 1 to 5 (see definition of statewide rank below) are eligible to participate in the Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP), which provides resources to schools to improve their academic achievement. No funds were allocated to II/USP in 2002–03.

**Subgroup APIs and Targets:** In addition to a whole-school API, schools also receive API scores for each numerically significant racial/ethnic and socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroup in the school. Growth targets are also set for each of the subgroups. Each subgroup must also meet its target for the school to be identified as having met its target.

**Percent Tested:** In order to be eligible for awards, elementary and middle schools must have at least 95 percent of their students in Grades 2–8 tested in STAR. High schools must test at least 90 percent of their students in Grades 9–11 on STAR.

**Statewide Rank:** Schools receiving a base API score are ranked in ten categories of equal size (deciles) from 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest), according to type of school (elementary, middle, or high school).

**Similar Schools Rank:** This is a comparison of each school with 100 other schools with similar demographic characteristics. Each set of 100 schools is ranked by API score from 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest) to indicate how well the school performed compared to schools most like it.

API criteria are subject to change as new legislation is enacted into law. More detailed and current information about the API and public school accountability in California can be found at the California Department of Education website at [api.cde.ca.gov](http://api.cde.ca.gov), or by speaking with the school principal.

## Schoolwide API

	API Base Data				API Growth Data		
	2000	2001	2002		From 2000 to 2001	From 2001 to 2002	From 2002 to 2003
Percentage Tested	96	97	99	Percentage Tested	97	99	99
Base API Score	573	549	565	Growth API Score	553	555	601
Growth Target	11	13	12	Actual Growth	-20	6	36
Statewide Rank	3	2	2				
Similar Schools Rank	8	2	5				

“#” school scored at or above the interim statewide performance target of 800

## API Subgroups—Racial/Ethnic Groups

	API Base Data				API Growth Data		
	2000	2001	2002		From 2000 to 2001	From 2001 to 2002	From 2002 to 2003
<b>African American</b>				<b>African American</b>			
Base API Score	487	500	567	Growth API Score	507	557	583
Growth Target	9	10	10	Actual Growth	20	57	16
<b>Asian (includes Indochinese)</b>				<b>Asian (includes Indochinese)</b>			
Base API Score				Growth API Score			
Growth Target				Actual Growth			
<b>Filipino</b>				<b>Filipino</b>			
Base API Score				Growth API Score			
Growth Target				Actual Growth			

“#” school scored at or above the interim statewide performance target of 800

### API Subgroups—Racial/Ethnic Groups (continued)

	API Base Data				API Growth Data		
	2000	2001	2002		From 2000 to 2001	From 2001 to 2002	From 2002 to 2003
<b>Hispanic</b>				<b>Hispanic</b>			
Base API Score	540	505	524	Growth API Score	505	512	566
Growth Target	9	10	10	Actual Growth	-35	7	42
<b>Native American</b>				<b>Native American</b>			
Base API Score				Growth API Score			
Growth Target				Actual Growth			
<b>Pacific Islander</b>				<b>Pacific Islander</b>			
Base API Score				Growth API Score			
Growth Target				Actual Growth			
<b>White (Not Hispanic)</b>				<b>White (Not Hispanic)</b>			
Base API Score	704	692	683	Growth API Score	702	679	708
Growth Target	9	10	10	Actual Growth	-2	-13	25

“#” school scored at or above the interim statewide performance target of 800

### API Subgroups—Socioeconomically Disadvantaged

	API Base Data				API Growth Data		
	2000	2001	2002		From 2000 to 2001	From 2001 to 2002	From 2002 to 2003
Base API Score	519	508	531	Growth API Score	508	521	578
Growth Target	9	10	10	Actual Growth	-11	13	47

“#” school scored at or above the interim statewide performance target of 800

### API-Based Awards and Intervention Programs

California program data are based on API growth data from the previous academic year.

\*\*\*The II/USP Program was not funded for the year 2002 or 2003

California Programs				Federal Programs			
	2001	2002	2003		2001	2002	2003
Eligible for Governor’s Performance Award	NO	NO	YES	Title I Recognition for Achievement	NO	NO	NO
Eligible for II/USP	NO	***	***	Identified for Title I Program Improvement	NO	NO	NO
Applied for II/USP \$	NO	***	***	Exited Title I Program Improvement	NO	NO	NO
Received II/USP \$	NO	***	***	Years Identified for Program Improvement	2	3	4
				District Schools Identified for Program Improvement	8	0	5
				Percent of Schools Identified for Program Improvement	4.4	0.0	2.7

“\*\*” school is not awards eligible due to adult testing irregularities

### Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

The federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) requires that all students perform at or above the proficient level on the state's standards-based assessments by 2014. In order to achieve this goal and meet annual performance objectives, districts and schools must improve each year according to set requirements. Data reported show whether all groups of students in the school made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Detailed information about AYP can be found at the California Department of Education Web site at [www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay) or by speaking with the school principal.

Groups	School			District		
	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
All Students			NO			YES
African American			NO			YES
Asian (includes Indochinese)						YES
Filipino						YES
Hispanic			NO			YES
Native American						YES
Pacific Islander						YES
White (Not Hispanic)			YES			YES
English Learners			NO			YES
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			NO			YES
Students With Disabilities			YES			YES

“\*” 2003 AYP status appealed and appeal was approved. School met AYP.

## IV. School Completion (Secondary Schools)

### Dropout Rate and Graduation Rate

Data reported for progress over the most recent three-year period toward reducing dropout rates include: Grade 9–12 enrollment, the annual number of dropouts, the one-year dropout rate (dropouts per 100 students) based on CBEDS data, and the graduation rate. To obtain the Grade 9–12 one-year dropout rate, the number of dropouts is divided by enrollment and the result is multiplied by 100. The graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of high school graduates by the sum of dropouts for Grades 9–12, in consecutive years, plus the number of graduates.

	School			District			State		
	99-00	00-01	01-02	99-00	00-01	01-02	99-00	00-01	01-02
Enrollment (9–12)	263	317	323	34,577	35,644	35,970	1,703,492	1,735,576	1,772,417
No. of Dropouts	19	20	15	1,207	1,289	1,417	47,282	47,899	48,454
Dropout Rate	7.2	6.3	4.6	3.5	3.6	3.9	2.8	2.8	2.7
Graduation Rate				84.8	84.6	83.3	85.9	86.7	86.9

## V. Class Size

### Average Teaching Load and Teaching Load Distribution

Data reported are the average class size and the distribution of classrooms by size based on CBEDS data.

Subject	2000-01				2001-02				2002-03			
	Avg.	1–22	23–32	33+	Avg.	1–22	23–32	33+	Avg.	1–22	23–32	33+
English	22.37	57	32	1	21.69	9	4		23.06	10	4	3
Mathematics	25.00	20	19	7	24.06	15	16	3	27.93	3	7	4
Science	28.34	4	19	6	32.00	1	2	5	33.88		3	5
Social Science	28.95	6	22	13	32.71		3	4	32.14		3	4

## VI. Teacher and Staff Information

### Teacher Credential Information

Data reported are the number of classroom teachers at the school in each category. All classroom teachers, part-time and full-time, are counted equally. If a teacher works at two schools, s/he is only counted at one school.

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Total Number of Teachers	56	60	60
Full Credential (fully credentialed and teaching in subject area)	44	45	54
Teaching Outside Subject Area (fully credentialed but teaching outside subject area)	12	11	3
Emergency Credential (includes district internship, university internship, pre-interns and emergency permits)	0	4	3
Teachers with Waivers (does not have credentials and does not qualify for an emergency permit)	0	0	0

### Highly Qualified Teachers

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) requires local educational agencies (LEAs) to report specific data regarding highly qualified teachers. As of December of 2003, the State Board of Education (SBE) had not approved a definition for use in reporting data pertaining to highly qualified teachers. Therefore, the requirement that LEAs include these data will not apply to reports published during the 2003-04 school year. The State Board of Education is scheduled to approve a definition for "highly qualified teacher" in 2004. Once approved, LEAs will be required to use the definition to provide data on report cards published during the 2004-05 school year.

### Teacher Evaluations

The school site administrators (principal and vice principals) formally evaluate tenured teachers every two years based on guidelines set forth in the California Education Code and the teachers' contract. Temporary and probationary teachers are evaluated yearly in a similar manner. Site administrators visit classrooms frequently to observe teachers' instructional practice.

Evaluation criteria for classroom teachers include:

- Progress of pupils toward established standards.
- Instructional techniques and strategies.
- Adherence to curricular objectives.
- Establishment and maintenance of a suitable learning environment.
- Performance of non-instructional duties and responsibilities, including supervisory and advisory duties.

Evaluation results are shared with the teacher and are forwarded to the school's instructional leader for review. All evaluations are confidential and are kept in the district personnel file of the teacher.

Permanent teachers receiving an overall evaluation of unsatisfactory in subject matter knowledge, teaching strategies, and teaching methods participate in the district's Peer Assistance and Review program. As program participants, they are assigned a consulting teacher to help them improve their teaching practice. The consulting teacher observes the teacher in the classroom, provides written feedback, demonstrates teaching strategies or accompanies the teacher to demonstrations in other classrooms, and provides other support as appropriate.

We are committed to making our instructional practices our first priority. Administrators are in the classrooms daily to ensure that our instructional practices are meeting every student's needs.

### Substitute Teachers

The district has a pool of almost 3,000 substitute teachers available for assignment when a classroom teacher is absent. It has an aggressive campaign to hire additional qualified substitutes to ensure a qualified pool is available to cover illness and absences of teachers attending professional development. This campaign includes an online application process available any time and working with principals to identify members of their school community who qualify to substitute.

We try to place substitute teachers according to their areas of expertise, although by state law, credentialed teachers may substitute at any grade level and in any subject.

### Counselors and Other Support Staff

Data reported are in full-time equivalents (FTEs). One FTE is defined as a staff person who is working full time. Two staff persons working half time also equal one FTE.

Title	FTE
Counselor	3.00
Librarian	1.00
Psychologist	1.00
Social Worker	0.00
Nurse	0.00
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	0.00
Resource Specialist (Non-Teaching)	1.00
Middle School Coordinator (1.00 FTE), Attendance Coordinator (1.00 FTE)	2.00
School Police Officer	1.00

### Academic Counselors

Data reported are in full-time equivalents (FTEs). One FTE is defined as a staff person who is working full time. Two staff persons working half time also equal one FTE. The number of students per academic counselor is enrollment reported in CBEDS divided by the number of academic counselors.

Number of Academic Counselors (FTE)	Students Per Academic Counselor
3.00	397.33

## VII. Curriculum and Instruction

San Diego City Schools’ Office of Instructional Support organizes all of the district’s efforts to improve student achievement by supporting teaching and learning in the classroom. Since 1998, the district has introduced a series of reform initiatives directed toward providing all students with effective teaching, high-quality instructional materials, rich learning environments, and additional time and support to reach state academic standards.

### School Instruction and Leadership

Instruction and instructional leadership are at the heart of the San Diego City Schools reform effort. Through the district’s Office of Instructional Support, Instructional Leaders train, coach, support and evaluate principals. Instructional Leaders provide professional development for principals in a variety of ways, e.g., monthly instructional conferences, study groups, and frequent school visits to provide coaching for individual principals. At the school, the principals, in turn, provide support to teachers through staff conferences, frequent opportunities for collaborative study and planning, and individual teacher coaching based on ongoing classroom observations.

Teachers at Roosevelt have received support in developing instructional practices from the math administrator, literacy administrator, two staff developers, the technology coordinator, the magnet coordinator, lead teachers, and a progressive administrative team. We understand the urgency to improve our students’ literacy and math achievement. Consequently, our professional development is structured around the needs of our teachers in meeting the individual needs of our students.

### Professional Development

Through the district’s educational reform strategies and the Office of Instructional Support, teachers and administrators engage in ongoing professional development in literacy, mathematics, and science instruction. Each year, principals identify a schoolwide professional development focus as well as areas of individual need. Throughout the year, principals, supported by peer coaches/staff developers, conduct group and individual staff conferences and coach teachers at the school site to improve instructional practice. At secondary schools, site literacy, mathematics, and/or science administrators also support professional development for teachers.

Teachers in the district participated in a total of three mandatory staff development days in each of the last three school years. These days focus primarily on school-based professional learning in relation to site needs.

We have provided various professional development opportunities at Roosevelt Middle School. Our staff has been able to participate in a variety of conferences and district-sponsored training. We have sent selected teachers to International Baccalaureate Middle Years Program training. We have conducted interschool and cross-school visitations and established study groups to discuss our instructional practices and a variety of professional literature. Our Math Department has participated in lesson study.

### Quality and Currency of Textbooks and Other Instructional Materials

The district adopts textbooks and instructional materials based on the implementation cycle established by the state. It provides sufficient textbooks for all students.

In 2002-03, teachers and students in middle-level schools used recently adopted standards-based materials in mathematics, Grades 6 and 7. They continued using recently adopted, standards-based materials in social studies and 8th grade mathematics. Beginning in 2003-04 teachers and students will be using newly adopted, standards based science and literacy materials in Grades 6, 7, and 8.

### List of Instructional Materials/Textbooks Used in Core Subject Areas (2002–03)

Subject Area	Grade	District Course (for secondary courses)	Instructional Material or Textbook	Adoption Year	From State (K–8) or Local Board (9–12) Lists?
English Language Arts	6	English 6th	Prentice Hall, Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices	2002–03	Yes
English Language Arts	7	English 7th	Prentice Hall, Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices	2002–03	Yes
English Language Arts	8	English 8th	Prentice Hall, Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices	2002–03	Yes
Mathematics	6	Mathematics 6th	Harcourt Brace, Harcourt Brace Math, Grade 6	2002–03	Yes
Mathematics	8	Mathematics 8th	McDougal, Heath Algebra 1	1999–00	Yes
Mathematics	7	Pre-Algebra 1,2	Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra, 2002	2002–03	Yes
Mathematics	8	Honors Algebra 1,2	Glencoe, Algebra 1	1998–99	Yes
Mathematics	8	Algebra 1-2	McDougal, Algebra 1	1999–00	Yes
Science	6	Science 6th	Foss Science Kits	1995–96	Yes
Science	7	Science 7th	Glencoe, Science: An Introduction to the Life, Earth and Physical Sciences	1999–00	No
Science	8	Science 8th	Glencoe, Science Interactions, Course 2 & 3	1995–96	Yes
Science	8	Science 8th	Holt, SciencePlus, Technology and Society	1995–96	Yes
History/Social Science	6	Social Studies 6th	McGraw-Hill, Adventures in Time and Place	2000–01	Yes
History/Social Science	7	Social Studies 7th	Houghton Mifflin, Across the Centuries	2000–01	Yes
History/Social Science	8	U.S. History 8th	Prentice, The American Nation	2000–01	Yes
History/Social Science	8	U.S. History 8th	Addison Wesley, Why We Remember	2000–01	Yes
English Language Arts	9	English 1,2	McDougal, Language of Literature, Grade 9	2002–03	Yes
English Language Arts	9	English 1,2	McDougal, Bridges to Literature	2002–03	Yes
Mathematics	9	Honors Geometry 1-2	Scott Foresman, UCSMP Geometry, 2nd Edition	1996–97	Yes
Science	9	Physics 1,2	It's About Time, Active Physics	2001–02	Yes
Science	9 to 12	Advanced Physics 1,2	Holt, College Physics	1999–00	Yes
Science	9 to 12	Biology 1,2	Glencoe, The Dynamics of Life	2000–01	Yes
Science	9 to 12	Advanced Biology 1,2	Brooks/Cole, Biology: Concepts and Applications	2000–01	Yes
History/Social Science	9 to 10	World History and Geography 1,2	McDougal, Modern World History: Patterns of Interaction	2002–03	Yes
History/Social Science	9 to 10	Advanced World History and Geography 1,2	Holt, Continuity & Change	1997–98	Yes

Note: Adoptions prior to school year 1999–00 are “pre-standards” (i.e., these textbooks and/or materials were adopted before content standards and standards-based materials were adopted by the State Board of Education).

### Instructional Minutes (School Year 2002–03)

The California Education Code establishes a required number of minutes per year for each grade. The table below compares the number of instructional minutes offered at the school level to the state requirement for each grade.

Grade Level	Instructional Minutes Offered	State Requirement
6	65,496	54,000
7	65,496	54,000
8	65,496	54,000
9	65,496	64,800

## Total Number of Minimum Days

In 2002–03, Roosevelt Junior High had 12 shortened days for students. The extra time on shortened days is used for staff development, parent consultation, and teacher planning.

## VIII. Post-Secondary Preparation (Secondary Schools)

### Percentage of Enrollment in Courses Required for University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) Admission (2002–03)

Enrollment in All Courses (Grades 9–12)	Enrollment in Courses Required for UC and/or CSU Admission (Grades 9–12)	Percentage of Enrollment in Courses Required for UC and/or CSU Admission
77	77	100.0

## IX. Fiscal and Expenditure Data

### Average Salaries (Fiscal Year 2001–02)

Statewide Data Category Used for Comparison (type and size of district from Management Bulletin 02–04):

	District Amount	State Average For Districts in the Same Data Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$34,517	\$35,980
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$58,207	\$57,139
Highest Teacher Salary	\$70,179	\$73,953
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	\$87,626	\$100,810
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$97,932	
Average Principal Salary (High)	\$107,513	
Superintendent Salary	\$199,500	\$171,096
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	37.44	43.28
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	3.52	5.20

### Additional Compensation for Administrators

In 2001–02, the district superintendent received benefits equivalent to \$75,694. Benefits included a performance bonus, retirement, Social Security, Medicare, unemployment insurance, Worker’s Compensation, life insurance, vision plan, and dental and medical insurance.

For the same year, principals in the district received variable benefits equivalent to 11.845 percent of their base salary plus fixed benefits equivalent to \$5,183. Variable benefits included retirement, Medicare, unemployment insurance, Workers’ Compensation, and life insurance. Fixed benefits included vision, dental, and medical insurance.

### Expenditures

District		Statewide Average: All Districts in Same Category	Statewide Average: All Districts
Total dollars	Dollars/student (ADA)	Dollars/student (ADA)	Dollars/student (ADA)
\$1,073,688,743	\$8,577	\$6,770	\$6,719

\*ADA—one full year of student attendance

## **Types of Services Funded**

The district's general fund includes monies for:

1. General operations—services, materials, and support to the general education
2. Special education—programs offering appropriate, individualized education to students with special needs
3. Integration—district voluntary integration effort to address the racial/ethnic isolation of students
4. Gifted and Talented Education—specialized learning assistance for students with high ability, achievement, or potential
5. Special projects—monies from agencies (e.g., federal, state) earmarked for specific services
6. Transportation
7. Maintenance and operations
8. District administration

Each school in the district receives an instructional budget based on enrollment, programs, and on formulas set by the Board of Education policy, state law, agreements with employee bargaining units, and guidelines of outside funding agencies.

At Roosevelt, we allocated some of the Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) monies and Magnet Funds to purchase books for our classroom libraries and for staff development opportunities, such as collaboration days, inter- and cross-school visitations, math materials, professional literature, and math focus.