

Marguerite Montgomery Elementary School

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	Marguerite Montgomery Elementary School
Street	1441 Danbury Dr.
City, State, Zip	Davis, CA 95616
Phone Number	530-759-2100
Principal	Jennifer McNeil
E-mail Address	jmcneil@djUSD.net
CDS Code	57726786118905

District Contact Information	
District Name	Davis Joint Unified School District
Phone Number	(530) 757-5300
Superintendent	Superintendent John Bowes
E-mail Address	superintendent@djud.net
Web Site	www.djud.net

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

In the Marguerite Montgomery Elementary School community we focus on learning for every student. Teachers, parents and administrators work collaboratively to ensure success and growth for each child. We spend significant time identifying what all students will learn and ensuring that this learning takes place. We partner with our diverse communities to provide active learning experiences through meaningful curriculum. PTA enables us to provide our students with enrichment activities including Art, music, and drama. We have clubs and activities that engage students with the world around them including Make a Difference Club, Bridge tutoring program, running club and more. Additionally, all sixth graders attend a week long outdoor science camp. MME enjoys strong community support in a culture that is warm and welcoming. MME takes pride in its diversity of students and experiences. MME is a neighborhood school with a traditional program and an Immersion program that is transitioning from a One-Way to a Two-Way Spanish Immersion program. Our campus is well-maintained with ample open space, green areas, a play structure, and a network of student gardens. Our mission statement reads: "At Marguerite Montgomery Elementary we cultivate a vibrant community dedicated to nurturing each child in a respectful, caring environment and providing rigorous, language-rich academic instruction in English and Spanish."

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

Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	89
Grade 1	69
Grade 2	64
Grade 3	46
Grade 4	80
Grade 5	51
Grade 6	44
Total Enrollment	443

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2015-16)

Student Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	2.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2
Asian	6.3
Filipino	0.2
Hispanic or Latino	58.7
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.2
White	26.6
Two or More Races	5
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	57.8
English Learners	42
Students with Disabilities	10.8
Foster Youth	0.9

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	26	21	19	391
Without Full Credential	0	1	1	10
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	1	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments *	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	1	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	95.8	4.2
All Schools in District	94.0	6.0
High-Poverty Schools in District	0.0	0.0
Low-Poverty Schools in District	89.4	10.6

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: October 6, 2016

Subject	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
Reading/Language Arts	Reading/Language Arts K-5 Houghton Mifflin, Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy, 2003, 6-8 Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes, 2002	Yes	0%
Mathematics	Mathematics, K-6: Envision Math, 2015	Yes	0%
Science	Science K-5 Delta Education, Full Option Science System (FOSS), 2007, 6-8 CPO Science, Focus on Earth, Life and Physical Science, 2006	Yes	0%

Subject	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
History-Social Science	History-Social Science K-5 Harcourt, Reflections: California Series, 2006, 6-8 TCI, History Alive! Middle School Program, 2006	Yes	0%

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

Our school is in good repair, according to the criteria established by the Office of Public School Construction. Our challenges are minor ones resulting from common wear and tear, and there are few of them. Recent projects have included exterior backpack hooks for all students, mounted projectors and cameras, and sound amplification systems in each classroom to support language learning. Our school has an aesthetically pleasing environment that reflects our students' backgrounds in its public art. We want our school to be a child-centered and child-friendly in addition to it being safe and in good repair. Our current goal is the construction of an outdoor classroom space.

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: 12/2016				
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		Asphalt cracking (Project scheduled for the summer of 2016). Playground surfacing material damaged (Project bid will be awarded in February for a spring/summer 2016 completion).

Overall Facility Rating (Most Recent Year)

Year and month of the most recent FIT report: 12/2016				
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	48	46	69	71	44	48
Mathematics	39	39	65	65	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	3	48	47	97.9	29.8
	4	76	71	93.4	64.8
	5	53	50	94.3	42.0
	6	47	44	93.6	38.6
Male	3	25	25	100.0	20.0
	4	43	41	95.3	58.5
	5	33	31	93.9	32.3
	6	28	27	96.4	33.3
Female	3	23	22	95.7	40.9
	4	33	30	90.9	73.3
	5	20	19	95.0	57.9
	6	19	17	89.5	47.1
Hispanic or Latino	3	31	30	96.8	13.3
	4	42	40	95.2	47.5
	5	33	32	97.0	34.4
	6	35	33	94.3	27.3
White	3	11	11	100.0	54.5
	4	20	20	100.0	85.0

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
	5	13	12	92.3	58.3
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	3	33	32	97.0	12.5
	4	42	40	95.2	50.0
	5	35	33	94.3	30.3
	6	34	33	97.1	30.3
English Learners	3	20	19	95.0	10.5
	4	25	21	84.0	28.6
	5	13	11	84.6	9.1
Students with Disabilities	4	16	14	87.5	21.4

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	3	48	48	100.0	34.0
	4	76	74	97.4	54.0
	5	53	52	98.1	30.8
	6	47	45	95.7	28.9
Male	3	25	25	100.0	28.0
	4	43	41	95.3	51.2
	5	33	32	97.0	21.9
	6	28	27	96.4	33.3
Female	3	23	23	100.0	40.9
	4	33	33	100.0	57.6
	5	20	20	100.0	45.0
	6	19	18	94.7	22.2
Hispanic or Latino	3	31	31	100.0	19.4
	4	42	40	95.2	35.0
	5	33	33	100.0	21.2
	6	35	34	97.1	11.8
White	3	11	11	100.0	90.0
	4	20	20	100.0	80.0

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
	5	13	12	92.3	41.7
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	3	33	33	100.0	18.2
	4	42	41	97.6	36.6
	5	35	34	97.1	23.5
	6	34	34	100.0	14.7
English Learners	3	20	20	100.0	10.0
	4	25	24	96.0	16.7
	5	13	13	100.0	23.1
Students with Disabilities	4	16	14	87.5	21.4

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)	56	31	49	82	81	78	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	53	51	96.2	49.0
Male	33	31	93.9	48.4
Female	20	20	100.0	50.0
Hispanic or Latino	33	32	97.0	34.4
White	13	12	92.3	66.7
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	35	33	94.3	33.3
English Learners	13	12	92.3	8.3

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.

State Priority: Other Pupil Outcomes

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Other Pupil Outcomes State Priority (Priority 8):

- Pupil outcomes in the subject areas of physical education.

California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2015-16)

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards

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.

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)

Montgomery is fortunate to have an outstanding staff and an energetic group of students and parents working together to refine and improve our learning community. Our PTA, School Site Council (SSC), and English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) are active, involved, and informed groups. Our goal is to build academic and social environments that will open doors to lifelong learning for every member of our school community in order to ensure that each student reaches their potential. Our parent education programs are rich and include literacy, math and Spanish/English instruction. Parent groups run by the Family Resource Center give families an opportunity to learn and enjoy one another as part of our school community.

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	2.1	1.8	2.4	3.7	2.4	3.0	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)

Our school places strong emphasis on safety for both students and staff. We review emergency plans frequently and train annually in safety procedures and fire and earthquake drills. The district's careful use of resources ensures that students have access to clean and safe facilities. The district's facilities staff works within a scheduled preventative maintenance program to prevent costly repairs. Each site has updated and implemented a district wide crisis plan. Staff and hired yard supervisors monitor the school grounds for 20 minutes before and after school as well as at all recesses and at lunch time. Visitors must sign in at the office, where they receive a bright badge to wear throughout their stay. We consider a comfortable and caring environment to be part of school climate and are implementing a school-wide character trait of the month program as well as incentives and consequences for behavior. We hold monthly spirit days, and provide opportunities for our students so that they develop the characteristics that will prepare them to become responsible, contributing citizens. For instance, we have a student based recycling program, our students compost fruits and vegetables, and they plant, tend, harvest and eat from our "triangle" food garden. Our staff works to know every child by name as well as to know their individual strength. We want our school to be a place that nurtures our students and a place our children truly enjoy being.

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	In PI	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement	2009-2010	2013-2014
Year in Program Improvement*	Year 5	Year 2
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	4
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	66.7

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

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)

Grade Level	2013-14				2014-15				2015-16			
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes		
		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+
K	27	0	2	0	23	0	3	0	22	1	2	0
1	26	0	2	0	20	1	2	0	23	0	3	0
2	26	0	3	0	25	0	3	0	21	0	3	0
3	25	0	3	0	27	0	3	0	24	0	2	0
4	22	0	2	0	24	0	2	0	26	0	3	1
5	28	0	2	0	24	0	2	0	17	1	2	0
6	27	0	2	0	22	0	3	0	20	1	1	0

Number of classes indicates how many classes fall into each size category (a range of total students per class).

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)	.7	N/A
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	.5	N/A
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	1.138	N/A
Psychologist	.6	N/A
Social Worker	0	N/A
Nurse	.20	N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	1.0	N/A
Resource Specialist	0	N/A
Other	.70	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	10,705	3,651	7,054	52,025
District	N/A	N/A	7,315	\$64,865
Percent Difference: School Site and District	N/A	N/A	-3.6	-19.8
State	N/A	N/A	\$5,677	\$71,517
Percent Difference: School Site and State	N/A	N/A	24.3	-27.3

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

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2015-16)

In 2015-16 Marguerite Montgomery Elementary School received funding and services through the following federal, state and local resources: Title I, Part A, Local Control Funding Formula, Davis Parcel Tax, Davis Schools Foundation, and Davis School Arts Foundation.

Types of funded services include: Reading specialist support, Math specialist support, English Learner specialist support, Differentiation specialist, School counselor support, Project supervision specialist, reading and English learner para-educator support, instructional technician specialist support, classroom libraries and instructional supplies, after-school and summer school Bridge program support, family math and literacy events, translation services, and professional development.

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2014-15)

Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$37,305	\$43,821
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$59,425	\$69,131
Highest Teacher Salary	\$79,525	\$89,259
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	\$104,453	\$108,566
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$111,180	\$115,375
Average Principal Salary (High)	\$118,111	\$125,650
Superintendent Salary	\$181,560	\$198,772
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	37%	37%
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	6%	6%

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

Professional Development (Most Recent Three Years)

Davis Joint Unified School District focuses our professional growth system on our mission and objectives with priority given to social emotional intelligence, differentiated instruction, inquiry based instruction, implementation of the Common Core State Standards, closing the achievement and opportunity gap, as well as the formative assessment process. These focus areas were developed through the Strategic Plan and Local Control Accountability Plan goals along with teacher surveys and Principal feedback to ensure relevancy and meaning for our community.

Davis Joint Unified School District uses a variety of professional learning models to engage staff in their continued growth. Built on the foundation of internal expertise and consultants from outside our district, staff has opportunities during the school year and summer to complete professional development learning episodes and time to implement best practices learned. These activities are supported by federal, state, and local funding as well as generous local parcel taxes. The professional growth occurring in Davis Joint Unified School District has a heavy emphasis on collaboration where time is reserved weekly for staff collaboration by sites in grade level or departmental teams under the direction of site administrators. Staff also has the opportunity to collaborate with grade level/content peers through Common Core Collaboration Grants and collaboration is built into all professional development sessions. Davis Joint Unified School District also has instructional coaches that provide professional growth opportunities with model lessons, collaborative planning and in context learning. Examples of recent Davis Joint Unified School District professional learning include:

- Site developed training (TK – 12) based upon needs articulated by staff, parents, and students to meet specific needs and goals. Sites develop professional growth with the support of outside expertise, district leadership, and staff.
- UC Davis Mathematics Project Teacher Leadership program (K-12) trained math teachers, instructional coaches, and some administration in the Common Core State Standards and progression of mathematical practices.
- Davis Joint Unified School District (7-12) Articulation breakout sessions by department where teacher experts lead and facilitate learning as well as keynote speakers addressing priority topics.
- English Language Development Series promoted by the County Office of Education to dissect the implementation and purpose(s) of the new English Language Development Standards.
- Yolo County Mental Health First Aid
- Restorative Practices
- Staff Book Groups on Mathematical Practices, Coaching Strategies, and impact of trauma (ACES)