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# General Background and History 

COMMUNITY

On March 22, 2013, Eisenhower High School marked the 50th ${ }^{-Y}$ Year Anniversary of President Dwight D. Eisenhower's historic visit to the Eisenhower campus. A 1963 Newsweek picture of the former President observing an Eisenhower class is proudly displayed on the school website under the heading: "Ike Visits Ike." Eisenhower High School is proud to be the high school with the longest standing tradition of service to the families and community of Rialto, California. Eisenhower is one of three comprehensive high schools that serve the Rialto Unified School District. When Eisenhower High School finally opened its doors to students on November 2, 1959, Rialto was still a small community. In 1956, Rialto's population was 15,359 . By 2010, Rialto's population had soared to 99,171 residents. Rialto's proximity to the Los Angeles area has made Rialto a place to call home for those who seek a relatively short commute to work. Rialto's housing mix and costs are believed to be some of the most affordable in our Southern California region. First time home-buyers find Rialto more affordable than almost any comparable community in the Inland Empire. The median income of Rialto households is $\$ 50,452$, well below the California average of $\$ 77,167$ for a family of four. Rialto is also a relatively young community, with a median age of 28.3 years. The two ethnic minorities with the largest representation in Rialto are Hispanic ( $67.6 \%$ of the population), followed by African-American (15.6\%). White residents make up 12.6\% of Rialto's population.

## PARENT/COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

Parents of Eisenhower High School students have numerous opportunities to work closely with the school and district to ensure their child's success. The district's Parent University offers courses and certification opportunities for parents to learn more about topics such as: Common Core State Standards; Healthy Mind, Body, and Environment; Classroom Climate; Report Cards and A-G requirements; Gifted And Talented Education (GATE) and other special programs; bullying; and Math/Literacy. Eisenhower is proud to report that more Eisenhower High School parents have graduated from the Parent University than any other Rialto Unified school site.

In addition to being able to shadow their student for a day, parents of Eisenhower students are encouraged to become involved with school-based organizations including: School Site Council, Parent Teacher Student Association, English Learner Advisory Committee, Golden Eagle Alliance Booster Club, Gridiron Booster Club, and WASC Parent Committee.

Eisenhower parents are also welcomed to visit the campus during Back-toSchool Night, annual College and Career Fair, and Coffee with the Principal morning meetings. New to Eisenhower during this 2013-2014 school year is the on-campus Parent Center. The Parent Center is adjacent to the administrative offices, and provides a place for parents to gather information about our school. Computers within the Parent Center will eventually allow parents to obtain current student academic progress via the Synergy Student Information System.

## SCHOOL/ BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS

Since our last full self-study in 2008, Eisenhower has been able to develop partnerships between outside academic enrichment organizations and our Science department. These partnerships have led to valuable and memorable experiences for our students. Going on its second year is the ACE mentoring program. ACE is a group of Architects Construction Engineers and Civil Engineers that visit campus twice a month in order to teach students about the business of building. These mentors arrange scholarships and internships for Eisenhower students. This program is supported locally by over a dozen businesses, and has allowed our students to tour businesses and work sites.

A second partnership developed by the Science department is with the California State University's Upward Bound program. Upward Bound is a college outreach program that works to motivate students whose families have not traditionally been able to attend college. By offering classes during the summer, which give the students' credit towards graduation, Upward Bound attempts to make the path to college easier for Eisenhower students. It functions like summer school, with a wider variety of classes and more interaction within the community. During the school year, the students are tutored and followed academically by Upward Bound mentors to help them assure acceptance into a college. In the fall of 2013, three of our Upward Bound NASA students presented their research at the annual TriO Council for Opportunity in Education (COE) conference for three days in Chicago, Illinois.

Through various student organizations on campus, Eisenhower High School has several opportunities for students to work in partnership with local community organizations and businesses. Our HOSA (Association of Health Sciences Students) club has been able to partner with outside organizations to offer students medical field related trainings. HOSA members have participated in 2 hour HOSPICE trainings and 10+ hours of trainings with Planned Parenthood Peer Tutoring program. Other clubs have visited Preston Elementary School, Dunn Elementary School, and Boyd Elementary School providing community services. In addition to visiting elementary schools in the area, Eisenhower students participate in other community service activities with organizations such as: Rialto Historical Society, Planned Parenthood of San Bernardino, Life Stream, Veterans Administration of Loma Linda, Rialto Retirement Center, Rialto Child Assistance, City of Rialto Department of Parks and Recreation, San Bernardino County Health Department, Nursing Department of Cal State University San Bernardino, and Toyota's Public Lands Day. Eisenhower has developed strong business partnerships with numerous organizations which provide scholarships to our students as well as donations to our school, such as: Kiwanis Club of Rialto, Rialto Rotary Club, The Rialto Police Benefit Association, Exchange Club of Rialto, Dr. Garrick L. Motley Memorial, Andrea Harring, and The Casey Bernal Foundation among others.

The Hope Through Housing Foundation (a.k.a. Hope), a nonprofit organization that offers academic and enrichment services to elementary, middle and high school youth, teamed with Eisenhower's counseling department in the summer of 2010 and 2011. They offered incoming Freshmen a four-day high school orientation experience that would prepare them for the challenges and expectations of high school. The course was called "Summer Bridge". Throughout four years, Hope Through Housing was able to offer amazing resources to our students through their Grove Teen Center. The Grove Teen Center is located in Rialto at 250 East Baseline Road, across the street from campus. The Grove Teen Center continues to offer students free services such as tutoring, homework assistance, test preparation, social clubs and activities. On campus, Hope Through Housing staffed a classroom available to students after school for tutoring, mentoring, college counseling, and general academic assistance. Four tutors were available to mentor students in most subjects. Students were offered snacks and the use of six computers and a printer. Due to the termination of funding for the project, Hope Through Housing no longer operates an after school tutoring classroom.

## ACCREDITATION HISTORY

Eisenhower's last, full self-study was conducted during the 2007-2008 academic year. As a result of that visit, Eisenhower was awarded a six-year accreditation term with a three-year review visit. During the 2007-2008 school year, Eisenhower's staff, in collaboration with the WASC Student Committee, the WASC Parent Committee, and a paid outside consultant, developed an Action Plan with the following five goals:

1. Improve reading comprehension levels of all students, especially English Learners.
2. Improve student performance in math classes and on standardized math tests.
3. Improve communication among all stakeholders.
4. Provide improved assistance to students in the development of a fouryear plan for high school, and the transition to post-secondary endeavors.
5. Improve the student attendance rates.

The data and evidence collected during this self-study indicates that these five Action Plan goals have been, and continue to be, noticeably addressed as Eisenhower strives to improve the quality and effectiveness of our instructional program. The three-year review visit in 2010 found that Eisenhower High School had positively addressed all of the suggestions and recommendations made by the 2008 WASC visiting team.

## School Purpose

## Mission Statement

We provide a safe environment and the opportunity for students to optimize their intellectual, social, and personal development to become productive members of a democratic society.

## Vision Statement

Eisenhower High School will prepare all students for post-secondary educational, vocational, and high school to career opportunities by promoting high academic achievement in a safe and productive environment.

Schoolwide Learner Outcomes

## Eisenhower High School will prepare its students to be:

Respectful individuals who:

* Demonstrate respectful behaviors towards students and adults.
* Possess the ability to demonstrate respect with individuals and groups. Responsible individuals who:
* Are responsible for their academic success.
* Demonstrate the willingness to assist others.

Relevant thinkers who:

* Actively pursue understandings of the world around them.
* Apply critical thinking skills to real life scenarios.

Rigorous learners who:

* Apply problem solving processes to evaluate and analyze academic material.
* Approach life with intellectual curiosity.


## School Program Data

An exciting new addition to Eisenhower's academic course offerings is the Science Technology Engineering Math (STEM) Academy. The STEM Engineering academy began its initial stages during the 2011 -2012 school year, with full implementation following during the 2012-13 school year. Made possible with grant funding from Project Lead the Way, the STEM Engineering program is open to all students in grades 9-12. The full program consists of five different courses: Engineering Design, Principles of Engineering, Digital Engineering, Civil Engineering, and Engineering Development and DesignCapstone. Designed as a four-year sequence program, students are able to develop skills that could prepare them for a future career in the fields of Engineering. Students participate in project-based learning, and are able to take engineering-related field trips.

We are especially proud of one of our longer-lasting Career Pathway programs: Early Childhood Education. This program partnerships with local businesses and elementary schools. Home Economics Careers and Technology Program provides students with the opportunity to take a sequence of courses in Child Development, culminating in a capstone course, Careers with Children. In this career pathway, students develop employment and management skills for careers in child development and education. Students, working under the supervision of a preschool or elementary school teacher, gain on-the-job experience by working directly with children in a day care or elementary setting for two hours a day. Participating Rialto day care facilities include La Petite Preschool, Rosie's I, and Rosie's II Preschools. Students gaining work experience with elementary students are partnered with Dunn Elementary, Morgan Elementary, and Preston Elementary.

A long-running Home Economics Careers and Technology Career Pathway that is not only unique to Eisenhower but also brings much pride to the campus is the Café d'Eisenhower, run by the Advanced Culinary Arts class. Eisenhower's Culinary Arts students were engaged in authentic Problem Based Learning long before PBL became the latest educational trend. Students who complete a sequence of Culinary Arts courses are invited to enroll in Advanced Culinary Arts; it is the capstone course for this program. Run like a professional restaurant, each week students prepare a delicious meal for paying customers. Diners are treated to a sit-down style lunch that includes a multiple course meal and table-side service. These limited space luncheons
sell-out most weeks, allowing the program to teach students about the various tasks of running a professional kitchen and restaurant. Each week, students share the responsibilities of host/hostess, waiter/waitress, and chef. Students involved in this program have catered for Rialto Women's Club, events at Carter High School, as well as numerous other events at Eisenhower High School. As part of the program, students have been able to take field trips to the college campuses of Cal Poly Pomona, San Bernardino Valley College, and to the Chino campus of Chaffey College.

The Internship class at Eisenhower is a two-year program that prepares students for the world of work and/or college. Students develop job and scholarship portfolios, hold mock job interviews, and complete job, college and financial aid applications. Students involved in the Internship program are placed at over 75 local businesses including La Petite Preschool, Arrowhead Regional Medical Center and the San Bernardino Sherriff's Academy. An internship program has been developed with the City of Rialto and is available to our students.

Eisenhower's Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) program currently services 244 of our students. AVID is designed to increase the success of Eisenhower students by having them participate in a rigorous curriculum. The goal is to increase their enrollment in 4-year universities following high school graduation. AVID elective classes include academic and social preparation in the areas of study skills, coping strategies, career awareness, portfolio development, writing skills throughout multiple areas, critical thinking, problem solving, the application of Cornell Notes, time management skills, cultural awareness, and tutoring opportunities. Numerous teachers have participated in AVID Path professional development in order to incorporate more research-based AVID instructional strategies in non-AVID classes.

## Demographic Data

## SCHOOL STATUS

The Rialto Unified School District has been designated as a Title l district, but does not classify its three comprehensive high schools as Title 1 schools.

## ENROLLMENT

For the 2012-13 school year, Eisenhower High School has a population of 2,410 students.

The grade level and gender break down is as follows:

|  | $9^{\text {TH }}$ GRADE | $\begin{array}{r} 10^{\mathrm{TH}} \\ \text { GRADE } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11^{\mathrm{TH}} \\ \text { GRADE } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12^{\mathrm{TH}} \\ \text { GRADE } \end{array}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 296 | 318 | 316 | 268 | 1,198 |
| Female | 308 | 330 | 311 | 263 | 1,212 |
| Total | 604 | 648 | 627 | 531 | 2,410 |

Differing from the ethnic make-up of the city of Rialto, the largest ethnic minority represented on our campus is Hispanic. Hispanics make up $67.6 \%$ of Rialto's population, and make up $80 \%$ of our school's population. The second largest ethnic minority group is African American, which represents 14\% of the student body. This percentage is closely similar to the City of Rialto's African-American population of $15.6 \%$

Eisenhower Student Population

| Fthnicity | Number | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ahispanic | 1,929 | $80 \%$ |
| African American | 331 | $14 \%$ |
| White | 83 | $>1 \%$ |
| Samoan | 21 | $>1 \%$ |
| Other Asian | 8 | $>1 \%$ |
| FHilipino | 6 | $>1 \%$ |
| Other Pacific Islander | 5 | $>1 \%$ |
| Cambodian | 2 | $>1 \%$ |
| Vietnamese | 1 | $>1 \%$ |
| American Indian | 2 | $>1 \%$ |
| Japanese | 2 | $>1 \%$ |

Eisenhower students are categorized into programs such as the Resource Specialist Program (RSP), Special Day Class (SDC), English Learner (EL), and the Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) program. For the 2013-2014 school year, the student enrollment in these programs is as follows:

| GRADE | $9^{\text {TH }}$ | $10^{\text {TH }}$ | $11^{\text {TH }}$ | $12^{\text {TH }}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RSP | 36 | 33 | 29 | 34 | 132 |
| SDC | 23 | 25 | 23 | 38 | 109 |
| EL | 127 | 116 | 112 | 88 | 443 |
| GATE | 122 | 120 | 104 | 78 | 424 |
| AVID | 46 | 96 | 69 | 33 | 244 |

## LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

Almost one-fifth of Eisenhower students are classified as English Learners. The primary language of a majority of Eisenhower's English Learners is Spanish. Students who have been classified as Initial Fluent English Proficient (IFEP) and students who are Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) are not included in our English Learner population numbers, but represent a significant percentage of Eisenhower students. Currently, there are 284 IFEP students and 633 RFEP students. As the Rialto community continues to grow, Eisenhower anticipates a continued growth in the English Learner student population. The total number of English Learner students and their EL classifications are as follows:

| GRAD E | $\begin{gathered} \text { BEGINNIN } \\ \mathbf{G} \\ \text { EL } 1 \end{gathered}$ | EARLY INTERMEDIAT E EL 2 | INTERMEDIAT E EL 3 | EARLY ADVANCE D EL 4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { ADVANCE } \\ \text { D } \\ \text { EL } 5 \end{gathered}$ | TOTA L |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $9^{\text {th }}$ <br> Grade | 5 | 16 | 56 | 42 | 8 | 127 |
| $10^{\text {th }}$ <br> Grade | 13 | 10 | 60 | 29 | 4 | 116 |
| $11^{\text {th }}$ <br> Grade | 4 | 7 | 46 | 52 | 3 | 112 |
| $12^{\text {th }}$ <br> Grade | 11 | 7 | 25 | 36 | 9 | 88 |
| Total | 33 | 40 | 187 | 159 | 24 | 443 |

In August 2010, the Rialto Unified School District opened an English Learner Newcomer Program on the Rialto High School campus in order to educate Beginning and Early Intermediate English Learners with 3 years or less
education in U.S. schools. This resulted in most English Learner students from these lower levels to be transferred Rialto High School. However, the English Learner newcomer program was reinstated for each high school according to the District boundaries in August 2013 for the academic year 2013-1014. In addition, Eisenhower offers English Language Development courses for Intermediate English Proficiency level 1 students and other Limited English Proficient (LEP) students who have tested at Beginning, Early Intermediate and Low Intermediate levels who have been in U.S. schools for 4 or more years. A placement assessment is given to these students and based on their assessment results, placement in the appropriate intervention class is made in conjunction with a mainstream English class. Tutoring is offered after school to English Learners who are struggling in their core classes. Summer School classes have also been offered to students in an effort to increase their English language proficiency. To encourage greater student participation in the tutorial support programs, staff members have communicated with parents through phone calls. Parent English Language Advisory Committee meetings are held regularly in order to promote student participation in these support programs.

## ATTENDANCE

The 2012-2013 Average Daily Attendance (ADA) rate for Eisenhower High School was $96.32 \%$. Twelfth grade students had a slightly better average daily attendance rate than the underclassmen, with a rate of $96.76 \%$. Juniors had an average daily attendance rate of $96.13 \%$. Sophomores were at $96.13 \%$, and freshmen were at 96.3\%.

The total mobility and transiency rates for Eisenhower High School during the 2012-13 school year were approximately $16 \%$. The overall truancy rate was $10.27 \%$, while the tardy rate was just under ten percent at $9.98 \%$. The school imposes serious consequences on students with attendance violations. Parents of students with poor attendance receive automated phone calls home, letters sent home, followed by in-person calls from the Attendance Office to discuss their student's absences. Habitual truancies, tardies, and other unexcused absences result in disciplinary consequences including placement on Attendance Contracts, referrals to the School Attendance Review Board (SARB), and ultimately citations from the school's Resource Officer. Many Rialto Unified School District students attend several schools in one year, or miss months of school at a time, due to transiency. Eisenhower staff members
have recognized that it is extremely difficult for students to be successful without regular school attendance, and would like to see a reversal in this trend.

## DISCIPLINE DATA

While there have been many site level administrative changes, staff implements a discipline plan that is firm, fair, and consistent. Administration ensures that all students clearly understand what is expected of them, and that the students will be held accountable for their behavior. Grade level assemblies are held at the beginning of each school year to welcome students and inform them of the school's discipline policy. The numbers of suspensions and expulsions have decreased significantly since the 2007-2008 school year, and are as follows:

| Years | Suspensions | Pxpulsions |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2012-13$ | 218 | 13 |
| $2011-12$ | 789 | 9 |
| $2010-11$ | 1530 | 12 |
| $2009-2010$ | 2049 | 15 |
| $2008-2009$ | 2217 | 17 |
| $2007-2008$ | 2203 | 26 |

## SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Eisenhower High School serves a large number of students who come from households with a lower socio-economic status. In 2013, 79\% of Eisenhower students were eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch (CALPADS). Of our 2012-2013 student enrollment, 83\% were classified as Socioeconomically Disadvantaged.

A majority of our students also come from households without a tradition of attending post-secondary educational institutions. Only $26 \%$ of Eisenhower parents reported to have either attended some college, were a college graduate, or attended a graduate school. Just 6\% of Eisenhower parents reported to be a college graduate.

## SCHOOL SAFETY AND APPEARANCE

Eisenhower High School is committed to providing a safe and secure school campus for students and staff. A team of seven campus security officers and a Rialto Police Department School Resource Officer, assigned to support the
four district high schools, maintain order on the campus by enforcing school rules and being highly visible on campus. Security personnel conduct conflict mediation meetings when appropriate and utilize a proactive approach to dealing with student behavior. In a spring 2013 student survey, $87 \%$ of Eisenhower students agreed with the statement: "I feel physically safe inside classrooms."

The Eisenhower facility is adequate to house all students and staff. Every teacher is assigned his/her own classroom. Although improvements have been made over the years to maintain the facility, much renovation and modernization still needs to be done to provide an attractive and effective learning environment.

On November 2, 2010, local voters approved Measure Y, a $\$ 98$ million general obligation bond allowing the District to improve all 29 RUSD schools. Eisenhower has benefited in the first phase of Measure $Y$ with modernization of our Science classrooms, new air-conditioning units in our gym, and the repair of our aging electrical infrastructure.

Major areas of need, scheduled to be addressed, in the second and third phases of Measure Y include the following:

- Upgrade our electrical capacity
- Construction of a new stadium, track and related facilities
- Construction of a performing arts building
- Construction of a two story classroom wing

Other areas of needed improvement not covered by Measure Y include:

- Replace/update the current inefficient/obsolete "co-generation" heating and cooling system on the north half of the campus
- Install and maintain an attractive quad area

The Eisenhower campus is well-maintained by our custodial staff, earning a reputation as the "cleanest school in the district". Graffiti is removed immediately and all classrooms, offices and restrooms are cleaned regularly. The grounds are free of trash and overall, the campus is clean, neat, and attractive.

## STAFF

The Eisenhower staff currently includes of 106 highly qualified teachers who all meet the requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) and are Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) certified. All Eisenhower teachers are teaching within the field of their credential, and there are zero teachers teaching with a Short Term Staff Permit or a Provisional Intern Permit. Three teachers are currently employed as part of an Intern program. Our teachers have an amazing total of 1,556 years of combined teaching experience. Eisenhower teachers have been teaching an average of fifteen years. The ethnic and gender breakdown of our teachers is as follows:

## Eisenhower Teacher Ethnicity Breakdown



Eisenhower Teacher Gender Breakdown


In addition to the teaching staff, there are five administrators, seven counselors, one librarian, two library media technicians, one career center technician, seven security officers, twelve nutrition service workers, and thirty-one instructional aides providing pupil support services to Eisenhower students. All of Eisenhower's classified staff currently meet the requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA).

## PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mondays are designated as late-start, Collaboration Days. With few exceptions, every Monday students arrive on campus at 8:24 AM, allowing teachers and administrators to use the pre-instructional period in order to work collaboratively in subject area departments, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), or to participate in site-based professional development. This school year, a large number of the Collaboration Days have been used for preparation of the WASC self-study in Focus Group meetings.

Since 2008, a big focus of professional development continues to be the development and refinement of the Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Even with the numerous changes in administration, PLCs have remained the center of curriculum and assessment development.

Other professional development opportunities that Eisenhower teachers have participated in since the last full self-study include:

| Action Learning Systemscoaching | Advanced <br> Placement course instruction | Advancement Via <br> Individual <br> Determination <br> (AVID) | AVID Path \& AVID Summer Institutes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blood Borne Pathogens | Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) | Common Core State Standards | Common Core for English Learners |
| Classroom Management | Content Imperatives: Higher Level Thinking | edge $\circledR^{\circledR}$ Reading/ <br> Language Arts Program | Eno Smart Boards |
| Extend a Menu: <br> Differentiation in the Core Curriculum | Geology Field Study | Illuminate Data Management | Kagan: <br> Cooperative Learning for Interaction |
| Long Term English Learners (LTELs) | Making Content <br> Comprehensible for English Learners: SIOP | Practical <br> Applications for Math and Science Through Use of Newton's Laws | Special <br> Education <br> Teacher <br> Professional <br> Development <br> (SETPD): Literacy <br> Week |
| SB 472 ELPD | SB 472 <br> Mathematics Institute | Six Traits of Writing | Synergy Student Information System |
| TAPPLE <br> Formative <br> Assessment Strategy | Special Education Local Plan Area | English 3D | Accountable Talk |

## STUDENT ACTIVITIES

A strong majority of $82 \%$ of Eisenhower students agreed with the statement: "I feel that Eisenhower offers enough extra-curricular activities" in the 2013 student survey. There are indeed a wide variety of extra-curricular and cocurricular activities in which Eisenhower students may become involved. In addition to the various athletic teams, students may become involved in one or more of the following clubs, which have been approved by the Associated Student Body (ASB):
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{llll}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Academic } \\
\text { Decathlon }\end{array} & \text { AP Spanish Club } & \text { Art2D2 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Advancement Via } \\
\text { Individual } \\
\text { Determination }\end{array}
$$ <br>
\hline Ballet Folklorico \& Band \& Pageantry \& Cancer Club \& Ceramics Club <br>

Choir \& Culinary Arts \& Dance \& French Club\end{array}\right\}\)| Health |
| :--- |
| Future Business |
| Leaders of <br> America (FBLA) |
| Future <br> Homemakers of <br> America (FHA- <br> HERO) |
|  |
| Key Club | Life Skills $\quad$ Link Crew $\quad$| Students of |
| :--- |
| America (HOSA) |

The extra-curricular clubs and various academic programs at Eisenhower provide students with opportunities to visit several Southern California colleges and universities in order to expose them to university life and encourage them to apply to and attend a post-secondary school following graduation. Students who are members of the school's NAPCA chapter have made visits to the University of California at Los Angeles, University of California at San Diego, and San Diego State University. In addition, many campus clubs are able to take field trips to museums, art shows, plays, and to ethnic restaurants in order to provide students with culturally diverse experiences.

## DISTRICT FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Since 2008, the vast majority of Eisenhower's financial support has come from the Quality Education Investment Act (QEIA). QEIA funds have been used to purchase instructional materials, provide professional development for teachers, allow students to participate in educational field trips, and pay the salaries of site personnel among other things. QEIA are expected to cease after this school year. Previous sources of school funding available to Eisenhower High School have either been entirely eliminated or significantly reduced. Eisenhower's Career Technical Education/ Regional Occupational Programs (CTE/ROP) department operates mainly through Perkins Grant funding.

| 2013-2014 Funding Source | Amount Received |
| :--- | :--- |
| Quality Education Investment Act <br> Grant (QEIA) | $\$ 721,359.00$ |
| Economic Impact Aid/ Limited <br> English Proficient (EIA/LEP) <br> Economic Impact Aid/ State <br> Compensatory Education <br> (EIA/SCE) | $\$ 356,095.00$ |
| Perkins Grant | $\$ 69,470.00$ |
| Discretionary Site Block Grant | $\$ 0$ |
| Gifted and Talented Education <br> (GATE) | $\$ 0$ |
| Tenth Grade Counseling | $\$ 0$ |

## Student Performance Data

Overall, since the last WASC Self-Study, Eisenhower High School has improved its total school Academic Performance Index (API) scores, as well as scores within each subgroup. Eisenhower's English Learner and Students with Disabilities subgroups continue to have the lowest API scores. The fouryear data for each subject area California Standards Tests (CSTs) shows that in most areas, Eisenhower students have increased the percentage scoring at an Advanced or Proficient proficiency level, and decreased the percentage of students scoring at the Below Basic and Far Below Basic proficiency levels. Highlights of positive gains in student achievement during the last four years include the gains made by $10^{\text {th }}$ grade Life Science and Chemistry students in the percentage scoring at the Proficient and Advanced levels on the CSTs. The Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) goals have only been met occasionally under Safe Harbor. Again, the English Learner subgroup and the Students With Disabilities subgroup have the lowest scores. Strategies to address the specific needs of English Learners and Students with Disabilities are discussed in PLCs for each grade level and/or core subject, as well as within departments during collaboration days. Each PLC uses CST data to make instructional adjustments and curriculum decisions.

Eisenhower High School has improved markedly with respect to California State School Rankings. Since 2010, Eisenhower moved in statewide school ranking from a three to a four school. Over the past two years, Eisenhower has improved its classification as compared to schools with similar populations, moving from a seven in 2011-2012 to a nine similar school rating in 2012-2013.

| School Year | Statewide Rank | Similar school rank |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2010-2011$ | 3 | 6 |
| $2011-2012$ | 4 | 7 |
| $2012-2013$ | 4 | 9 |

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DATA

## Academic Performance Index Summary Chart

|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overall | 633 N | 697 Y | 697 N | 721 C | 724 Y | 726 N |
| African- <br> American | 624 Y | 673 Y | 674 N | 698 C | 711 Y | 661 N |
| Hispanic | 631 Y | 700 Y | 696 N | 722 C | 722 N | 733 Y |
| SED | 633 Y | 701 Y | 701 N | 696 C | 721 Y | 724 N |
| EL | 612 Y | 654 Y | 666 Y | 693 C | 710 Y | 714 N |
| SWD | 421 N | 469 Y | 454 N | 469 C | 470 N | 483 N |
|  | $\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{Yes}$ met growth target | N=No did not meet growth target |  |  |  |  |

## CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS (CST) FOUR YEAR DATA

English Language Arts $\mathbf{9}^{\text {th }}$ Grade

| Proficiency Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | 13\% | 12\% | 16\% | 15\% | +2\% |
| Proficient | 30\% | 31\% | 26\% | 38\% | +8\% |
| Basic | 29\% | 35\% | 38\% | 33\% | +4\% |
| Below Basic | 19\% | 15\% | 15\% | 11\% | -8\% |
| Far Below Basic | 9\% | 7\% | 5\% | 3\% | -6\% |

English Language Arts $9^{\text {th }}$ Grade Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $46 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 3 \%}$ |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $42 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 1 \%}$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{-}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 5 \%}$ |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 0 \%}$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 7 \%}$ |

English Language Arts $\mathbf{1 0}^{\text {th }}$ Grade

| Proficiency <br> Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | 9\% | 11\% | 9\% | 12\% | +3\% |
| Proficient | 17\% | 25\% | 25\% | 24\% | +7\% |
| Basic | 38\% | 34\% | 38\% | 39\% | +1\% |
| Below Basic | 22\% | 18\% | 19\% | 16\% | -6\% |
| Far Below Basic | 14\% | 12\% | 9\% | 9\% | -5\% |

English Language Arts $10^{\text {th }}$ Grade Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $17 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $+\mathbf{+ 6 \%}$ |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $27 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 1 \%}$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 8 \%}$ |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $26 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 9 \%}$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 8 \%}$ |


| Proficiency <br> Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | $9 \%$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 \%}$ |
| Proficient | $21 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 2 \%}$ |
| Basic | $\mathbf{3 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 4 \%}$ |
| Below Basic | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 \%}$ |
| Far Below $16 \%$ $15 \%$ $11 \%$ <br> Basic    |  |  |  | $\mathbf{- 7 \%}$ |  |

English Language Arts $11^{\text {th }}$ Grade Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $\mathbf{3 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 3 \%}$ |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $29 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 2 \%}$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 5 \%}$ |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $\mathbf{3 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 \%}$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 \%}$ |

Algebra I

| Proficiency Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | 3\% | 1\% | 4\% | 6\% | +3\% |
| Proficient | 17\% | 20\% | 22\% | 23\% | +6\% |
| Basic | 26\% | 24\% | 24\% | 26\% | - |
| Below Basic | 38\% | 36\% | 34\% | 34\% | -4\% |
| Far Below Basic | 15\% | 16\% | 16\% | 12\% | -3\% |

Algebra I Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $22 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 3 \%}$ |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $20 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 0 \%}$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | $9 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 2 \%}$ |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $20 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 2 9 \%}$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | $16 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $\mathbf{- 4 \%}$ |

Integrated Math

| Proficiency | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advanced | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 2 \%}$ |
| Proficient | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 6 \%}$ |
| Basic | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 9 \%}$ |
| Below Basic | $\mathbf{5 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 \%}$ |
| Far Below $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ $\mathbf{2 3 \%}$ $\mathbf{2 1 \%}$ <br> Basic    |  | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 3 \%}$ |  |  |

Integrated Math Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $6 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $15 \%$ | - | - |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $6 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 9 \%}$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | - | - | - | $0 \%$ | - |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 8 \%}$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 7 \%}$ |

Geometry

| Proficiency | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Level |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 \%}$ |
| Proficient | $9 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 3 \%}$ |
| Basic | $23 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 3 \%}$ |
| Below Basic | $48 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 4 \%}$ |
| Far Below | $19 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 3 \%}$ |
| Basic |  |  |  |  |  |

Geometry Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $10 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 \%}$ |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $11 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 5 \%}$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | $0 \%$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{-}$ |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 4 \%}$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | $1 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 \%}$ |

Algebra II

| Proficiency <br> Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 5 \%}$ |
| Proficient | $\mathbf{1 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 2 \%}$ |
| Basic $\mathbf{3 2 \%}$ $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ $\mathbf{2 9 \%}$ <br> Below Basic $29 \%$ $\mathbf{2 1 \%}$ $\mathbf{3 7 \%}$ <br> Far Below <br> Basic $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ $\mathbf{5 \%}$ $\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 2 \%}$ |  |  |  |

Algebra II Subgroup Data:Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $13 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $+5 \%$ |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $27 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $+7 \%$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | - | - | - | - | - |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $28 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 5 \%}$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | $15 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 5 \%}$ |

Summative High School Mathematics

| Proficiency <br> Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 3 \%}$ |


| Proficient | $\mathbf{3 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Basic | $30 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $\mathbf{- 9 \%}$ |
| Below Basic | $31 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $+4 \%$ |
| Far Below | $1 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $+6 \%$ |
| Basic |  |  |  |  |  |

Summative High School Math Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $36 \%$ | - | - | $0 \%$ | $\mathbf{- 3 6 \%}$ |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $30 \%$ | - | $31 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 3 \%}$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | - | - | - | - | - |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $34 \%$ | - | - | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 4 \%}$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | - | - | - | - |  |

World History

| Proficiency Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | 11\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% | +4\% |
| Proficient | 13\% | 19\% | 20\% | 22\% | +9\% |
| Basic | 27\% | 30\% | 35\% | 29\% | +2\% |
| Below Basic | 17\% | 18\% | 13\% | 12\% | -5\% |
| Far Below Basic | 32\% | 21\% | 20\% | 21\% | -11\% |

World History Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $21 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $+7 \%$ |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $23 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $+15 \%$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $+1 \%$ |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $25 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $+11 \%$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | $11 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $\mathbf{- 3 \%}$ |

U.S. History

| Proficiency <br> Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | 16\% | 12\% | 18\% | 14\% | -2\% |
| Proficient | 27\% | 28\% | 24\% | 23\% | -4\% |
| Basic | 28\% | 28\% | 30\% | 30\% | +2\% |
| Below Basic | 15\% | 16\% | 11\% | 15\% | - |
| Far Below <br> Basic | 13\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | +5\% |

US History Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $39 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 \%}$ |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $43 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $\mathbf{- 8 \%}$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | $7 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $\mathbf{- 1 \%}$ |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $43 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 1 \%}$ | $40 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 7 \%}$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | $18 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 0 \%}$ |  |


| Proficiency <br> Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | 12\% | 14\% | 13\% | 18\% | +6\% |
| Proficient | 20\% | 25\% | 35\% | 25\% | +5\% |
| Basic | 43\% | 35\% | 37\% | 32\% | -11\% |
| Below Basic | 17\% | 16\% | 9\% | 17\% | - |
| Far Below <br> Basic | 8\% | 10\% | 6\% | 8\% | - |

$10^{\text {th }}$ Grade Life Science Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $26 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $+3 \%$ |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $32 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | $14 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $-6 \%$ |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $33 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $+10 \%$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | $15 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $-6 \%$ |

Biology

| Proficiency Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | 8\% | 8\% | 14\% | 8\% | - |
| Proficient | 21\% | 19\% | 28\% | 22\% | +1\% |
| Basic | 40\% | 40\% | 38\% | 40\% | - |
| Below Basic | 17\% | 21\% | 11\% | 16\% | -1\% |
| Far Below Basic | 13\% | 13\% | 9\% | 14\% | +1\% |

Biology Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $26 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $\mathbf{- 1 \%}$ |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $28 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 2 \%}$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | $11 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $\mathbf{- 9 \%}$ |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $30 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $\mathbf{- 1 \%}$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | $11 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $\mathbf{- 9 \%}$ |

Chemistry

| Proficiency <br> Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 8 \%}$ |


| Proficient | $\mathbf{2 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 1 \%}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Basic | $45 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 7 \%}$ |
| Below Basic | $12 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 8 \%}$ |
| Far Below | $5 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $\mathbf{- 4 \%}$ |  |
| Basic |  |  |  |  |  |

Chemistry Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $28 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $+19 \%$ |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $38 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $+19 \%$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | - | - | - | - | - |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $39 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $+19 \%$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | $28 \%$ | $24 \%$ | - | - | - |

Earth Science

| Proficiency <br> Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 2 \%}$ |
| Proficient | $14 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 0 \%}$ |
| Basic | $41 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 6 \%}$ |
| Below Basic | $18 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 5 \%}$ |
| Far Below $24 \%$ $12 \%$ $12 \%$ <br> Basic    |  |  |  | $\mathbf{- 1 3 \%}$ |  |

Earth Science Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> American | $14 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 2 \%}$ |
| Hispanic or <br> Latino | $16 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 5 \%}$ |
| Students with <br> Disabilities | $4 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | - |
| Economically <br> Disadvantaged | $16 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| English <br> Language <br> Learner | $8 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 3 \%} \%$ |  |

Physics

| Proficiency <br> Level | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Progress |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced | - | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 \%}$ |
| Proficient | - | $\mathbf{4 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 \%}$ |
| Basic | - | $\mathbf{3 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 3 \%}$ |


| Below Basic | - | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 \%}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Far Below | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ | - |  |
| Basic |  |  |  |  |  |

Physics Subgroup Data: Percent Proficient or Advanced

| Subgroup | 2010 | - | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## CALIFORNIA HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAM

Over the past four years, the percentage of Eisenhower students passing the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) has increased in both English Language Arts and Math. Eisenhower students have made the greatest achievement gains on the Math portion of the CAHSEE; the percentage of students earning a proficient score increased by 13\% from 2010 to 2013. A CAHSEE data highlight for Eisenhower is that the Hispanic student subgroup increased its percentage proficient on the Math test by $23 \%$ over the past four years. Student scores on the English Language Arts portion of the CAHSEE have remained relatively static over the past four years.

CAHSEE Data 2010-2013
English Language Arts Overall

| Year | Number Tested | Number Passed | Percent <br> Passed | Number <br> Profficient | Percent <br> Profficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 614 | 492 | $80 \%$ | 300 | $48 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 629 | 480 | $76.5 \%$ | 313 | $50 \%$ |
| 2012 | 612 | 497 | $81.2 \%$ | 286 | $48.8 \%$ |
| 2013 | 602 | 497 | $81.5 \%$ | 286 | $47.1 \%$ |
| Growth |  |  | $+1.5 \%$ |  | $-.9 \%$ |

English Language Arts- African American

| Year | Number Tested | Number Passed | Percent <br> Passed | Number <br> Profficient | Percent <br> Proficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 161 | 124 | $77 \%$ | 58 | $36 \%$ |
| 2011 | 165 | 122 | $74 \%$ | 74 | $45 \%$ |
| 2012 | 121 | 95 | $78.5 \%$ | 53 | $43.8 \%$ |
| 2013 | 79 | 53 | $67 \%$ | 22 | $28 \%$ |
| Growth |  |  | $-10 \%$ |  | $-8 \%$ |

English Language Arts - Hispanic

| Year | Number Tested | Number Passed | Percent <br> Passed | Number <br> Proficient | Percent <br> Profficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | 367 | 296 | $81 \%$ | 191 | $52 \%$ |
| 2011 | 350 | 267 | $76.5 \%$ | 180 | $51.5 \%$ |
| 2012 | 317 | 259 | $81.7 \%$ | 140 | $44.2 \%$ |
| 2013 | 508 | 407 | $80 \%$ | 218 | $43 \%$ |
| Crowth |  |  | $-1 \%$ |  | $-9 \%$ |

CAHSEE Data 2010-2013

## Math Overall

| Year | Number Tested | Number Passed | Percent <br> Passed | Number <br> Profficient | Percent <br> Profficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | 610 | 452 | $74 \%$ | 247 | $39 \%$ |
| 2011 | 629 | 500 | $80 \%$ | 324 | $51.5 \%$ |
| 2012 | 612 | 475 | $80.9 \%$ | 276 | $47.1 \%$ |
| 2013 | 598 | 495 | $82.7 \%$ | 311 | $52 \%$ |
| Growth |  |  | $+8.7 \%$ |  | $+13 \%$ |

Math- African American

| Year | Number Tested | Number Passed | Percent <br> Passed | Number <br> Proficient | Percent <br> Profficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | 161 | 106 | $66 \%$ | 48 | $30 \%$ |
| 2011 | 165 | 126 | $76.5 \%$ | 68 | $41.5 \%$ |
| 2012 | 122 | 90 | $73.8 \%$ | 41 | $33.6 \%$ |
| 2013 | 78 | 52 | $67 \%$ | 27 | $35 \%$ |
| Growth |  |  | $+1 \%$ |  | $+5 \%$ |

Math- Hispanic

| Year | Number Tested | Number Passed | Percent <br> Passed | Number <br> Profficient | Percent <br> Profficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | 367 | 278 | $76 \%$ | 156 | $42.5 \%$ |
| 2011 | 350 | 284 | $81 \%$ | 191 | $55 \%$ |
| 2012 | 317 | 245 | $77.5 \%$ | 154 | $48.7 \%$ |
| 2013 | 507 | 423 | $83 \%$ | 334 | $66 \%$ |
| Growth |  |  | $+7 \%$ |  | $+23.5 \%$ |

## ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP)

Eisenhower High School did not meet AYP in the past two years. In 2013, Eisenhower met 14 of the 18 AYP criteria. In 2012, Eisenhower met 13 of the 22 AYP criteria.

Participation Rate English Language Arts Target :95\%
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { Year } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Enrollment } \\
\text { First Day of } \\
\text { Testing }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Number of } \\
\text { Students } \\
\text { Tested }\end{array}
$$ \& Rate \& Met AYP <br>

Criteria\end{array}\right]\)|  |
| :---: |
| 2012 |

Participation Rate Mathematics
Target: 95\%

2012-2013: Schoolwide
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { Year } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Enrollment } \\
\text { First Day of } \\
\text { Testing }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Number of } \\
\text { Students } \\
\text { Tested }\end{array}
$$ \& Rate \& Met AYP <br>

Criteria\end{array}\right]\)|  |
| :---: |
| 2012 |
| 2013 |

Percent Proficient- Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)
2012-2013

English Language Arts
2012 Target 77.8\% 2013 Target 88.9\%

| Year | Valid Scores | Number At or Above Proficient | Percent At or Above Proficient | Met AYP <br> Criteria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 | 555 | 219 | 39.5\% | NO |
| 2013 | 595 | 255 | 42.9\% | NO |
| African American 2012 | 89 | 35 | 39.3\% | YES (Safe Harbor) |
| African American 2013 | 75 | 22 | 29.3\% |  |
| Hispanic or Latino $2012$ | 435 | 167 | 38.4\% | NO |
| Hispanic or Latino 2013 | 483 | 212 | 43.9\% | YES (Safe Harbor) |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged 2012 | 480 | 189 | 39.4\% | NO |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged 2013 | 487 | 201 | 41.3\% | NO |
| English Learners 2012 | 264 | 93 | 35.2\% | NO |
| English Learners $2013$ | 272 | 100 | 36.8\% | NO |

Percent Proficient- Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)
2012-2013

Mathematics
2012 Target 77.4\% 2013 Target 88.7\%

| Year | Valid Scores | Number At or Above Proficient | Percent At or Above Proficient | Met AYP <br> Criteria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 | 554 | 245 | 44.2\% | NO |
| 2013 | 593 | 327 | 55.1\% | YES (Safe Harbor) |
| African American 2012 | 89 | 39 | 43.8\% | NO |
| African American 2013 | 75 | 26 | 34.7\% |  |
| Hispanic or Latino $2012$ | 434 | 185 | 42.6\% | NO |
| Hispanic or Latino 2013 | 481 | 278 | 57.8\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { YES } \\ \text { (Safe Harbor) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Socioeconomically <br> Disadvantaged 2012 | 479 | 216 | 45.1\% | NO |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged 2013 | 487 | 272 | 55.9\% | YES (Safe Harbor) |
| English Learners $2012$ | 263 | 110 | 41.8\% | NO |
| English Learners $2013$ | 273 | 149 | 54.6\% | YES (Safe Harbor) |

Graduation Rate Results

| Year | Met Schoolwide <br> Graduation | Met Student Group <br> Graduation Rates | Met Overall <br> Graduation Rate <br> Criteria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 | YES | YES | YES |
| 2013 | YES | NO | NO |

CALIFORNIA ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT TEST (CELDT)

# Reclassification-RFEP 

| Year | Total ELs | Percentage Reclassified |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2008-2009$ | 505 | $6.34 \%$ |
| $2009-2010$ | 562 | $6.41 \%$ |
| $2010-2011$ | 529 | $19.09 \%$ |
| $2011-2012$ | 470 | $17.87 \%$ |
| $2012-13$ | 564 | $14.18 \%$ |

This increase in the Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) rate can be attributed to the greater attention that has been given to the EL student population in order to help them meet district reclassification criteria.

Eisenhower High School has about 443 English Learners, with the majority of our students in the Intermediate and Early Advanced levels and in the $9^{\text {th }}$ and $10^{\text {th }}$ grades proving that English Learners are achieving advanced levels in English in the areas of listening, speaking, reading and writing, meeting the assessment and grade requirements and able to reclassify out of the English Learner program.

TITLE III ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT

AMAO1- Annual Growth

| Number of <br> Annual CELDT <br> Takers | Number in <br> Cohort | Percent with <br> Prior CELDT <br> Scores | Number Met <br> AMMO 1 | Percent Met <br> AMAO 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 539 | 537 | $99.6 \%$ | 341 | $63.5 \%$ |

AMAO 2 - Attaining English Proficiency

|  | Number in Cohort | Number Attaining <br> English Proficiency <br> Level | Percent Attaining <br> English Proficiency <br> Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less Than 5 <br> Years | 52 | 21 | $40.4 \%$ |
| 5 Years or More | 492 | 270 | $54.9 \%$ |

## BENCHMARK ASSESSMENTS

Standards-based Benchmark Exams are administered at the district level in both Mathematics and Language Arts. The English Language Arts benchmark exams were developed by district personnel, using a question-bank purchased from an outside source. Math benchmark exams were rewritten during the 2011-12 school year by INSPECT Assessments, and are administered district-wide. Curriculum-embedded assessments in English Language Arts were developed by the Rialto Unified School District's Director of Secondary Literacy. Curriculum-embedded assessments in Math were developed by a team of Math coaches representing the district's secondary campuses. Both the district Benchmark Exams and the district embedded assessments allow Eisenhower teachers to monitor student achievement through a uniform assessment procedure. These assessments also allow for both long-term and short-term student accountability. English Language Arts and Math teachers use the assessment data to modify their instructional plans when necessary, improving their ability to address student needs.

Student performance on the English Language Arts Benchmark Exams has improved over the past two years. Students in grades 10 and 11 have experienced substantial increases in the percentage of students scoring Proficient and/or Advanced by the third administration of the Benchmark Exams. The data shows that fewer students score in the Far Below Basic and/or Below Basic range by the third Benchmark Exam, while an increased number of students score at the Proficient and/or Advanced performance levels.

Student performance on the Mathematics Benchmark Exams has also improved over the past two years. Algebra I students increased the percentage of students scoring at the Advanced level over the last two years, with the third Benchmark witnessing the greatest gains. In Geometry, there was a large drop in the percentage of students scoring Far Below Basic by the third benchmark. Large gains have also been made with the percentage of students scoring Advanced on the Bridges benchmark.

English Language Arts Benchmark Results Grade 9
2012-13

| Proficiency Level | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advanced | $7.6 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Proficient | $12.5 \%$ | $16.6 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| Basic | $36.3 \%$ | $30.8 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $24.5 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $19 \%$ | $18.7 \%$ | $2 \%$ |

2011-12

| Proficiency Level | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advanced | $1.1 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ |
| Proficient | $11.7 \%$ | $20.5 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| Basic | $37.7 \%$ | $33.2 \%$ | $36.1 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $29.3 \%$ | $26.3 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $20.3 \%$ | $14.9 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |

English Language Arts Benchmark Results Grade 10
2012-13

| Proficiency Level | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advanced | $1.6 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Proficient | $10.4 \%$ | $23.3 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
| Basic | $41.4 \%$ | $35.6 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $29.4 \%$ | $19.8 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $17.5 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

2011-12

| Proficiency Level | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advanced | $0.5 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ |
| Proficient | $9.1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $49.6 \%$ |
| Basic | $40.7 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $32.2 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $36.3 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $10.9 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $13.5 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |

English Language Arts Benchmark Results Grade 11
2012-13
Proficiency Level $\quad 1^{\text {st }}$ Quarter $\quad 2^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter $\quad 3^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter

| Advanced | $4.4 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Proficient | $16.1 \%$ | $23.8 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| Basic | $38.4 \%$ | $34.3 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $26.6 \%$ | $23.2 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $14.5 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

2011-12

| Proficiency Level | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advanced | $6.5 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ |
| Proficient | $15.5 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $53.4 \%$ |
| Basic | $38.6 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $29.8 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $22.5 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $16.8 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $1 \%$ |

Algebra I Benchmark Results
2012-13

| Proficiency Level | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advanced | $48.61 \%$ | $7.82 \%$ |  |
| Proficient | $24.84 \%$ | $23.81 \%$ | $3.39 \%$ |
| Basic | $13.49 \%$ | $21.33 \%$ | $30.34 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $6 \%$ | $19.67 \%$ | $13.84 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $7.07 \%$ | $20.08 \%$ | $3.57 \%$ |

2011-12

| Proficiency Level | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advanced | $47 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Proficient | $22 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Basic | $14 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $7 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $9 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $6 \%$ |

Geometry Benchmark Results
2012-13

| Proficiency Level | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advanced | $44.9 \%$ | $13.36 \%$ | $10.09 \%$ |
| Proficient | $31.69 \%$ | $22.82 \%$ | $27.52 \%$ |
| Basic | $11.94 \%$ | $21.02 \%$ | $23.93 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $4.94 \%$ | $17.87 \%$ | $15.04 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $6.53 \%$ | $24.92 \%$ | $23.42 \%$ |

2011-12

| Proficiency Level | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advanced | $34 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Proficient | $30 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Basic | $18 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $9 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $9 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $31 \%$ |

Bridges Benchmark Results
2012-13

| Proficiency Level | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advanced | $12 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Proficient | $26 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Basic | $29 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $9 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $24 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $35 \%$ |

2011-12

| Proficiency Level | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advanced | $12 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Proficient | $26 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Basic | $29 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $9 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $24 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $35 \%$ |

## Algebra II Benchmark Results

2012-13

| Proficiency Level | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advanced | $70.64 \%$ | $15.11 \%$ | $37.26 \%$ |
| Proficient | $20.35 \%$ | $23.81 \%$ | $28.66 \%$ |
| Basic | $5.23 \%$ | $21.33 \%$ | $23.25 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $2.03 \%$ | $19.67 \%$ | $7.01 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $1.74 \%$ | $20.08 \%$ | $3.82 \%$ |

2011-12

| Proficiency Level | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Quarter | $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advanced | $64 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Proficient | $25 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Basic | $7 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Below Basic | $2 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Far Below Basic | $1 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $11 \%$ |

## COLLEGE ASSESSMENTS

Since the last full self-study, the percent of all twelfth grade Eisenhower students taking the SAT has declined. During the 2008-2009 school year, 37\% of seniors took the SAT, during the 2011-12 school year only $28 \%$ took the SAT. Eisenhower students who do take the SAT tend to score below the national norms in both Critical Reading and Math. For the class of 2012, the College Board reported that the average Critical Reading score was 496, and the average Math score was 514.

| SAT RESULTS | $2008-$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 12 Enrollment | 2009 | $2009-2010$ | $2010-2011$ | $2011-2012$ |
| Percent of seniors talking test | 365 | 506 | 556 | 549 |
| Average Critical Reading Score | 412 | 435 | 27.7 | $28 \%$ |
| Average Math Score | 418 | 447 | 426 | 425 |

Eisenhower students also tend to score below the California state average on the ACT. However, the five-year trend shows that Eisenhower students have made significant advances in closing the gap between California state averages and Eisenhower school averages.

| ACHIResults | $2008-$ | $2009-$ <br> 2010 | $2010-$ <br> 2011 | $2011-$ | 2012 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## ADVANCED PLACEMENT

Advanced Placement classes are offered in Biology, Calculus, English Language and Composition, English Literature, French, Government, Macroeconomics, Spanish Language, Spanish Literature, Statistics, and U.S. History for those students who wish to take college level classes in high school. An Advanced Placement World History course is being offered this school year, with the intention that tenth grade Social Studies students will become acclimated to the rigors of an AP class prior to taking AP US History. 20122013 Advanced Placement exam results are as follows:

|  | \#OF EXAMS | \# OF STUDENTS | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| COURSE | TAKEN | PASSING | PASSNING |
| Biology | 11 | 2 | $19 \%$ |
| Calculus | 44 | 1 | $>1 \%$ |
| English Language | 37 | 9 | $24 \%$ |
| Composition | 47 | 13 | $28 \%$ |
| English Literature | 57 | 29 | $51 \%$ |
| Government | 5 | 1 | $20 \%$ |
| Macroeconomics | 68 | 32 | $47 \%$ |
| Spanish Language | 6 | 6 | $100 \%$ |
| Spanish Literature | 27 | 18 | $67 \%$ |
| Statistics | 48 | 15 | $31 \%$ |
| United States |  |  |  |
| History |  |  |  |

## A-G REQUIREMENTS

Eisenhower guidance counselors encourage students to attempt and complete the rigorous $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{G}$ requirements set forth by the University of California. According to the 2013 Senior Exit Survey, $86 \%$ of 2013 graduates reported that they planned to attend either a two-year or four-year university following graduation. While $34 \%$ of exiting seniors reported acceptance to one or more four-year universities, $35 \%$ of exiting seniors reported no acceptance to either a two-year or four-year university. 31\% of the 2013 exiting seniors reported acceptance to a community college or junior college. This percentage of Eisenhower exiting seniors who report acceptance to two-year has remained relatively static through out the past six years. In 2007, 32\% of exiting seniors reported that they would be attending local community colleges.

## REPORT CARD ANALYSIS

By the first semester of the 2013-2014 school year, the majority of Eisenhower students earned passing grades in their core academic classes. Over the past four years, some courses have seen large improvements in the increase of students receiving passing grades and a reduction in the percentage of students failing. The English learner population continues to remain below, sometimes significantly below, the pass rate of the non English Learner population. The data below was emailed to all staff by the principal, with the goal of having teachers think about their current grading policy. Eisenhower's current grade distribution is not aligned with a normal distribution bell-curve, becoming the source of discussion within departments and PLCs.

Grade Distribution by Department
$1^{\text {st }}$ Semester 2013-14

| Subject | A | B | C | D | F |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| English | $17.68 \%$ | $28.52 \%$ | $24.15 \%$ | $17.59 \%$ | $19.76 \%$ |
| Fine Arts | $44.99 \%$ | $27.74 \%$ | $18.27 \%$ | $17.36 \%$ | $13.44 \%$ |
| World Lang. | $25.28 \%$ | $27.10 \%$ | $27.85 \%$ | $16.97 \%$ | $11.90 \%$ |
| Math | $13.83 \%$ | $23.40 \%$ | $27.97 \%$ | $21.32 \%$ | $21.38 \%$ |
| Health | $13.88 \%$ | $16.56 \%$ | $19.91 \%$ | $18.83 \%$ | $30.80 \%$ |
| PE | $45.70 \%$ | $22.62 \%$ | $14.76 \%$ | $7.65 \%$ | $13.69 \%$ |
| Science | $24.16 \%$ | $23.59 \%$ | $20.63 \%$ | $16.19 \%$ | $20.82 \%$ |
| Social |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studies | $20.69 \%$ | $23.46 \%$ | $26.13 \%$ | $22.96 \%$ | $20.46 \%$ |
| Special Ed | $39.80 \%$ | $39.38 \%$ | $33.91 \%$ | $22.20 \%$ | $9.68 \%$ |
| Vocational | $36.88 \%$ | $27.25 \%$ | $20.47 \%$ | $17.29 \%$ | $10.41 \%$ |
| School Total | $36.76 \%$ | $27.32 \%$ | $24.19 \%$ | $17.89 \%$ | $18.23 \%$ |

D/F Grades 2012-2013

## Percent That Received at Least One D/F Grade in at Least One Core Class

| By Subgroup | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Quarter | 1st Semester |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| English Learner | $70 \%$ | $70 \%$ |
| RFEP | $44 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| Hispanic/Latino | $57 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
| African American | $61 \%$ | $54 \%$ |
| Total EHS | $53 \%$ | $51 \%$ |

Over the past three years, there has seen a steady increase in the percentage of students successfully meeting the graduation requirements of Eisenhower High School. At the end of the spring semester 2013, 439 of the 487 seniors participated in the May graduation ceremonies. By July 2013, another 18 of those students were able to meet graduation requirements. Another positive trend is that Eisenhower High School has been the only Rialto Unified School District high school to reduce its dropout rate over the past three school years.

|  | EHS | 2008 | 2009 | FORMULA <br> CHANGED | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Graduation <br> Rate | 65 | 65 | 62 | 80 | 87 | 90 |  |
| Dropout | 25.7 | 16.2 |  | 22.3 | 8.7 | 8.2 | 8.2 |

At the end of the 2012-13 school year, the vast majority of Eisenhower's graduating seniors reported to have plans to continue their education or training following graduation. Attending a two-year junior or community college is what $53 \%$ of our 2013 graduates reported to their counselor they planned on doing. Seventy-three of Eisenhower's graduating seniors reported that they planned on attending a California State University, while twenty-five graduating seniors reported that they were committed to attending one of the various University of California campuses. Twenty-six other graduating seniors reported that they were planning to attend an out-of-state or private university. Another twenty-six reported that they would be attending a trade school, while twenty-eight students reported that they would be enlisting in
one of the branches of the military. Only twenty-eight graduating seniors reported that they would enter into the work force directly after high school without first attending a post-secondary institution.

## Perception Data

The Student Survey completed by Eisenhower students in the spring of 2013 revealed that a strong majority of students felt that they were valued and respected by administrators, teachers, and other students. The respect was mutual, as $91 \%$ of students agreed with the statement: "I respect most of my teachers." Students not only seemed to believe that most of their teachers are enthusiastic about learning. Students also report that their teachers have helped them develop reading, writing, and math skills. Students feel that their teachers review materials with them prior to assessment and that teachers regularly communicate with students about their academic progress. With $67 \%$ of students agreeing that their classes are challenging, $75 \%$ of Eisenhower students agree that Eisenhower has prepared them for college and career opportunities. Students report that teachers use a variety of assessment methods, with $86 \%$ of students agreeing with the statement "Teachers use different ways to evaluate my progress."

An area of weakness revealed by the Student Survey is that one-third of Eisenhower students disagreed with the statement: "I enjoy coming to school." Perhaps this result is connected to another area of weakness revealed by the Student Survey that $35 \%$ of students disagreed with the statement: "I am kept informed of school activities and programs." During the 2012-2013 school year, morning announcements were almost entirely eliminated, however, morning announcements have been reinstated this school year.

The Parent Survey was completed in the fall of 2013 as part of the registration requirements for students. 1,235 parents completed the survey and the responses were compiled. The majority of parents reported that they felt they are welcomed on campus and that they are aware of the various opportunities to become involved in the school. Most parents surveyed felt that Eisenhower is a safe campus and that their students are treated with respect, professionalism, and courtesy. Indicative of parent satisfaction with Eisenhower's academic programs, $81 \%$ of parents felt that Eisenhower prepares their child for life beyond high school. Other positive findings of the parent survey include the fact that $85 \%$ of parents agreed with the statement: "My child has adequate opportunities to participate in extracurricular activities", while $84 \%$ of parents agreed with the statement: "I am satisfied with academic course offerings at Eisenhower."

The Staff Survey completed by Eisenhower staff members in the spring of 2013 revealed that the majority of Eisenhower staff felt that they belong at Eisenhower High School and were recognized for their good work. 86\% percent of staff reported that new teachers were welcomed by the Eisenhower staff and 79\% reported there were a sufficient number of opportunities to collaborate with colleagues. Other positive findings include the fact that a majority of staff felt that the Eisenhower community is supportive, staff morale is high, and that there is mutual respect among students and staff.

Areas of weakness revealed by the Staff Survey include the fact that almost half of the staff ( $47 \%$ ) disagreed with the statement: "The discipline policy is consistently enforced." Almost 40\% of staff disagreed with the statement:
"The discipline policy is clear and fair."

