

Murray Manor

School Accountability Report Card

Board Approved on February 6, 2018

La Mesa Spring Valley Schools

Murray Manor Elementary

California Department of Education School Accountability Report Card Reported Using Data from the 2016-17 School Year

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/fq/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](#) 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 2017-18)

District Contact Information (School Year 2017-18)	
District Name	La Mesa-Spring Valley
Phone Number	(619) 668-5700
Superintendent	Brian Marshall
E-mail Address	brian_marshall@lmsvschools.org
Web Site	www.lmsvschools.org

School Contact Information (School Year 2017-18)	
School Name	Murray Manor Elementary
Street	8305 El Paso St.
City, State, Zip	La Mesa, Ca, 91942-2704
Phone Number	619-668-5865
Principal	Gina Miller, Principal
E-mail Address	gina.miller@lmsvschools.org
County-District-School (CDS) Code	37681976038533

Last updated: 1/29/2018

School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2017-18)

Murray Manor Campus is committed to meeting the needs of all scholars in kindergarten through sixth grade.

We take pride in our culture of learning, success, and excellence. Our reputation as a top school in La Mesa-Spring Valley Schools, identified as a California Distinguished School and CA Honor Roll School, is warranted due to our dedication of being a leader in student academic achievement by providing each of our scholars with a challenging learning experience, while embracing the climate of possibility to rise and progress at high levels every day.

Murray Manor Campus takes pride in our tradition of success and excellence based in engaging, meaningful, evidence based instructional and learning practices. Twenty-five classroom teachers collaborate with Specialized Academic Instructional staff, support staff, and instructional specialists while on the journey in embracing the growth mindset built on collective respect and focused on student achievement.


We believe every child can achieve and the effort to meet each child's needs for growth socially, emotionally, and academically is ongoing and intentional. Our focus will continue to be on the tradition of academic excellence via Common Core State Standards and provide opportunities for success as a pathway to continuously build sustainable change on our journey to educate our 21st Century Learners. Our guiding questions are, "What does it mean to be college and career ready?" and "What are we trying to accomplish together?" Our vision is that it's our moral imperative to do what's best and right to maximize success for each and every scholar with a sense of urgency.

We have defined our purpose to build a strong academic and character foundation in each scholar by providing an instructional program that emphasizes high standards of achievement partnered with a Peace Builder emphasis to develop responsible citizens. We are tenacious about improvement and use a collaborative model with relevant research-based practices and analysis of data to accomplish the goals we set each year.

Last updated: 12/21/2017

Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2016-17)

Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	106
Grade 1	105
Grade 2	110
Grade 3	124
Grade 4	102
Grade 5	98
Grade 6	105
Total Enrollment	750



Last updated: 1/11/2018

Student Enrollment by Student Group (School Year 2016-17)

Student Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	5.2 %
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.1 %
Asian	4.7 %
Filipino	1.9 %
Hispanic or Latino	34.9 %
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.5 %
White	41.7 %
Two or More Races	10.9 %
Other	0.1 %
Student Group (Other)	Percent of Total Enrollment
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	37.6 %
English Learners	12.7 %
Students with Disabilities	8.7 %
Foster Youth	0.4 %

Last updated: 1/11/2018

A. Conditions of Learning


State Priority: Basic

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Basic (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
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2017-18
With Full Credential	28	33	23	527
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	0
Teachers Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence (with full credential)	0	0	0	0



Last updated: 1/20/2018

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

Indicator	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments*	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions			1



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.

Last updated: 1/20/2018

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2017-18)

Year and month in which the data were collected: August 2017

Subject	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
Reading/Language Arts	McGraw-Hill – Wonders (Adopted 2016) Intervention English Language Arts Houghton Mifflin – Portals (Adopted 2009)		0.0 %
Mathematics	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt – Math Expressions (Adopted 2015) The College Board – SpringBoard Mathematics (Adopted 2013)		0.0 %
Science	Pearson Scott-Foresman – California Science (Adopted 2006) Holt Rinehart Winston – Holt California Science (Adopted 2007)		0.0 %
History-Social Science	Pearson Scott-Foresman – History-Social Science for California (Adopted 2006) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kindergarten – Learn & Work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st – Time & Place • 2nd – Then & Now • 3rd – Our Community • 4th – Our California • 5th – Our Nation Glencoe McGraw-Hill – Discovering Our Past (Adopted 2006) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6th – Ancient Civilizations 		0.0 %
Foreign Language	McGraw-Hill – Wonders – English Language Development Program (Adopted 2016)		0.0 %
Health	N/A		0.0 %
Visual and Performing Arts	SRA – Art Connections (Adopted 2008) Pearson Scott-Foresman – Making Music (Adopted 2008)		0.0 %
Science Lab Eqpmt (Grades 9-12)	N/A	N/A	0.0 %

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

Last updated: 1/30/2018

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements

This school is inspected continuously throughout the year by the Maintenance and Operations Department staff. Work orders are generated and repairs and/or maintenance is performed as required.

Last updated: 1/11/2018

School Facility Good Repair Status

Year and month of the most recent FIT report: December 2016

System Inspected	Rating	Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	Good	
Interior: Interior Surfaces	Good	
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/Vermin Infestation	Good	
Electrical: Electrical	Good	
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/Fountains	Good	
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	Good	
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	Good	
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences	Good	

Overall Facility Rate

Year and month of the most recent FIT report: December 2016

Overall Rating	Good
----------------	------

Last updated: 1/11/2018

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. Only eligible students may participate in the administration of the CAAs. CAAs items are aligned with alternate achievement standards, which are linked with the Common Core State Standards [CCSS] for students with the most 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 ELA and Mathematics for All Students

Grades Three through Eight and Grade Eleven (School Year 2016-17)

Subject	Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standards					
	School		District		State	
	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16	2016-17
English Language Arts / Literacy (grades 3-8 and 11)	65%	66%	50%	50%	48%	48%
Mathematics (grades 3-8 and 11)	45%	44%	39%	38%	36%	37%

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.

Last updated: 1/11/2018

CAASPP Test Results in ELA by Student Group**Grades Three through Eight and Grade Eleven (School Year 2016-17)**

Student Group	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Met or Exceeded
All Students	424	409	96.46%	66.26%
Male	239	229	95.82%	63.76%
Female	185	180	97.30%	69.44%
Black or African American	28	27	96.43%	51.85%
American Indian or Alaska Native	--	--	--	
Asian	20	17	85.00%	58.82%
Filipino	--	--	--	
Hispanic or Latino	140	137	97.86%	56.20%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	--	--	--	
White	170	163	95.88%	75.46%
Two or More Races	53	52	98.11%	73.08%
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	188	180	95.74%	55.56%
English Learners	77	72	93.51%	50.00%
Students with Disabilities	38	34	89.47%	20.59%
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services				
Foster Youth				

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 (i.e., achieved Level 3--Alternate) on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

Note: 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.

Last updated: 1/11/2018

CAASPP Test Results in Mathematics by Student Group**Grades Three through Eight and Grade Eleven (School Year 2016-17)**

Student Group	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Met or Exceeded
All Students	424	411	96.93%	44.04%
Male	239	230	96.23%	44.78%
Female	185	181	97.84%	43.09%
Black or African American	28	27	96.43%	22.22%
American Indian or Alaska Native	--	--	--	
Asian	20	18	90.00%	50.00%
Filipino	--	--	--	
Hispanic or Latino	140	137	97.86%	32.85%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	--	--	--	
White	170	163	95.88%	57.06%
Two or More Races	53	53	100.00%	39.62%
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	188	182	96.81%	25.27%
English Learners	77	75	97.40%	40.00%
Students with Disabilities	38	35	92.11%	--
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services				
Foster Youth				

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 (i.e., achieved Level 3--Alternate) on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

Note: 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.

Last updated: 1/11/2018

CAASPP Test Results in Science for All Students**Grades Five, Eight and Ten**

Subject	Percentage of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced					
	School		District		State	
	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16
Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)	74.0%	76.0%	62.0%	57.0%	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.

Note: The 2016-17 data are not available. The California Department of Education is developing a new science assessment based on the Next Generation Science Standards for California Public Schools (CA NGSS). The new California Science Test (CAST) was piloted in spring 2017. The CST and CMA for Science will no longer be administered.

Last updated: 1/11/2018

State Priority: Other Pupil Outcomes

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

- Pupil outcomes in the subject area of physical education

California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2016-17)

Grade Level	Percentage of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	Four of Six Fitness Standards	Five of Six Fitness Standards	Six of Six Fitness Standards
5	10.6%	43.6%	27.7%

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.

Last updated: 1/11/2018

C. Engagement

State Priority: Parental Involvement

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Parental Involvement (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 2017-18)

Murray Manor Campus is a strong example of research demonstrating that parent involvement in children's learning is positively related to achievement, higher levels of success, and satisfaction. Simply put, there is a positive and convincing relationship between family involvement and scholars' improved academic achievement. This relationship holds true across families of all economic, racial/ethnic, and educational backgrounds. In addition to parent involvement at school, family involvement at home appears to have a great achievement impact. We will work with all our families to help them be engaged in their child's learning.

We have groups we highly encourage parents to become involved with including Parent Educational Presentations, Parent/Teacher Association (PTA), School Site Council, and English Learner Advisory Committee. Also, there are other parent committees that are formed for specific programs and/or needs throughout the school year including our Art and P.E. Docent programs, Oasis, Garden Club, and our Everyone a Reader program. Our partnerships with local businesses provide a strong link to our community. Parent/Guardians are always welcome to volunteer, and there are many ways to be involved—volunteering in/outside the classroom, assisting with school-wide events, helping with projects, making copies, etc.

We want all families to feel welcome and important at Murray Manor. Parents are critical to our success. We ask that parents/guardians be our educational partners in their scholar's education because learning and growing is impacted by an adult's attention and encouragement. By being involved, active, and working together, we will continue the tradition of excellence at Murray Manor Campus. Scholars who feel hopeful and cared for are able to achieve at higher levels—the best news is that it is within our power to help them do so. Together, as educational partners, we will continue to make this a remarkable school by putting our scholars first in all we do to be the difference.

State Priority: Pupil Engagement

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

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



State Priority: School Climate

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

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

Suspensions and Expulsions

Rate	School			District			State		
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Suspensions	0.6%	0.4%	0.8%	3.8%	3.8%	4.3%	3.8%	3.7%	3.7%
Expulsions	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%



Last updated: 1/11/2018

School Safety Plan (School Year 2017-18)

Current site Comprehensive School Safety Plans (CSSP) are received by the District each year and are approved by the La Mesa-Spring Valley School Board of Education. Each site's plan outlines systems, programs, and practices in place to ensure a safe school environment including, but not limited to, child abuse reporting, disaster preparedness, campus access, and drug and alcohol education and cessation. Each site has one teacher appointed as the school's Health and Safety Officer. This person and the site principal presented their School Safety Plans to their respective School Site Counsel for review and acceptance prior to submission to the Board of Education.

Last updated: 1/30/2018

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 2017-18)

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status		In PI
First Year of Program Improvement		2008-2009
Year in Program Improvement		Year 3
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	6
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	50.0%

Last updated: 1/11/2018

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)

Grade Level	2014-15			2015-16			2016-17					
	Average Class Size	Number of Classes *			Average Class Size	Number of Classes *			Average Class Size	Number of Classes *		
		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+
K	23.0	1	4	0	26.0	0	4	0	27.0	0	4	0
1	30.0	0	4	0	24.0	0	4	0	26.0	0	4	0
2	31.0	0	4	0	29.0	0	4	0	28.0	0	4	0
3	32.0	0	3	0	29.0	0	4	0	31.0	0	4	0
4	34.0	0	1	3	33.0	0	1	2	34.0	0	0	3
5	35.0	0	0	2	35.0	0	0	3	33.0	0	1	2
6	36.0	0	0	3	35.0	0	0	2	35.0	0	0	3
Other	0.0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0

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

Last updated: 1/11/2018

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2016-17)

Title	Number of FTE* Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor		
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)		N/A
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)		N/A
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0.7	N/A
Psychologist	0.7	N/A
Social Worker		N/A
Nurse	0.1	N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	2.6	N/A
Resource Specialist (non-teaching)	2.0	N/A
Other		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 2015-16)

Level	Total Expenditures Per Pupil	Expenditures Per Pupil (Restricted)	Expenditures Per Pupil (Unrestricted)	Average Teacher Salary
School Site	\$5075.3	\$0.0	\$5075.3	\$90149.0
District	N/A	N/A	\$5430.4	\$83717.8
Percent Difference – School Site and District	N/A	N/A	-6.8%	7.4%
State	N/A	N/A	\$6574.0	\$78363.0
Percent Difference – School Site and State	N/A	N/A	-25.7%	14.0%

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

Last updated: 1/19/2018

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2016-17)



Special Education
 Title II Part A - Improving Teacher Quality
 Title III - Immigrant Education
 Title III Part A - Limited English
 Lottery - Instructional Materials

Last updated: 1/19/2018

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2015-16)

Category	District Amount	State Average For Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$52,814	\$48,678
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$67,933	\$78,254
Highest Teacher Salary	\$98,330	\$96,372
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	\$122,793	\$122,364
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$128,682	\$125,958
Average Principal Salary (High)	\$	\$126,758
Superintendent Salary	\$213,294	\$212,818
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	38.0%	38.0%
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	4.0%	5.0%

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



Last updated: 1/11/2018

Professional Development

La Mesa-Spring Valley continues to make fundamental shifts in their professional learning by ensuring our learning is attending to requisite knowledge and skills needed to ensure high levels of learning for each and every student. This year, all teachers participated in an additional full day of professional learning prior to the start of school with a focus on a framework for high-quality teaching and learning, the four questions of a PLC and the 6 characteristics that make up a PLC. Professional learning is also offered during student breaks and summer and is offered in a variety of ways via full day, after school, in class coaching, and conference attendance. We are also committed to Professional Learning Communities and have provided a weekly structure (Tuesday afternoons) that allows teachers of the same grade level or discipline to meet and analyze student learning and discuss best practices to address the needs of each and every student. One Tuesday a month is also dedicated to whole staff learning. The California Teachers Induction Program (CTIP) support providers assist new teachers, and the Peer Assistance and Review program supports teachers experiencing challenges.

In recent years, professional learning has focused on the content and implementation of the California State Standards including the effective adoption of new curriculum in English language arts and mathematics. In the last year, our professional learning has focused in on instructional anatomy and instructional leadership. Instructional anatomy is developing a common language for high-quality teaching and learning, whereas instructional leadership is developing District, principal and teacher leaders to analyze and lead for high-quality teaching and learning. Our theory of action is that if we develop a common language and deep understanding of quality teaching and define and develop instructional leaders within a Professional Learning Community, then each and every student, regardless of race, class, language, and disability will learn at high levels. This work continues this year and we are now fully engaged in identifying power standards in both English Language Arts and Mathematics, identifying the learning targets that align to the standards, and developing common formative assessments to measure student progress in meeting the standards.

Last updated: 1/29/2018