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This report focuses exclusively on the San Diego Unified School District and is a revised and updated version of an earlier report. It was prepared in consultation with Roxanne Ruzic, Ed.D, Associate Director for Social Science Research at the Center for Education Policy and Law.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD) is the seventh largest urban K-12 school district in the nation and the second largest in California. During the 2010-11 school year, SDUSD’s 181 district-operated schools provided education services to 116,170 students (if district-authorized public charter schools located are included, the number of schools increases to 222 and enrollment to 131,784).

This report covers the school years from 2002-03 to 2010-11 and provides information in four areas: (1) student enrollment, demographics, and students in underperforming schools; (2) student performance on national and state tests; (3) student high school performance and college opportunity; and (4) financial and personnel trends. A summary of findings from this report follows below.

Section I: Student Enrollment, Demographics, and Students in Underperforming Schools

- Enrollment in SDUSD’s district-operated schools declined 12% between 2002-03 and 2010-11. Enrollment in private schools located within the district declined 24% while enrollment in charter schools located within the district grew 76%.

- The percentage of students in the SDUSD identified as Latino has grown since the 2002-03 school year by 5%, while the percentages of White and African American students have declined, 4% and 2%, respectively. In 2010-11, 65% of the district’s students were low-income, 28% English learners, and about 11% enrolled in special education. In 2010-11, the district had a greater percentage of low-income students, English learners, and students enrolled in special education than the state as a whole.

- Nearly one-quarter of students in grades K-8 and more than one-third of students in high school in SDUSD attend an underperforming school with a statewide Academic Performance Index ranking of 1-3.¹

Section II: Student Performance on National and State Tests

- The percentage of students in SDUSD achieving proficiency or higher on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)² in mathematics and reading in grades four and eight has increased, on average, 12% since 2003. Despite the growth, in 2010-11, across the two grade levels and two subjects, the percentage of students failing to reach proficiency on the exams ranged from 61% to 73%.

- Several student subgroups in the district had lower rates of improvement on NAEP exams in mathematics and reading between 2003 and 2011, resulting in a significant,

¹ Schools in SDUSD are given a statewide Academic Performance Index rating between 1 and 10, with 1 being low and 10 being high. API 1-3 ranked schools are considered underperforming.
² Administered by the U.S. Department of Education, NAEP is known as the “Nation’s Report Card.”
persistent, and growing test score gap. For example, in eighth grade mathematics, 6% of Latino students in 2002-03 achieved proficiency or higher. By 2010-11, 14% of Latino students achieved proficiency or higher. During the same two time periods, 35% and 58% of White students achieved proficiency. Thus, the gap between White and Latino students increased from 29% in 2002-03 to 44% in 2010-11. Low-income students, English Learners, and students with disabilities in SDUSD lag far behind district students as a whole in NAEP performance.

- On the 2009 NAEP fourth grade science exam, 29% of students in SDUSD achieved proficiency. This rate of proficiency is slightly lower than that for all students nationally, but higher than that for students in California as well as students in large city districts across the nation. At the eighth grade level, 20% of students in SDUSD achieved proficiency. This is lower than the rate of proficiency for all students nationally, and about the same as the rate for students in California as well as students in large city schools across the nation. Low-income students, English Learner, and students with disabilities in SDUSD performed at much lower levels than students in the district as a whole.

- Proficiency levels of students in SDUSD on the California Standards Test (CST) in mathematics and English language arts were higher than on the NAEP in 2010-11. In 2010-11, 66% of all second graders and 56% of all sixth graders in schools in SDUSD achieved proficiency on the mathematics CST in 2010-11, while 59% of second and sixth graders in SDUSD achieved proficiency in English language arts. On average, across both grade levels and subjects, the CST proficiency achievement of SDUSD students was 2% higher than those of students in the state as a whole.

- Test score gaps among subgroups on the NAEP are also evident on the CSTs. For example, on the sixth grade English language arts CST in 2010-11, 47% of socio-economically disadvantaged students, 15% of English learners, and 36% of students with disabilities achieved proficiency or higher as compared with 59% of all students.

Section III: Student High School Performance and College Opportunity

- A high percentage of all students in SDUSD who persist to graduation pass the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE), though the passage rates are less strong for certain subgroups of students, particularly English learners and students with disabilities.

- The SDUSD district-wide graduation rate for the Class of 2010 cohort was 78.1%, higher than for students in the state as a whole. Graduation rates varied by racial/ethnic subgroups. The graduation rates for White and Asian/Pacific Islander students in the 2010 cohort were higher than those for African American and Latino students.

- The overall dropout rate for the SDUSD Class of 2010 cohort was 9.1%. Dropout rates varied by racial/ethnic subgroups. The dropout rates for White and Asian/Pacific
Islander students in the 2010 cohort were lower than those for African American and Latino students.

- The percentage of students who graduated from SDUSD in 2010 with the coursework necessary to apply for admission to a UC or CSU school was 44.3%, higher than the rate of 36.3% for students in the state as a whole.

- The estimated two or four-year college-going rate for SDUSD graduates within sixteen months of graduation in 2009 was 73.2%. The rate of college enrollment ranged from 61.5% to 81.5% among different racial/ethnic subgroups.

Section IV: Financial and Personnel Trends

- Although average daily attendance within the district fell by slightly more than 11% over the school years 2003-04 to 2010-11, dollars per-student decreased by less than 1% after adjusting for inflation.

- Total general fund revenues increased by 6% during this period, led by a 47% increase in federal revenue, an 18% increase in other local revenues, and a slightly more than 12% increase in other state revenue. Countering this trend was a more than 5% decrease in revenue limit source funds.

- General fund expenditures increased in three areas during this period – a 35% increase in employee benefits, a 16% increase in classified personnel salaries, and a 3% increase in certificated personnel salaries. Overall, general fund expenditures increased by almost 7%. Meanwhile, spending on books and supplies fell by 50% and spending on services and other operating expenses fell by 9%.

- Taken together, the number of teachers, pupil service professionals, and administrators fell by 7% over this time period; when disaggregated, the number of teachers declined by 7%, the number of administrators declined by 25%, while the number of pupil service professionals increased by 8%. These numbers may be partially explained by the 11% decline in average daily attendance that took place over the same time period.

- With overall employment in the district declining by less than 2%, the ratio of students to district employees is currently about 8 to 1.

- Very few probationary teacher contracts were nonextended during the school years 2002-03 to 2010-11. Only a handful of continuing contract teachers were terminated for unsatisfactory performance during this period, none during the past three years.
The San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD) is the seventh largest urban K-12 school district in the nation and the second largest in California\(^3\). During the 2010-11 school year, SDUSD’s 181 district-operated schools provide education services to 116,170 students (if district-authorized public charter schools located are included, the number of schools increases to 222 and enrollment to 131,784).

This report covers the school years from 2002-03 to 2010-11 and provides information in four areas: (1) student enrollment, demographics, and students in underperforming schools; (2) student performance on national and state tests; (3) student high school performance and college opportunity; and, (4) financial and personnel trends.

Section I: Student Enrollment, Demographics, and Students in Underperforming Schools

This section focuses on data related to students in the following categories:

- Student enrollment in district-operated schools, charter schools, and private schools within the district\(^4\)
- Student demographics
- Students in underperforming schools

To allow for longitudinal analysis, statistics have been gathered wherever possible for the school years 2002-03 to 2010-11.

**Student Enrollment**

Statistics on student enrollment in SDUSD are available from the California Department of Education (CDE) for district, charter, and private schools. These data are submitted by districts to the department on a single day in October known as “Information Day” as part of its California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).

---


\(^4\) The term “district-operated schools” means those schools that are directly administered by the district. In some data reporting, charter schools located within school district boundaries are included in the statistics for the district as a whole, because these schools were authorized by the district and the district is legally required to monitor their operations. In other data reporting, charter schools are not included. Clarification is provided in this report when charters area and are not included in statistics.
As Figure 1 demonstrates, the mix of enrollment by school type has shifted over the past nine years. Over this time period, public and private school enrollment has declined while charter school enrollment has increased.

![Figure 1](chart.png)

Enrollment in district-operated schools declined during this time span. The total number of students in district-operated schools was 116,170 in 2010-11, a decline of 12% since 2002-03 when enrollment totaled 131,865 students. Enrollment also declined for private schools located within the geographic boundaries of the district during this period. In 2010-11, a total of 15,243 students were enrolled in private schools within district boundaries, 24% fewer than 2002-03. At the same time, charter school enrollment has increased. In 2010-11, a total of 15,614 students were enrolled in 41 charter schools within the district, up 76% since 2002-03 when 8,888 students were enrolled in 20 charter schools. In 2010-11, the total number of students enrolled in San Diego charter schools was 12% of the number enrolled in both district-operated and charter SDUSD schools combined.

Figure 2 on the following page charts the growth in the enrollment and number of charter schools located within SDUSD between 2002 and 2011.
**Student Demographics**

**Race/Ethnicity**

As Figures 3 and 4 demonstrate, the student populations in 2010-11 in both SDUSD and the state as a whole were racially and ethnically diverse. Data include students in both district-operated and charter schools.
In 2010-11, the district as a whole enrolled 45.6% Latino\textsuperscript{5}, 23.9% White, 14.8% Asian/Pacific Islander\textsuperscript{6}, and 11.3% African American students. However, it is important to note that most schools in both the district and the state do not mirror this degree of diversity. In fact, racial isolation in traditional public schools, charter schools, and private schools throughout the state is more the rule than the exception.

Over the past nine years, some change in the ethnic mix of SDUSD students has occurred (data not shown). The percentage of African American students declined 3.7%, Asian/Pacific Islander students 2.6%, and White students 2.3%, while the percentage of Latino students increased by 4.7%. For the state, the decline in the percentage of White students has been more significant – 7.1%.

Students from Disadvantaged Households

The number of students in SDUSD from disadvantaged households is tracked in two ways by the CDE: 1) through eligibility in the federal Free and Reduced Price Meals Program and 2) through identification as socio-economically disadvantaged. According to the CDE, a total of 86,314 students in SDUSD, or 65%, were eligible\textsuperscript{7} for a free or reduced price meal throughout the 2010-11 school year.\textsuperscript{8} These counts include students ages five through seventeen and include students enrolled in charter schools within the district. The number of students eligible for the free and reduced meal program is the most common standard used to estimate district poverty levels on an annual basis. Nine years ago, the poverty level was 57%. However, prior to 2006, only students actually enrolled in the program, rather than those who were eligible, were counted. For the state as a whole, the percentage of students eligible for free and reduced meals in 2010-2011 was 56%, as compared with 48% of students actually enrolled in the free and reduced meal program in 2002-03.

The second metric to gauge the level of household disadvantage of students is the identification of students as socio-economically disadvantaged. The socio-economically disadvantaged subgroup includes students who participate in or are eligible to participate in the federal Free and Reduced lunch program or students in households where neither parent is a high school graduate. The CDE has reported this metric for districts since the school year 2007-08. Table 1 on the following page shows the percentage of socio-economically disadvantaged students within each ethnic category in SDUSD on Information Day in 2010. The percentage of students identified as socio-economically disadvantaged in SDUSD in 2010-11 was 63%. The percentage

---

\textsuperscript{5} The CDE uses the ethnic designation of “Hispanic or Latino of Any Race.” This report uses the designation of “Latino” to describe this student population.

\textsuperscript{6} Asian/Pacific Islander student data includes students identified as Asian, Filipino, Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander.

\textsuperscript{7} A student may qualify for free or reduced price meals in several ways: 1) low-income eligibility application based on the United States Department of Agriculture Income Eligibility Guidelines; 2) automatic eligibility if household receives assistance such as Food Stamps (FS), California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKS), Kinship Guardian Assistance Program (KinGAP), Food Distribution Program or Indian Reservations (FDPIR); or 3) automatic eligibility if student is migrant, homeless, or runaway.

\textsuperscript{8} According to the CDE, this count includes students throughout the school year. It is not a census count from Information Day.
varied by race/ethnicity ranging from 25% for White students to 78% for African American students.

Table 1
Total Enrollment for Students Identified as Socio-economically Disadvantaged SDUSD 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7,913</td>
<td>31,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>50,208</td>
<td>60,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>11,602</td>
<td>14,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6,541</td>
<td>10,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td>7,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3,215</td>
<td>6,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>82,908</td>
<td>131,784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English Learners

About 28% of students in SDUSD were classified as English Learners (ELs) on Information Day in 2009. These are students who are fluent in another language and are in the process of acquiring English language skills. For the state as a whole, the percentage was 24%.

Statistics for ELs in SDUSD on Information Day in 2010 were not completed and certified by the district for the 2010-11 CALPADS data submission. However, using the Spring 2011 Language Census, which identifies the number of ELs enrolled in a specific instructional setting, the number of ELs in SDUSD was 37,160 or 28% of the total student population.

Students with Disabilities

A total of 14,000 students aged 5-21 in the district – about 11% of the total – were enrolled in special education programs under the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 2010-11. Special education enrollment statewide is 10%. These figure includes both district and charter school students who have individualized education programs (IEPs). It is important to note that students in some charter schools receive special education services through out-of-district special education agencies.

Students in Underperforming Schools

As part of a statewide accountability system, each year California reports the academic success of its public schools through an Academic Performance Index (API). API is an improvement model that measures academic growth on assessment measures such as the California Standards Tests (CSTs) and the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE). Scores on the
API range from a low of 200 to a high of 1,000. To calculate statewide rankings, schools are first sorted by type (elementary, middle, and high school) and then divided into ten equal groups or deciles. A statewide ranking from 1-10 thus shows a relative placement by school type. Schools with statewide rankings of 1-3 are considering underperforming schools.

Table 2 shows the percentage of students attending underperforming schools in SDUSD during the 2009-10 school year using the 2010 statewide base rankings, the latest base rankings available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools Serving Grade Levels</th>
<th># of Students Attending API 1-3 Schools</th>
<th># of Students Attending All Schools</th>
<th>% of Students Attending API 1-3 Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary (K-8 Grade Levels)</td>
<td>22,220</td>
<td>89,858</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (9-12 or 6-12 Grade Levels)</td>
<td>14,206</td>
<td>38,211</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All School Grade Levels</td>
<td>36,426</td>
<td>128,069</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td>131,417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2009-10, 66 SDUSD schools received a statewide API ranking of 1-3. As Table 2 shows, nearly one-quarter of students in primary schools serving grade levels K-8 and more than one-third of students in secondary schools serving grade levels 9-12 or 6-12 attended underperforming schools in SDUSD in 2009-10. With all grades combined, 28% of students in SDUSD attended schools with API statewide rankings of 1-3.

Across ethnic subgroups (data not show), there are some differences in student attendance at underperforming schools. For example, at the high school level, 53% of Latino students and 46% of African American students attended an underperforming school in SDUSD in 2009-2010, both well above the district average for students as a whole.

---

9 There are some exceptions to this process for schools with small enrollment.
10 Includes one K-12 school, Whittier/Del Sol Academy.
11 In 2009-10, five schools did not receive a valid API score. Enrollment from those schools is not included in this table. There are a number of reasons why a school might not have a valid API score, including designation as a special education school, too small enrollment, or invalidated scores.
Section II: Student Performance on National and State Tests

This section focuses on student achievement data in the following categories:

- National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) test performance
- California Standards Test (CST) performance
- English Learners and non-English Learners test performance

To allow for longitudinal analysis, statistics have been gathered wherever possible for the school years 2002-03 to 2010-11.

Student Performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress

Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education and administered through its National Center for Education Statistics, NAEP is the nation’s only representative assessment of what students know and can do in various subject-matter areas. It is known as the “Nation’s Report Card” because it is administered across multiple subject areas and grade levels to a sample of students in all 50 states. It thus offers a common metric for comparing the performance of students across states and selected urban districts.

NAEP exams are administered every two years to representative samples of students in grades four and eight. No test scores are available for individual students or schools. The tests’ content is not directly reflective of a particular state’s curriculum but instead assesses students’ skills levels in basic subjects such as reading, mathematics, and science. Thus, student performance may vary somewhat between NAEP and state assessments such as the California Standards Test, though under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), the degree of rigor of state assessment tests is based in part on their comparison with NAEP.

The test results for fourth graders who performed at or above proficiency on the mathematics and reading exams in the years 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, and 2011 are presented in Figures 5 and 6 for students in SDUSD; students in California; students in the United States; and students in large cities (districts located in cities with populations greater than 250,000).\textsuperscript{12} Note that because the percentage of students reaching proficiency or higher remains low, the vertical percentage scale on the left side of these figures only goes to 50%. All test score results are taken from the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics.

\textsuperscript{12} For this section, beginning in 2009, results for charter schools are excluded from the district results if they are not included in the school district’s Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) report to the U.S. Department of Education.
As Figures 5 and 6 above show, there has been improvement in the performance of SDUSD fourth graders, on average, on both tests between 2003 and 2011, with mathematics scores improving more than reading scores. In 2011, fourth grade students in SDUSD performed somewhat better on NAEP mathematics and reading exams, on average, than students in the state as a whole and in other large city districts, and performed comparably to students in the nation as a whole. Even with the improvement in mathematics and reading scores in 2011, only 39% of SDUSD students in fourth grade achieved proficiency or higher in mathematics, and only 31% achieved proficiency or higher in reading in that year.

In 2011, eighth grade students in SDUSD performed better on NAEP mathematics and reading exams, on average, than students in the state as a whole and in other large city districts, but performed worse than students in the nation as a whole (data not shown). The percentage of eighth grade students achieving proficiency or higher in 2011 was slightly lower than that for fourth graders in the district with 31% of eighth graders achieving proficiency or higher in mathematics and 27% achieving proficiency or higher in reading.

The percentage of students in SDUSD achieving proficiency or higher on NAEP in mathematics and reading in grades four and eight has increased, on average, 12% since 2003. Despite the growth, in 2010-11 across the two grade levels and two subjects, the percentage of students failing to reach proficiency on the exams ranged from 61% to 73%.

Figures 7 and 8 on the following page display SDUSD achievement levels for fourth and eighth grade students on both mathematics and reading tests by race/ethnicity. For these figures, the vertical percentage scale goes to 70% because the percentage of some subgroups achieving proficiency or higher on the exams exceeds 50%.
Between 2003 and 2011, the percentage of students in the district who achieved proficiency in mathematics and reading increased for all four racial/ethnic subgroups, though differences in performance among subgroups persist.

As Figure 7 demonstrates, in 2011 66% of White and 53% of Asian/Pacific Islander fourth grade students achieved proficiency or higher in mathematics, while only 17% of African American and 24% of Latino students did so. As Figure 8 demonstrates, in 2011 on the NAEP reading test, 57% of White and 40% of Asian/Pacific Islander students in the fourth grade achieved at the proficient or higher level, while only 17% of African American and Latino students did so.

For eighth graders, Figure 9 shows that despite improvement in NAEP math test scores from 2003 onward, only White students in the sample had more than 50% reaching proficiency or higher in 2011. No ethnic group in the district performed at this level in reading (Figure 10).
Another trend is noticeable. More modest improvement in rates of proficiency for African American and Latino students, on average, as compared with White and Asian/Pacific Islander students, has resulted in a widening test score gap between students in these.

In fourth grade mathematics (as seen in Figure 7), the percentage of students achieving proficiency or higher in 2003 was 41% for White students, 8% for African American students, and 9% for Latino students. In 2011, the percentage of students achieving proficiency or higher was 66% for White students, 17% for African American students, and 24% for Latino students. Thus, the gap between rates of proficiency for White and African American students increased from 33% to 49% between 2003 and 2011; for White and Latino students, from 32% to 42%. In fourth grade reading (as seen in Figure 8), the gap between rates of proficiency for White and African American students increased from 34% to 40% between 2003 and 2011; for White and Latino students, from 31% to 40%.

A similar gap also is evident between students on the eighth grade tests in mathematics and reading (as seen in Figures 9 and 10). In eighth grade mathematics, the percentage of students achieving proficiency or higher in 2003 was 35% for White students, 7% for African American students, and 6% for Latino students. In 2011, the percentage of students achieving proficiency or higher was 58% for White students, 8% for African American students, and 14% for Latino students. Thus, the gap between rates of proficiency for White and African American students increased from 28% to 50% between 2003 and 2011; for White and Latino students, from 29% to 44%. In eighth grade reading, the gap between rates of proficiency for White and African American students increased from 30% to 35% between 2003 and 2011; for White and Latino students, from 28% to 31%.

As Figures 11 and 12 reveal, fourth grade students from low-income households, students who are English Learners (ELs), and students with disabilities all had lower rates of proficiency on NAEP mathematics and reading exams between 2003 and 2010, on average, than students in the district overall. In these figures, the vertical percentage scale moved back to 0-50%.
The test score gap between all students and the three subgroups increased between 2003 and 2011. The percentage of all students in the district at or above proficient on the NAEP fourth grade mathematics exam increased from 20% in 2003 to 39% in 2011 (see Figure 11). The percentage of students with disabilities at or above proficient increased from 8% in 2003 to 12% in 2011, low-income students 10% to 25%, and ELs 5% to 15%.

In 2011, the U.S. Department of Education released figures for the 2009 NAEP science exam for grades four and eight. Because of changes to the assessment in 2009, the results for 2009 cannot be compared to those from previous years. Because only one year of data is displayed, Figures 13 -15 are formatted differently from the previous NAEP figures for mathematics and reading. As noted in Figure 13 below, a little less than one-third of students across all public schools reached proficiency or higher on this test at both the fourth and eighth grade levels. Students in SDUSD performed about the same as students in fourth grade nationally, but 9 percentage points lower than eighth graders nationally. SDUSD students performed considerably better than students in California as a whole and in large city schools at the fourth grade level but about the same as students in these two groups at the eighth grade level.

Figure 13
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The next two figures show the percentage of San Diego Unified students at or above proficiency on NAEP science exams in 2009 by ethnicity and by subgroups. As see in Figure 14 on the following page, White students had the highest rates of proficiency in science in both fourth and eighth grade, followed by Asian/Pacific Islander students. Both Latino and African American students lagged far behind, with 12% or fewer students from each group reaching proficiency at either grade level.

Figure 15 on the following page shows that low-income students, students with disabilities, and ELs performed at much lower rates, on average, than students in the district overall. Of these
groups, ELs had the lowest rates of proficiency, with only five percent of students reaching proficiency or higher in fourth grade and almost no students reaching proficiency in eighth grade.

Student Achievement on the California Standardized Testing and Reporting System

The state’s Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) system consists of multiple measures of student performance. Its core component is the California Standards Test (CST), which assesses student progress in grades two through eleven in the achievement of the goals associated with the state’s curriculum content standards. Though parents can opt out of the test, fully 95% of every state-designated student subgroup (and there are many) must participate in the assessments for a school not to be classified as low-performing. California has indicated to the U.S. Department of Education that it expects to have all students at or above the proficient level on the state’s English language arts and mathematics standards tests by school year 2013-2014 in compliance with the No Child Left Behind Act.13 As noted earlier, the degree of rigor of state assessment tests is determined in part by their comparison with NAEP. Data presented in this section, unless otherwise noted, are from the CDE and include students in both district-operated and charter schools.

Figures 16 and 17 on the following page show the percentage of students in San Diego public schools achieving proficiency or higher on the 2010-11 second grade and sixth grade.

---

13 At this writing, the reauthorization of this federal law is pending in Congress. The Obama administration has issued guidelines for states to secure waivers from various provisions of NCLB because of Congress’s reauthorization delay. To secure waivers, states must agree to certain conditions such as changing student assessment to focus more on college- and career-readiness. Whether California will seek a waiver remains uncertain at this time.
Second grade is the first grade level the CSTs are administered to students and sixth grade is the last year most students take general math. Included in both figures is the performance of students by racial and ethnic subgroups.

The rate of proficiency for second graders in the district on the math CST was unchanged from the year before. (data from 2009-10 not shown in these figures). The rate of proficiency for sixth graders remained stable as well, increasing one percentage point, from 55% in 2009-10 to 56% in 2010-11. The rate of proficiency for second graders on the English language arts CST increased by two percentage points, from 57% in 2009-10 to 59% in 2010-11, while the rate of proficiency for sixth graders declined from 61% to 59% during this same period. At both grade levels, rates of proficiency for district students were approximately 4% higher than the state as a whole in 2009-10, and 3% higher than the state as a whole in 2010-2011.

As shown in Figures 16 and 17, above, both White and Asian students performed better in 2010-11, on average, than students in the district overall, while African American and Latino students performed worse. For example, on the sixth grade English language arts CST in 2010-11, 80% of White students, 72% of Asian/Pacific Islander students, 48% of African American students, and 44% of Latino students achieved proficiency compared with 59% of all students.

Average rates of proficiency on the CST increased for both African American and Latino students between 2002-03 and 2010-11. In 2002-03, just 16% of African American students

---

14 At or Above Proficiency figures are obtained from the CDE website by combining CDE percentages for % Advanced and % Proficient. Does not include results from 15 charter schools that contract independently for testing services.

15 Asian percentages are weighted figures including students identified as either Asian, Filipino, Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander.
and just 19% of Latino students in the district achieved proficiency or higher on the sixth grade mathematics CST. By 2010-11, that percentage rose to 37% for African American students and 43% for Latino students. The same upward trend is apparent on the English language arts CST at the sixth grade level. In 2002-03, 25% of African-American students and 20% of Latino students achieved proficiency on the exam. By 2010-11, the rate of proficiency had nearly doubled for African American students, rising to 48%, and more than doubled for Latino students, rising to 44%. Still, half or more of all African American second and sixth graders and forty-five percent or more of all Latino second and sixth graders failed to reach proficiency on the mathematics and English language arts CSTs in 2010-11.

The gap between levels of proficiency for White and African American students increased by 3% for second grade English language arts and 2% for second and sixth grade mathematics, but decreased by 6% for sixth grade English language arts between 2002-03 and 2010-11. The gap between levels of proficiency for White and Latino students decreased by 7% for second grade mathematics and sixth grade English language arts, 4% for second grade English language arts, and 1% for sixth grade mathematics during this time.

As displayed in Figures 18 and 19, the rates of proficiency for low-income students, ELs, and students with disabilities on the 2010-11 CST mathematics and English language arts tests at both grade levels lagged behind students in the district overall.16

Differences in relative rates of proficiency between students of different racial/ethnic groups (shown in Figures 16 and 17), and between English learners, students from low-income

---

16 Does not include results from 15 charter schools that contract independently for testing services.
households, and students with disabilities as compared with students in the district as a whole (shown in Figures 18 and 19), on the CSTs are similar to those on the NAEP.

**English Learners and Non-English Learners in the Latino Student Population**

A significant portion of SDUSD students are identified as English Learners (ELs). The CDE defines an English Learner as a “those students for whom there is a report of a primary language other than English on the state-approved Home Language Survey and who, on the basis of the state approved oral language (grades K-12) assessment procedures and including literacy (grades 3-12 only), have been determined to lack the clearly defined English language skills of listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing necessary to succeed in the school's regular instructional programs.”\(^\text{17}\) For this section, data was obtained for the school year 2009-10, the latest year available, from a specific reporting request to the CDE.

In 2009-10, 28% of students (37,152 of 131,417 enrolled) were classified as ELs. Of those 28%, over three-quarters (28,602) were identified as Spanish-speaking. While most Spanish-speaking ELs are also ethnically identified as Latino, it is possible to be a Spanish-speaking English Learner with an ethnic or racial identification other than Latino.

Figures 20 and 21 disaggregate the performance of Latino students on the English language arts and mathematics CSTs by EL or non-EL designation. Across all grade levels and performance categories, Spanish-speaking EL students underperform their Latino non-EL peers.

In 2009-10, 57% of the Latino students tested across general CST mathematics in grades 2 - 7, and Algebra 1, Geometry, and Algebra 2 (taken in various grades), were identified as ELs. As shown in Figure 20, the percentage of Latino EL students who scored at or above proficiency in mathematics in 2009-10 at each level was between 8% and 24% lower than the percentage of Latino non-EL students who achieved proficiency on the same exams.

**Figure 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Algebra I</th>
<th>Geometry</th>
<th>Algebra II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{17}\) CDE Dataquest glossary accessed at http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/gls_learners.asp.
In 2009-10, 62% of the Latino students tested in CST English language arts in grades 2-11 were identified as ELs. As shown in Figure 21, the percentage of Latino EL students who scored at or above proficiency in English language arts language arts in 2009-10 at each level was between 8% and 41% lower than the percentage of Latino non-EL students who achieved proficiency on the same exams.

Figure 21
El and Non-EL SDUSD Latino Students
At or Above Proficiency
CST English Language Arts 2009-10

Section III: Student High School Performance and College Opportunity

This section focuses on data related to SDUSD students in the following categories:

- California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) passage rates
- High school graduation and dropout rates
- Postsecondary preparedness and attendance rates

Passage Rates on the California High School Exit Exam

In order to receive a diploma, California public school students must pass the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) in mathematics and English language arts. The test is aligned with the state’s curriculum content standards. CAHSEE tests competency in English language arts through tenth grade content standards and in mathematics through sixth and seventh grade content standards and Algebra 1. Students can begin taking the exam in their sophomore year and are allowed to continue taking any sections they fail until they have passed all portions of the exam. Following their senior year, any students who do not pass the exam may seek supplemental remedial instructional in preparation for the test or may seek other options to a diploma such as the General Educational Development (GED) test.
The cumulative pass rates for SDUSD’s Class of 2010 is shown in Figures 22 and 23. Data are from the SDUSD Research and Reporting Department and include students in district-operated schools, excluding charters. This is the latest data available from the school district.\(^{18}\)

Upwards of 90% of the Class of 2010 cohort eventually passed both portions of CAHSEE. These statistics encompass the 7,370 students in the Class of 2010 cohort but not the large number who left the cohort for various reasons including dropping out of school or moving out of the district. In its sophomore year, the Class of 2010 numbered 8,726 students.

The pass rate for low-income students (91% mathematics and literacy) was close to the rate for all students (94% mathematics; 93% literacy). However, the pass rate for ELs (74% mathematics; 66% literacy) and students with disabilities (62% mathematics; 63% literacy) were lower than the rate for all students.

**Cohort Graduation and Dropout Rates**

Beginning with the graduating class of 2010, the CDE began reporting graduation and dropout rates based on four-year adjusted cohort information\(^{19}\) collected about individual students using the state’s California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).\(^ {20}\)

A high school cohort is the group of students who enter the ninth grade together and could potentially graduate in four years’ time. Previously, the CDE calculated the graduation rate

---


formula based on the Graduation Leaver Indicator (GLI). The GLI is a measure of departures rather than a measure of on-time graduation. This formula basically sums up the number of dropouts over four years to arrive by default at an on-time graduation rate percentage. Because of this change in the graduation rate formulation, comparisons cannot be made between 2010 and previous years’ data.

The new CALPADS system is able to track student mobility during the high school years and report on each cohort’s on-time graduation rate. It also includes specific data on non-graduating students within the cohort, meaning those who dropped out of high school, completed a special education program, passed the General Education Development (GED) test, or remain enrolled after four years in high school. The new cohort graduation and dropout rate calculation system, however, does not take into account students who drop out of the school system before grade nine.

Table 3 on the following page includes cohort outcome data for the Class of 2009-10. This includes students who entered 9th grade in the year 2006-07 and were scheduled to graduate in June 2010. Students from district-operated or district-funded charter schools are included in these figures. Direct-funded charter schools are not included in the district-wide cohort data. As the table shows, graduation and drop-out rates in the district vary by race/ethnicity subgroups.

---

21 The previously posted class of 2009-10 cohort outcome data was updated on January 24, 2012 on the CDE Dataquest website. According to the website, “This update reflects corrections made by local education agencies (LEAS) and independently reporting charter schools to the CALPADS Fall 1 2010-11 Snapshot and to the CALPADS Operational Data Store (ODS). Modifications were also made to the criteria used to place and remove students from the 2009-10 cohort.” http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/whatsnew.asp.

22 CDE (2011). 4-year Adjusted Cohort Outcome Data Processing. “The 4-year Adjusted Cohort forms the basis for calculating graduation rates, dropout rates, and other related rates. The cohort is the group of students that could potentially graduate during a 4-year time period (grade 9 through grade 12). The 4-year Adjusted Cohort includes students who enter 9th grade for the first time in the initial year of the 4-years used for the cohort. This cohort is then adjusted by: Adding students who later transfer into the cohort during grade nine (year 1), grade 10 (year 2), grade 11 (year 3), and grade 12 (year 4); and Subtracting students who transfer out, emigrate to another county, or die during the 4-year period. Students who drop out during the four year period remain in the cohort, as well as students that complete 12th grade and exit the educational system without graduating. Students that take longer than four years to graduate or remain enrolled after four years are also included as part of the cohort.”
Table 3
SDUSD Cohort Outcome Data for the Class of 2009-10
Selected Subgroups by Ethnicity and All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Class of 2010 Cohort</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Number of Dropouts</th>
<th>Dropout Rate</th>
<th>Still Enrolled</th>
<th>Special Education Completer</th>
<th>GED Completer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pac Islander</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>3,555</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SDUSD Students</td>
<td>8,272</td>
<td>6,456</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cohort Graduation Rate**
When calculated based on the new cohort formula, the California statewide graduation rate for the Class of 2010 was 75.2%. The SDUSD district-wide graduation rate was 78.1%. Graduation rates for the district varied by race/ethnicity, with White and Asian/Pacific Islander students graduating at significantly higher rates (87.7% and 91.4%, respectively) than African American and Latino students (72.4% and 68.4%, respectively). 25

The CDE also reports graduation rates by school. Within a district, rates are higher in some high schools than in others. For example, for the SDUSD Class of 2010, graduation rates in senior high schools ranged from 43.5% at the School of Communication at San Diego High to 95.2% at Scripps Ranch High School.

**Cohort Dropout Rate**
Differences in graduation rates among subgroups by ethnicity (as seen in Table 3) are mirrored in cohort dropout rates as well. The overall cohort dropout rate for the SDUSD Class of 2010 was 9.1%, as compared with 4.1% for Asian/Pacific Islander students, 4.8% for White students, 12.3% for African American students, and 12.8% for Latino students. These data include both district-operated and district-funded schools but not direct-funded charters.

**Year-to-Year Dropouts**
As previously noted, while the dropout rate is calculated using data from 9th through 12th grade, there is also a significant number of students who drop out during the 7th and 8th grades. Table

---

23 Includes Asian, Filipino, and Pacific Islander. An asterisk appears on the CDE Dataquest website to protect student privacy when there are ten or fewer students.

24 The total for SDUSD includes selected subgroups plus Native American students or students identified as Two or More Races.

25 The total number of Latino graduates (district-operated school 2010 cohort graduates, direct-funded charter school graduates, or other cohort graduates) in 2009-10 was 949.
4 shows the number of students in SDUSD who dropped out by grade level over the eight-year period from 2002-03 to 2009-10. These figures include adjustments in grades 9-12 for reenrolled dropouts and lost transfers and include students who dropped out from charter schools.

Table 4  
Number of SDUSD Dropouts  
2002-03 to 2009-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7th-8th</th>
<th>9th-12th</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>2,378</td>
<td>2,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>2,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>1,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>2,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>2,035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, the percentage of dropouts by student race/ethnicity in 2009-10 did not reflect the rates of race/ethnicity of students in the district as a whole. For example, while Latino students represented 45.9% of the student population, they represented 64.6% of the dropouts. Similarly, while African American students represented 11.7% of the total student population, they represented 14.4% of the dropouts. Figure 24 shows the percentage of dropouts by race/ethnicity group in SDUSD for 2009-10 and race/ethnicity for students as a whole.

---

26 Includes adjustments for reenrolled grade 9-12 dropouts and grade 9-12 lost transfers.

27 Dropout data for 2008-09 may not reflect true dropout rates. The school district has identified to the CDE a reporting error for that time period.
**Postsecondary Preparedness and Attendance Rates**

**UC/CSU Eligibility**

According to data from the CDE, the percentage of students who graduated from SDUSD in 2010 eligible for UC/CSU admission was 44.3%, a significant increase over the previous year’s figure of 32.8% though data reporting errors may account for the lower percentage in 2008-09. Statewide, the UC/CSU eligibility rate in 2010 was 36.3%, up from 35.3% the year before.

![Figure 25](chart.png)

There was some gender imbalance in the eligibility of SDUSD students (data not shown). On average, the percentage of female students with UC/CSU eligibility was 8% greater than that for male students for the years 2002 to 2010.

In this context, it should be noted that a study done in 2010 by The Education Trust-West and financed by San Diego Unified sets forth a number of recommendations for improving the percentage of students meeting the A-G requirements for admission to the UC/CSU system.²⁸

**Estimate of College Enrollment Rates**

As part of a federal reporting requirement,²⁹ the CDE developed a Postsecondary Achievement Report to measure the college enrollment rates of graduating high school students. Using data from both the CALPADS student tracking system and the National Student Clearinghouse (NCS) college enrollment tracking system, in 2011 CDE provided estimates for college enrollment in a postsecondary institution within sixteen months of graduation for students who graduated in the school year 2008-09.³⁰ Table 5 on the next page shows college enrollment estimates for graduates from SDUSD and the state as a whole within sixteen months of graduating in 2008-2009.

---


²⁹ State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

³⁰ The CDE data include a caveat that the data may underestimate the actual college-going enrollment because not all postsecondary institutions participate in the NCS, some students may opt out for privacy reasons, and there may be inaccuracies in the matching process if a student used a different name across institutions. The NCS database includes 93% of postsecondary institutions in the U.S.
Table 5
College Enrollment Estimates for Graduates
Within Sixteen Months of 2009 Graduation
SDUSD and California Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Subgroups</th>
<th>SDUSD</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Graduates</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the graduating class of 2009, the estimated rate of two-year or four-year college attendance for SDUSD graduates was 73.2%, slightly lower than high school graduates in the state as a whole. The estimated rate of college enrollment varied in the district from a low of 61.5% for students with disabilities to a high of 81.5% for Asian/Pacific Islander students.

Section IV: Financial and Personnel Trends

Financial Trends

This section begins by presenting financial information for the San Diego Unified School District over the most recent eight-year period available, 31 2003-04 to 2010-11. This information provides an important context for considering the academic performance of the district’s students as presented in the previous section. However, given the volume of budgetary and personnel data available for the district, only the information necessary to identify major trends is presented here.

Budgetary Overview

California’s current system for funding public schools has been in place for 38 years – with additions and changes resulting from major voter decisions (Propositions 13 and 98), judicial rulings (Serrano v. Priest), and annual tinkering by lawmakers. As a result of these semi-regular

31 Financial data from the CDE for the school years 2003-04 to 2010-11 excludes charter schools. For the school year 2002-03, however, average daily attendance and per-student spending figures may or may not include charter schools and clarification has yet to be received from the CDE. As such, to ensure inter-temporal comparability the 2002-03 school year has been excluded from our analysis.
changes, the system of school finance in California is “extraordinarily complex and difficult to understand,” at least according to a popular website hosted by the California Department of Education. However, there are a few basic facts that will help make the tables in this section easier to understand.

Throughout the state, about two-thirds of total funding for K-12 is for general purposes. The other one-third is for special purposes or categories of students, called categorical aid (two popular examples of categorical aid are funds for K-3 Class Size Reduction and Gifted and Talented Education). Although funding for categorical aid can be based on a myriad of things, general purpose funding is based only on two things – the average number of students attending during the year (called average daily attendance) and the revenue limit money the district receives based on average daily attendance, which is largely a mix of state and local funds. When we multiply average daily attendance by the district’s per-pupil revenue limit (which since the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978 limiting property tax revenues has been set largely by the governor and state legislature) we get the district’s total revenue limit income, which represents the bulk of funds available for general purposes.

To understand the concept of revenue limits, it is helpful to note that in 1972 the California Legislature set revenue limits for each district, roughly according to the district’s expenditures on general education programs. However, the significant variation in revenue limits that existed between districts led the courts (via the second Serrano v. Priest case in 1976) to require that the state make these funds more equitable across districts. By 2000, almost 97% of the state’s students were within a band (known as the Serrano band) of about $350. While the legislature and governor almost always provide cost-of-living adjustments to revenue limits, neither the school board nor local voters can increase the revenue limit. In fact, if local property tax revenues rise within a district, the increase goes towards the district’s revenue limit with a concomitant decrease in the state’s share; however, if local property tax revenues fully fund the revenue limit, then the district gets to keep the extra property tax revenue. Only about 60 of the over 1,000 school districts in the state fall into this category.

The district’s General Fund, often thought of as “the budget,” covers regular operating revenues and expenses and serves as the chief operating fund for school districts. Technically the General Fund is only part of the overall budget. Other components include special revenue funds, capital project funds, debt service funds, and enterprise funds. However, because these later funds are typically used for purposes other than K-12 education, we concentrate on General Fund revenues and expenditures in the first two tables presented below.

---

Research Methodology

All of the financial and personnel information except for teacher contract non-extension and termination presented in this section comes directly from the California Department of Education and reflects the most recent data publicly available (2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11). Although every effort is made by the California Department of Education to catch errors or misinterpretations in the data supplied to them by districts, this information is not changed after it has been certified; as a result, the financial statements that appear on the California Department of Education website may include some uncorrected data. Given this important caveat, for each of the years in our profile we present the financial data in nominal terms, which means that they have not been adjusted for inflation, and the personnel data in actual numbers, rather than full-time equivalents. The staffing and enrollment data encompass both traditional public and charter schools within the district, while the financial data exclude charter schools. In addition, when we make the occasional reference to the rate of inflation over this time period, we use data on the urban consumer price index from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Specifically, the rate that we use is a simple average of three inflation rates calculated at different starting and ending places over this period to better approximate the timing of the actual school year (September 03 – September 10, January 04 – January 11, and June 04 - June 11). In addition to presenting data for each year, we calculate the simple percentage change over the eight-year period to make trends easier to identify and understand.

Findings

The first three tables, which concentrate on financial issues, begin at the macro level with a look at general fund revenues (Table 6) and general fund expenditures (Table 7). Table 8 presents average daily attendance and dollars per student within the district, which helps provide a context for the first two general fund tables. The final two tables, which highlight important personnel issues, describe the number of various types of certificated and classified staff over this time period (Table 9) as well as per-pupil certificated staff trends (Table 10).

As described in the preceding paragraph, the first of the budgetary tables (Table 6 on the following page) looks at general fund revenues for San Diego Unified School District in millions of dollars from 2003-04 to 2010-11. An examination of this table shows that over the eight-year period there was a 6% increase in total revenue, driven by large increases in federal revenue (46.9%), other local revenue (17.9%), and other state revenue (12.3%). Countering this trend was a 5.4% decrease in revenue limit source funds. To place these changes in context, the inflation rate over this period was 18.6%, suggesting that, at least in real terms, total revenues for the district declined by 12.6% over this period (6.0 -18.6).
Table 6
General Fund Revenues (in millions) for San Diego Unified School District for 2003-04 to 2010-11 Including the Percentage Change from 2003-04 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Limit Sources</td>
<td>$617.9</td>
<td>$630.6</td>
<td>$637.5</td>
<td>$670.9</td>
<td>$646.3</td>
<td>$637.3</td>
<td>$557.7</td>
<td>$584.4</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Revenue</td>
<td>$118.1</td>
<td>$113.5</td>
<td>$130.2</td>
<td>$112.2</td>
<td>$112.8</td>
<td>$164.7</td>
<td>$154.9</td>
<td>$173.5</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State Revenue</td>
<td>$279.9</td>
<td>$279.3</td>
<td>$286.0</td>
<td>$364.3</td>
<td>$316.1</td>
<td>$297.4</td>
<td>$294.4</td>
<td>$314.3</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Revenue</td>
<td>$39.7</td>
<td>$44.2</td>
<td>$58.5</td>
<td>$77.5</td>
<td>$101.2</td>
<td>$91.4</td>
<td>$53.5</td>
<td>$46.8</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$1,055.6</td>
<td>$1,067.5</td>
<td>$1,112.2</td>
<td>$1,224.9</td>
<td>$1,176.5</td>
<td>$1,190.8</td>
<td>$1,060.4</td>
<td>$1,119.0</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To help understand this table, the following definitions may prove helpful:

- **Revenue Limit Sources** includes base revenue limits, plus other funds such as Equalization, Summer School, and Prior Year Adjustments.
- **Federal Revenue** includes all money received for the No Child Left Behind Act plus Special Education and other Federal programs.
- **Other State Revenue** includes lottery and state categoricals like K-3 Class Size Reduction, Gifted and Talented Education (GATE), and Economic Impact Aid.
- **Other Local Revenue** includes interest, donations and reimbursements, parcel taxes, rents and leases, and other local sources.

While the first financial table presents general fund revenues, the second presents general fund expenditures for the district over the 2003-04 to 2010-11 time period. An examination of Table 7 on the following page reveals that while employee benefits increased by 35%, classified salaries by 16.3%, and the salaries of certificated employees (like teachers, certified pupil support, and certified supervisors and administrators) by 3.4% over the period, spending on books and supplies fell by 50.1% during this period while spending on services and other operating expenses fell by 8.6%. Taken together, the overall growth in these expenditures was 6.9% during the eight-year period, well below the 18.6% actual rate of inflation over the same period.
### Table 7

**General Fund Expenditures (in millions) for San Diego Unified for 2003-04 to 2010-11 Including the Percentage Change from 2003-04 to 2010-11**

(Excludes Capital Outlay, Other Outgo, and Direct Support/Indirect Costs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certificated Personnel Salaries</strong></td>
<td>$511.3</td>
<td>$500.3</td>
<td>$507.3</td>
<td>$543.6</td>
<td>$569.1</td>
<td>$574.0</td>
<td>$542.5</td>
<td>$528.8</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classified Personnel Salaries</strong></td>
<td>$165.4</td>
<td>$164.7</td>
<td>$177.3</td>
<td>$197.5</td>
<td>$211.7</td>
<td>$199.5</td>
<td>$194.1</td>
<td>$192.3</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Benefits</strong></td>
<td>$201.1</td>
<td>$226.5</td>
<td>$239.0</td>
<td>$250.4</td>
<td>$258.6</td>
<td>$249.3</td>
<td>$263.9</td>
<td>$271.5</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Books and Supplies</strong></td>
<td>$75.0</td>
<td>$79.7</td>
<td>$88.5</td>
<td>$51.5</td>
<td>$58.8</td>
<td>$62.2</td>
<td>$43.9</td>
<td>$37.4</td>
<td>-50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services and Other Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$70.6</td>
<td>$41.1</td>
<td>$52.8</td>
<td>$86.1</td>
<td>$100.6</td>
<td>$83.0</td>
<td>$77.5</td>
<td>$64.5</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$1,023.4</td>
<td>$1,012.4</td>
<td>$1,064.9</td>
<td>$1,129.1</td>
<td>$1,198.8</td>
<td>$1,168.0</td>
<td>$1,121.9</td>
<td>$1,094.5</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To understand what is included in the categories in Table 7, the following information may prove helpful:

- **Certificated Personnel Salaries** includes the salaries of individuals such as teachers, certified pupil support, and certified supervisors and administrators.

- **Classified Salaries** includes the salaries of individuals such as instructional assistants, athletics staff, clerical and office, maintenance staff, and classified supervisors and administrators.

- **Employee Benefits** includes Health and Welfare, Worker’s Compensation, and other employee benefits.

- **Books and Supplies** includes expenditures on such things as approved textbooks and core curricula material, books and other reference materials, and materials and supplies.

- **Services and Other Operating Expenses** includes expenditures on such things as travel and conferences, dues and memberships, housekeeping services, rentals, leases, and repairs.
The next table displays two important pieces of information for the district – average daily attendance and dollars per-student. Both of these numbers are legislatively required in that the “current expense of education,” defined as dollars per student, must be calculated annually for every district. Average daily attendance differs significantly from standard enrollment figures. While enrollment is a count of students on a specific day in October, which was the basis for the enrollment data presented in the previous section, average daily attendance, which is reported to the California Department of Education three times a year, is calculated as the total days of student attendance divided by the number of instructional days in the school year. Typically, average daily attendance is less than actual enrollment because absences, even if excused, are not included in average daily attendance. This number, which does not include charter school enrollment, is then used to calculate dollars per student, by taking total expenditures, subtracting out food services, facilities acquisition and construction, and certain other expenditures, and then dividing by average daily attendance.

Table 8
Average Daily Attendance and Dollars per Student for San Diego Unified 2003-04 to 2010-11 and the Real and Nominal Percentage Change from 2003-04 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Attendance</td>
<td>123,997</td>
<td>119,957</td>
<td>114,826</td>
<td>112,931</td>
<td>113,165</td>
<td>110,670</td>
<td>110,420</td>
<td>109,946</td>
<td>-11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars per Student</td>
<td>$8,156</td>
<td>$8,164</td>
<td>$8,981</td>
<td>$9,708</td>
<td>$10,426</td>
<td>$10,399</td>
<td>$9,855</td>
<td>$9,655</td>
<td>18.4% (nominal) -0.2% (real)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of this table reveals a powerful trend within the district – average daily attendance has fallen every year but one for the past eight years, for a total decrease of 11.3% from the 2003-04 base. At the same time, dollars per student have risen significantly during this period – in fact, from a nominal perspective more than enough to offset the decline in students (18.4%). When adjusted for inflation, there was a slight decrease in dollars per student over this time period (-0.2%), but this decrease was considerably less than the percentage decline in average daily attendance.

Personnel Trends

Changes in Number of Personnel

The first of the personnel tables, Table 9 on the following page, shows the number of certificated and classified staff employed in San Diego Unified during the 2003-04 to 2010-11 time period. Close examination of this table reveals that the number of certificated staff
declined by 7.3% over this period, led by a 25.2% decline in the number of administrators and a
7.5% decline in the number of teachers; this was partially balanced out by a 7.8% increase in
the number of pupil service professionals. As was noted previously, average daily attendance
fell by more than 11% during this period, helping to explain the declines in the number of
teachers and administrators. Among classified staff during this period, the number of office and
clerical workers decreased slightly (0.6%); however, this was more than offset by increases in
the numbers of paraprofessionals (0.7%) and other classified staff (14.9%), which includes
custodians, bus drivers, and cafeteria staff. Taken together, these changes produced a decline
of 1.5% in the total number of certificated and classified employees working for the district; as
such, the ratio of students to district employees is currently about 8 to 1.

Table 9
The Number and Percentage of All San Diego Unified School District Staff for
2003-04 to 2010-11 and the Percentage Change from 2003-04 to 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certificated Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>7,668 (47.8%)</td>
<td>7,421 (49.9%)</td>
<td>7,555 (47.4%)</td>
<td>7,416 (45.7%)</td>
<td>7,325 (44.6%)</td>
<td>7,210 (45.2%)</td>
<td>7,054 (46.8%)</td>
<td>7,095</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Services</td>
<td>795 (5.0%)</td>
<td>650 (4.4%)</td>
<td>704 (4.4%)</td>
<td>735 (4.5%)</td>
<td>888 (5.4%)</td>
<td>880 (5.5%)</td>
<td>920 (6.1%)</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>610 (3.8%)</td>
<td>761 (5.1%)</td>
<td>660 (4.1%)</td>
<td>864 (5.3%)</td>
<td>796 (4.8%)</td>
<td>739 (4.6%)</td>
<td>419 (2.8%)</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>-25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotals</strong></td>
<td>9,073</td>
<td>8,832</td>
<td>8,919</td>
<td>9,015</td>
<td>9,009</td>
<td>8,829</td>
<td>8,393</td>
<td>8,408</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classified Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>2,575 (16.1%)</td>
<td>2,071 (13.9%)</td>
<td>2,493 (15.6%)</td>
<td>2,690 (16.6%)</td>
<td>2,755 (16.8%)</td>
<td>2,246 (14.1%)</td>
<td>1,974 (13.1%)</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Clerical</td>
<td>1,617 (10.1%)</td>
<td>1,646 (11.1%)</td>
<td>1,635 (10.3%)</td>
<td>1,736 (10.7%)</td>
<td>1,681 (10.2%)</td>
<td>1,073 (6.7%)</td>
<td>1,557 (10.3%)</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,773 (17.3%)</td>
<td>2,335 (15.7%)</td>
<td>2,892 (18.1%)</td>
<td>2,779 (17.1%)</td>
<td>2,960 (18.0%)</td>
<td>3,789 (23.8%)</td>
<td>3,143 (20.9%)</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotals</strong></td>
<td>6,965</td>
<td>6,052</td>
<td>7,020</td>
<td>7,205</td>
<td>7,396</td>
<td>7,108</td>
<td>6,674</td>
<td>7,386</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>16,038</td>
<td>14,884</td>
<td>15,939</td>
<td>16,220</td>
<td>16,405</td>
<td>15,937</td>
<td>15,067</td>
<td>15,794</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To understand the categories in Table 9, the following definitions may prove helpful:

- **Administrators** are defined as those certificated employees who are not teachers or
  pupil services professionals, and include superintendents, principals, assistant
  superintendents, assistant principals, program directors or coordinators, and other
  certificated staff not providing direct services to students.
• *Pupil services personnel* are defined as those certificated employees who provide direct services to students but are not teachers, and include counselors, nurses, psychologists, social workers, librarians, speech specialists, and other medical personnel.

• While the definition of *teachers* is self-evident, this category does not include adult education, Regional Occupation Programs (ROP), child care, and preschool teachers.

• *Paraprofessionals* are considered classified staff and include teaching assistants, teacher aides, pupil service aides, and library aides.

• *Office and clerical* are considered classified staff and include those with clerical or administrative support duties such as the school secretary.

• The *Other* category includes all the remaining non-certificated staff, including custodians, bus drivers, and cafeteria workers.

The next table presents information that describes per-pupil certificated staff trends over the 2003-04 to 2010-11 time frame using full-time equivalents rather than the total number of teachers, administrators, and per-pupil-service professionals (although this table does not display actual employment figures within the district, interested readers can find them in Table 9). Examination of Table 10 shows that the number of students per teacher increased significantly over this time period from 18.5 to 22.5, or by 21.6%. (Note: the number of students per teacher should not be confused with average class size since there are many teachers in the district who are not classroom-based.) During this time period, the number of students per administrator also increased – from about 230 to 310, or by 35%. However, the number of students per pupil-service professional decreased by almost 6% over this period, falling from 186.1 students to 175.2 students.

**Table 10**
**Per-Pupil Certificated Staff Trends for the San Diego Unified School District from 2003-04 to 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Services</td>
<td>186.1</td>
<td>222.2</td>
<td>199.9</td>
<td>194.9</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>172.5</td>
<td>151.8</td>
<td>175.2</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>229.7</td>
<td>182.1</td>
<td>204.6</td>
<td>177.2</td>
<td>200.1</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>327.2</td>
<td>310.1</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher Terminations**

With regard to the termination of teachers, there are two kinds of action that a school district can take under California law. The first, and by far the easiest, is simply not to extend the contract of probationary teachers. Probationary teachers are those serving the first two years of employment in the district. If during this time, the district decides a probationary teacher
should not be retained at the end of the year, it simply opts not to extend the contract. While the teacher needs to be informed of the action, no reasons need be given and no due process hearing is required. The graph below shows the number of first year and second year probationary teachers in SDUSD whose contracts were not extended for each school year between 2002-03 and 2010-11. The information for this and the following figure was obtained from the SDUSD Human Resources Services Division.

Figure 26
Nonextension of Probationary Teacher Contracts

It is clear that there was a spike in the number of contract nonextensions in 2003-04. It should be noted that between school years 2003-04 and 2004-05, there was also a significant decrease in the total number of teachers on first and second-year probationary contracts from 1,052 to 730. In 2007-08, no probationary teachers experienced nonextension of their contracts. Though there were 203 teacher layoffs because of financial exigency that year, all were recalled. In 2008-09, 11 probationary contracts were nonextended, and in 2009-10, seven. In 2010-11, no probationary teachers experienced nonextension of their contracts.

Note. Negative employment decisions in school districts are never easy, in part because teachers as public employees have property rights in their employment and in part because the California Education Code specifies in considerable detail the steps to be taken in termination actions. The statutory legal requirements only can be marginally affected by collective bargaining. To illustrate the complexity, consider the situation where a school district wishes to terminate a probationary teacher’s contract during the year (termed “a mid-contract termination”). Unlike contract nonextension at the end of the year, a constitutionally protected property right exists during the contract term and California law details the due process requirements for ending it. Because of the legal requirements, few probationary teachers have their contracts terminated during the year. It is simply more cost-effective for the district to place the probationary teacher on administrative leave with pay and nonextend the contract at the end of the year. However, even a nonextension decision can be challenged through the grievance process or in court as illegally motivated (e.g., triggered by discrimination or retaliation for the exercise of a constitutional right) or unfair.
Most of the district’s teachers are on permanent contract. Terminating a permanent teacher’s contract is much more difficult because the contract by definition does not end until the person retires or dies. California law specifies in elaborate detail the causes for termination of a permanent contract and the due process procedures to be followed. Because constitutional law requires that the employment action must be justified (termed “good cause”) and because there is a tilt in the law toward remediation rather than termination, the costs in time and money to terminate a permanent contract are high.

Figure 27 on the following page shows the number of permanent contract teachers in SDUSD who received notice of possible termination for unsatisfactory performance since 2002-03. Unsatisfactory performance is one of nine permissible reasons set forth in the California Education Code for the termination of permanent teacher contracts.34 Before termination proceedings can be initiated against a teacher for unsatisfactory performance, the teacher must be given 90 days to remedy the deficiencies under California law. If school officials have done a good job of documenting teacher deficiencies and already have gone through remediation steps with little success, the teacher may opt to resign rather than go through the trauma and pain of contesting the action. As noted in the figure, nine teachers received initial termination notices for unsatisfactory performance in the 2002-03 school year and 18 teachers received such a notice in 2003-04. Of these, most opted to resign. Of the handful who did not resign, the district followed through successfully with contract termination for all except one (the green-triangle line). The only exception is one teacher in 2004-2005 who successfully challenged the action.

Note that as with probationary teacher contract nonextensions, dismissal notices to permanent teachers for unsatisfactory performance spiked in 2003-04 when 18 received such notice. Thereafter, the number declined, reaching zero in 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11. Of those receiving such notice, most opted to resign (the red-diamond line). The others were dismissed pursuant to a formal due process hearing (the green-triangle line).

34 The other eight include (1) immoral or unprofessional conduct, (2) dishonesty, (3) evident unfitness for service, (4) physical or mental condition unfitting him or her to instruct or associate with children, (5) persistent violation of or refusal to obey school laws of the state or reasonable regulations prescribed for the government of the public schools by the State Board of Education or by the governing board of the school district employing him or her, (6) conviction of a felony or of any crime involving moral turpitude, (7) violation of Section 51530 [teaching communism] or conduct specified in section 1028 of the Government Code, and (8) alcoholism or other drug abuse which makes the employee unfit to instruct or associate with children. Of these, unprofessional conduct requires a 45-day period for the teacher to improve after receiving initial notice of contract termination. At the end of the 45 days, the district can initiate a dismissal action, following all of the due process requirements set forth in the Education Code.
As noted above and in the footnote, there are eight other reasons for permanent contract teacher termination other than unsatisfactory performance. As noted by the blue-circle line in Figure 27, no permanent teachers in the San Diego district received notice of contract termination for any of these reasons in 2002-03, in 2003-04, in 2005-06, and in 2008-09. In 2004-05, 2006-07 and 2007-08, one teacher did so each year. In 2008-09, no continuing contract teachers received termination notice for reasons other than unsatisfactory performance. In 2009-10, seven teachers did so and in 2010-11, two teachers did so. Of these, all resigned or retired before the effective date of action to terminate.