<div style="border: 2px solid navy; padding: 20px; text-align: center;">

Lexington Junior High School
School Accountability Report Card
Reported Using Data from the 2013-14 School Year
Published During 2014-15

</div>

Every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC), by February 1 of each year. 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 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/.

- View this SARC online at the school and/or LEA Web sites.

- For more information about the LCFF or LCAP, see the CDE LCFF Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/.

- For additional information about the school, parents and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.

About This School

Contact Information (Most Recent Year)

School Contact Information	
School Name	Lexington Junior High School
Street	4351 Orange Avenue
City, State, Zip	Cypress, CA 90630-2799
Phone Number	(714) 220-4201
Principal	Sam Joo
E-mail Address	joo_s@auhsd.us
Web Site	www.auhsd.us/lexington
CDS Code	30664316085260

District Contact Information	
District Name	Anaheim Union High School District
Phone Number	(714) 999-3511
Superintendent	Michael B. Matsuda
E-mail Address	webmaster@auhsd.us
Web Site	www.auhsd.us

School Description and Mission Statement (Most Recent Year)

At Lexington Junior High School, we believe that to be successful educators we must create a high-interest level in learning and maintain cross-curricular collaboration with enthusiasm for our subject areas. We are dedicated to maintaining high expectations for ourselves and for our students, and to utilizing a variety of instructional strategies so all students are actively engaged in relevant learning and are successful in our classes. We set professional goals annually and frequently re-examine our effectiveness through peer collaboration and the sharing of best practices. Our collaborative and enthusiastic spirit maintains our focus on continuous improvement with the intent to help all students achieve academically and socially at Lexington.

Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2013-14)

Grade Level	Number of Students
Grade 7	624
Grade 8	639
Total Enrollment	1,263

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2013-14)

Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	2.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.3
Asian	30.8
Filipino	5.3
Hispanic or Latino	26.0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.6
White	27.9
Two or More Races	5.3
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	33.2
English Learners	9.2
Students with Disabilities	6.6

A. Conditions of Learning

State Priority: Basic
The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Basic State Priority (Priority 1):
- Degree to which teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject area and for the pupils they are teaching;
- Pupils have access to standards-aligned instructional materials; and
- School facilities are maintained in good repair.

Teacher Credentials

Teachers	School			District
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2014-15
With Full Credential	50	45	46	1327
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	0
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence (with full credential)	0	1	1	

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

Indicator	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments *	0	1	1
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

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

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

Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (School Year 2013-14)

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	**Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers**
This School	100.00	0.00
All Schools in District	99.98	0.02
High-Poverty Schools in District	99.98	0.02
Low-Poverty Schools in District	100.00	0.00

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

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2014-15)

Year and month in which data were collected: August 2009

All content subject areas utilize standards-aligned, state and district adopted textbooks and instructional materials. Teachers have input into the textbook selection process at the District level through an established curriculum cycle. Teachers are given indepth training on the instructional materials and the ancillary materials that accompany the basic textbook material. Ancillary materials support both the language need students and the learning needs students.

This information was collected in November 2012.

Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
Reading/Language Arts	English language arts textbooks were adopted in the spring of 2009. There is one textbook or DVD available per student.	Yes	0
Mathematics	Mathematics textbooks were adopted in 2007-08. Course appropriate, standards-based textbooks were chosen for each mathematics course. There is one textbook available per student.	Yes	0
Science	Science textbooks were adopted in 2007. There is one textbook available per student.	Yes	0
History-Social Science	History/Social science textbooks were adopted in 2005-06. There is one textbook available per student.	Yes	0
Foreign Language	Foreign language textbooks were adopted in 2003-04. There is one textbook available per student.	Yes	0
Health	Health is taught as part of science and PE curriculum. Science textbooks were adopted in 2006-07.	Yes	0
Visual and Performing Arts	Visual and performing arts students have access to course appropriate textbooks and instructional materials.	Yes	0

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

The Lexington Junior High School campus opened in 1972. The 20.3 acre site includes 43 regular classrooms. There are 9 labs, which are designed for specific programs (Science and Computers labs). The site also includes a media center, a cafeteria, a gym and a variety of sports fields. The Lexington facilities have undergone an extensive modernization and construction program. The estimated budget was $19.3 million and was completed in September, 2007. All campus buildings were modernized. New science classrooms and staff parking were added. PTSA and the School Site Counsel recently purchased an electronic marquee in the summer of 2010, which completed the modernization of the school.

Maintenance and Repair: Site and District maintenance staff ensure that the repairs necessary to keep the school in good repair and working order are completed in a timely manner. A work order process is used to ensure efficient service. Emergency repairs are given the highest priority.

Cleaning Process and Schedule: The District's Board of Trustees has adopted cleaning standards for all schools. The administration works daily with the custodial staff to develop cleaning schedules to ensure a clean and safe school. All classrooms and restrooms are cleaned daily. Deep cleaning, including waxing of floors and painting, takes place during times when students are not in classes. Students, parents, and staff are encouraged to report any objectionable conditions via a uniform complaint procedure.

The most recent site inspection was completed on October 27, 2014.

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year) Year and month in which data were collected: October 27, 2014				
System Inspected	**Repair Status**			**Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned**
	Good	**Fair**	**Poor**	
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	
Interior: Interior Surfaces	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	
Electrical: Electrical	[ ]	[X]	[ ]	
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	[X]	[ ]	[ ]	
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	[ ]	[X]	[ ]	

Overall Facility Rating (Most Recent Year)

	Exemplary	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
Overall Rating	[ ]	[X]	[ ]	[ ]

B. Pupil Outcomes

State Priority: Pupil Achievement

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

- Statewide assessments (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress and its successor the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program);

- The Academic Performance Index; and

- The percentage of pupils 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.

California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress / Standardized Testing and Reporting Results for All Students in Science (Three-Year Comparison)

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)	87	83	83	64	62	62	60	59	60

Note: Science assessments include California Standards Tests (CSTs), California Modified Assessment (CMA), and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). 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.

California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress Results by Student Group in Science (School Year 2013-14)

Group	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced
All Students in the LEA	62
All Student at the School	83
Male	86
Female	80
Black or African American	65
American Indian or Alaska Native	58
Asian	95
Filipino	94
Hispanic or Latino	72
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	
White	78
Two or More Races	91
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	72
English Learners	43
Students with Disabilities	34
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services	

Note: CAASPP includes science assessments (CSTs, CMA, and CAPA) in grades 5, 8, and 10. 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.

Standardized Testing and Reporting Results for All Students (Three-Year Comparison)

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
English-Language Arts	75	77	70	49	54	52	54	56	55
Mathematics	56	60	58	35	37	35	49	50	50
History-Social Science	75	77	73	49	51	50	48	49	49

Note: STAR Program was last administered in 2012-13. 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.

Academic Performance Index Ranks (Three-Year Comparison)

API Rank	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Statewide	9	9	8
Similar Schools	4	5	2

Note: For 2014 and subsequent years, the statewide and similar schools ranks will no longer be produced.

Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group (Three-Year Comparison)

Group	Actual API Change		
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
All Students at the School	13	16	-21
Black or African American			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian	7	5	-7
Filipino			
Hispanic or Latino	35	24	-30
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			
White	6	18	-24
Two or More Races			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	24	21	-24
English Learners	-10	20	-38
Students with Disabilities			

Note: "N/D" means that no data were available to the CDE or LEA to report. "B" means the school did not have a valid API Base and there is no Growth or target information. "C" means the school had significant demographic changes and there is no Growth or target information.

State Priority: Other Pupil Outcomes

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

• Pupil outcomes in the subject areas of English, mathematics, and physical education.

California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2013-14)

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards
7	15.7	33.2	35.8

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

C. Engagement

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

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

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (Most Recent Year)

Lexington Junior High School is a highly active campus, with a wide variety of programs and extra-curricular activities developed for the diverse student body. These activities are successful, because of the genuine support and volunteer spirit of our parents and community. Over 150 parents sign-up annually to assist in the following areas: Book Fair, dances, Fit-a-thon fundraiser, band performances, drama shows, dance/choir performances, library assistance, classroom assistance, and reward/incentive programs. Additionally, parents are encouraged to join a very active PTSA, or seek a position on the School Site Council, Discipline Committee, or ELAC Committee.

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

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

Suspensions and Expulsions

Rate	School			District			State		
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Suspensions	1.6	4.7	5.5	3.2	5.8	5.4	5.7	5.1	4.4
Expulsions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1

Note: The rate of suspensions and expulsions is calculated by dividing the total number of incidents by the total enrollment x 100.

School Safety Plan (Most Recent Year)

School Safety Plans are reviewed on an annual basis. Input is gathered from staff, community resource groups, and the School Site Council in order to determine any needed changes. The Lexington Junior High School plan was updated in August 2013. It was discussed with staff in August 2013, and again prior to an emergency evacuation drill (The Great Shakeout) in October 2013.

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.

Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2013-14)

AYP Criteria	School	District
Made AYP Overall		
Met Participation Rate: English-Language Arts		
Met Participation Rate: Mathematics		
Met Percent Proficient: English-Language Arts		
Met Percent Proficient: Mathematics		

Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2014-15)

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	---	14
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	---	100.0

Note: Cells with "---" do not require data.
* DW (determination waiver) indicates that the PI status of the school was carried over from the prior year in accordance with the flexibility granted through the federal waiver process.

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)

Subject	2011-12				2012-13				2013-14			
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms		
		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+
English	29.8	8	17	26	29	9	17	23	29	7	25	17
Mathematics	32.7	5	5	34	31	5	9	27	29	6	17	21
Science	34.8	0	4	32	33	2	4	32	32	5	6	29
Social Science	34.6	1	2	32	33	2	2	33	34		8	28

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

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2013-14)

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor	2	632
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	0	---
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	0	---
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	1	---
Psychologist	0.5	---
Social Worker	0	---
Nurse	0.16	---
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	1	---
Resource Specialist	0	---
Other	0	---

Note: Cells with "---" 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 2012-13)

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Supplemental/ Restricted	Basic/ Unrestricted	
School Site	$7,874	$1,454	$6,420	$85,451
District	---	---	$1,852	$85,155
Percent Difference: School Site and District	---	---	246.7	0.3
State	---	---	$4,690	$72,276
Percent Difference: School Site and State	---	---	36.9	18.2

Note: Cells with "---" do not require data.

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2013-14)

English Learner, Special Education,and Staff Development programs are supported through the folllowing categorical funds: EIA-LEP, Special Edication, and Title II Professional Development. Perkins Funds, Physical Education grant, schoolwide fundraiser and other grants are also sources of support for curricular programs.

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2012-13)

Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	$47,150	$42,957
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	$85,797	$69,613
Highest Teacher Salary	$98,662	$89,407
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	$0	
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	$126,652	$120,526
Average Principal Salary (High)	$136,840	$129,506
Superintendent Salary	$243,016	$207,044
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	41	37
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	4	5

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

Professional Development

Teachers participate in a variety of District in-services as well as professional development workshops and conferences to enhance their knowledge and instructional skills. Staff led in-services are regularly provided to train teachers in the use of Illuminate (student assessment data program), Formative Assessment, SmartBoards, Critical Friends Team Discussions, CEMSS Science Training, Kagan workshops and Power Point. New teachers are also required to participate in the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program. The District and school continue to train teachers in strategies to deliver a differentiated curriculum with depth and complexity. Teachers learn to utilize students' assessment results in order to target instruction to better meet the individual needs of students. Classified staff members have many opportunities to participate in training designed to enhance their effectiveness with students. All District staff members are supported in their efforts to deliver highly-effective lessons.