

# Forest Charter School

## School Accountability Report Card

### Reported Using Data from the 2015-16 School Year

### Published During 2016-17

By February 1 of each year, every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC). The SARC contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school. Under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) all local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to prepare a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), which describes how they intend to meet annual school-specific goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities. Additionally, data reported in an LCAP is to be consistent with data reported in the SARC.

- For more information about SARC requirements, see the California Department of Education (CDE) SARC Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/>.
- For more information about the LCFF or LCAP, see the CDE LCFF Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/>.
- For additional information about the school, parents/guardians and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.

#### **DataQuest**

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE DataQuest Web page at <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/> that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district and the county. Specifically, DataQuest is a dynamic system that provides reports for accountability (e.g., test data, enrollment, high school graduates, dropouts, course enrollments, staffing, and data regarding English learners).

#### **Internet Access**

Internet access is available at public libraries and other locations that are publicly accessible (e.g., the California State Library). Access to the Internet at libraries and public locations is generally provided on a first-come, first-served basis. Other use restrictions may include the hours of operation, the length of time that a workstation may be used (depending on availability), the types of software programs available on a workstation, and the ability to print documents.

## **About This School**

#### **Contact Information (School Year 2016-17)**

<b>School Contact Information</b>	
<b>School Name</b>	Forest Charter School
<b>Street</b>	470 Searls Ave.
<b>City, State, Zip</b>	Nevada City, CA 95959-3030
<b>Phone Number</b>	(530) 265-4823
<b>Principal</b>	Peter Andreas Sagebiel
<b>E-mail Address</b>	psagebiel@forestcharter.com
<b>Web Site</b>	www.forestcharter.com
<b>CDS Code</b>	29 10298 0126219

<b>District Contact Information</b>	
<b>District Name</b>	Nevada County Office of Education
<b>Phone Number</b>	(530) 478-6400
<b>Superintendent</b>	Holly Hermansen
<b>E-mail Address</b>	hhermansen@nevco.org
<b>Web Site</b>	www.nevco.org

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

Forest Charter School is a WASC Accredited, Certified California Charter School that is committed to nurturing the love of learning in all students through parental choice in education. By cultivating a staff of dedicated personnel, Forest Charter School pledges an ongoing and expansive environment of educational excellence. The cornerstone of our Personalized Learning Program is positive collaboration on the part of participating students, parents, and professional educators. The ultimate mission of Forest Charter School is to honor the student's learning style through parental options in the selection and implementation of effective curriculum to prepare him/her for success in the 21st Century.

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

<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>
Kindergarten	31
Grade 1	27
Grade 2	27
Grade 3	33
Grade 4	36
Grade 5	36
Grade 6	49
Grade 7	54
Grade 8	62
Grade 9	67
Grade 10	58
Grade 11	93
Grade 12	123
<b>Total Enrollment</b>	<b>696</b>

### Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2015-16)

Student Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	0.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2
Asian	1.3
Filipino	0
Hispanic or Latino	7.5
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.6
White	88.4
Two or More Races	0
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	42.8
English Learners	0.3
Students with Disabilities	10.6
Foster Youth	0

## A. Conditions of Learning

### State Priority: Basic

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Basic State Priority (Priority 1):

- Degree to which teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject area and for the pupils they are teaching;
- Pupils have access to standards-aligned instructional materials; and
- School facilities are maintained in good repair.

### Teacher Credentials

Teachers	School			District
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2016-17
With Full Credential	37	37.8	37.8	N/A
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence (with full credential)	0	0	0	

### Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

Indicator	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments *	0	0	0
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 2015-16)**

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
<b>This School</b>	96.5	3.5
<b>All Schools in District</b>	76.8	23.2
<b>High-Poverty Schools in District</b>	76.8	23.2
<b>Low-Poverty Schools in District</b>	0.0	0.0

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

**Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2016-17)**

**Year and month in which data were collected:** 12/16

Forest Charter is an Independent Study school that uses many different curriculum's. Due to this fact Forest Charter does not use specific textbooks for all disciplines. A student has access to many different choices of textbooks for each discipline.

Subject	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>	N/A		0%
<b>Mathematics</b>	N/A		0%
<b>Science</b>	N/A		0%
<b>History-Social Science</b>	N/A		0%
<b>Foreign Language</b>	N/A		0%
<b>Health</b>	N/A		0%
<b>Visual and Performing Arts</b>	N/A		0%
<b>Science Laboratory Equipment (grades 9-12)</b>	N/A		0%

**School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)**

Future repairs are to be determined by the Nevada City School District. The Nevada City School District can be contacted at 530-273-7736

Science and adjacent room portable received overhaul. Rooms received new sub flooring, carpets, tiles, paint, cabinets, chairs and tables.

Alarm system was upgraded in the Computer lab and main office.

Fire Alarm control panel was replaced.

Sequoia room was painted.

Sequoia and Cedar room received new chairs and tables.

### School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)				
Year and month of the most recent FIT report: 12/16				
System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
<b>Systems:</b> Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	X			Heaters worked on in numerous classes
<b>Interior:</b> Interior Surfaces	X			General wear and tear in MPR/Gym
<b>Cleanliness:</b> Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	X			Pest control excellent from yearly inspection.
<b>Electrical:</b> Electrical	X			No issues
<b>Restrooms/Fountains:</b> Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains		X		Good overall, outside drinking fountains turned off for winter time.
<b>Safety:</b> Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	X			Extinguishers up to date, science room updated for maximum safety.
<b>Structural:</b> Structural Damage, Roofs	X			Roofs replaced Summer of 15
<b>External:</b> Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	X			Old water damaged windows replaced in some classrooms.

### Overall Facility Rating (Most Recent Year)

Year and month of the most recent FIT report: 12/16				
Overall Rating	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
			X	

## B. Pupil Outcomes

### State Priority: Pupil Achievement

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

- **Statewide assessments** (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress [CAASPP] System, which includes the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for students in the general education population and the California Alternate Assessments [CAAs] for English language arts/literacy [ELA] and mathematics given in grades three through eight and grade eleven. The CAAs have replaced the California Alternate Performance Assessment [CAPA] for ELA and mathematics, which were eliminated in 2015. Only eligible students may participate in the administration of the CAAs. CAA items are aligned with alternate achievement standards, which are linked with the Common Core State Standards [CCSS] for students with significant cognitive disabilities); and
- The percentage of students who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and the California State University, or career technical education sequences or programs of study

### CAASPP Test Results in English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA) and Mathematics for All Students

Subject	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standards (grades 3-8 and 11)					
	School		District		State	
	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16
<b>English Language Arts/Literacy</b>	43	49	42	44	44	48
<b>Mathematics</b>	27	33	26	29	34	36

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

**CAASPP Test Results in ELA by Student Group  
Grades Three through Eight and Grade Eleven (School Year 2015-16)**

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
<b>All Students</b>	<b>3</b>	36	30	83.3	48.3
	<b>4</b>	43	34	79.1	36.4
	<b>5</b>	45	38	84.4	41.7
	<b>6</b>	54	49	90.7	37.0
	<b>7</b>	64	52	81.3	57.7
	<b>8</b>	70	57	81.4	51.8
	<b>11</b>	105	91	86.7	54.5
<b>Male</b>	<b>3</b>	12	10	83.3	30.0
	<b>4</b>	22	19	86.4	22.2
	<b>5</b>	24	20	83.3	33.3
	<b>6</b>	32	29	90.6	34.6
	<b>7</b>	22	17	77.3	35.3
	<b>8</b>	39	34	87.2	47.1
	<b>11</b>	53	46	86.8	50.0
<b>Female</b>	<b>3</b>	24	20	83.3	57.9
	<b>4</b>	21	15	71.4	53.3
	<b>5</b>	21	18	85.7	50.0
	<b>6</b>	22	20	90.9	40.0
	<b>7</b>	42	35	83.3	68.6
	<b>8</b>	31	23	74.2	59.1
	<b>11</b>	52	45	86.5	59.1
<b>White</b>	<b>3</b>	30	24	80.0	56.5
	<b>4</b>	36	30	83.3	37.9
	<b>5</b>	36	30	83.3	50.0
	<b>6</b>	46	42	91.3	41.0
	<b>7</b>	58	46	79.3	56.5
	<b>8</b>	61	50	82.0	55.1
	<b>11</b>	93	84	90.3	50.6
<b>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</b>	<b>3</b>	14	12	85.7	36.4
	<b>4</b>	24	18	75.0	38.9
	<b>5</b>	20	16	80.0	35.7
	<b>6</b>	11	11	100.0	33.3
	<b>7</b>	19	15	79.0	40.0
	<b>8</b>	22	19	86.4	33.3
	<b>11</b>	52	42	80.8	50.0

Note: ELA test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The "Percent Met or Exceeded" is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Note: The number of students tested includes all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using only students who received scores.

**CAASPP Test Results in Mathematics by Student Group  
Grades Three through Eight and Grade Eleven (School Year 2015-16)**

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
<b>All Students</b>	<b>3</b>	36	31	86.1	40.0
	<b>4</b>	43	33	76.7	21.9
	<b>5</b>	45	37	82.2	40.5
	<b>6</b>	54	47	87.0	23.4
	<b>7</b>	64	52	81.3	51.9
	<b>8</b>	64	52	81.3	51.9
	<b>11</b>	105	90	85.7	25.6
<b>Male</b>	<b>3</b>	12	10	83.3	50.0
	<b>4</b>	22	18	81.8	17.6
	<b>5</b>	24	19	79.2	36.8
	<b>6</b>	32	27	84.4	33.3
	<b>7</b>	22	17	77.3	35.3
	<b>8</b>	22	17	77.3	35.3
	<b>11</b>	53	45	84.9	26.7
<b>Female</b>	<b>3</b>	24	21	87.5	35.0
	<b>4</b>	21	15	71.4	26.7
	<b>5</b>	21	18	85.7	44.4
	<b>6</b>	22	20	90.9	10.0
	<b>7</b>	42	35	83.3	60.0
	<b>8</b>	42	35	83.3	60.0
	<b>11</b>	52	45	86.5	24.4
<b>White</b>	<b>3</b>	30	25	83.3	45.8
	<b>4</b>	36	29	80.6	20.7
	<b>5</b>	36	29	80.6	48.3
	<b>6</b>	46	40	87.0	27.5
	<b>7</b>	58	46	79.3	52.2
	<b>8</b>	58	46	79.3	52.2
	<b>11</b>	93	83	89.3	24.1
<b>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</b>	<b>3</b>	14	12	85.7	18.2
	<b>4</b>	24	18	75.0	23.5
	<b>5</b>	20	15	75.0	26.7
	<b>6</b>	11	10	90.9	20.0
	<b>7</b>	19	15	79.0	33.3

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
	8	19	15	79.0	33.3
	11	52	41	78.8	17.1

Note: Mathematics test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The "Percent Met or Exceeded" is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Note: The number of students tested includes all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using only students who received scores.

### CAASPP Test Results in Science for All Students

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
<b>Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)</b>	50	45	55	50	48	58	60	56	54

Note: Science test results include California Standards Tests (CSTs), California Modified Assessment (CMA), and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) in grades five, eight, and ten.

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

### CAASPP Test Results in Science by Student Group Grades Five, Eight, and Ten (School Year 2015-16)

Student Group	Total Enrollment	# of Students with Valid Scores	% of Students with Valid Scores	% of Students Proficient or Advanced
<b>All Students</b>	178	137	77.0	55.5
<b>Male</b>	101	79	78.2	54.4
<b>Female</b>	77	58	75.3	56.9
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	13	10	76.9	30.0
<b>White</b>	154	118	76.6	59.3
<b>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</b>	71	52	73.2	46.2
<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	22	17	77.3	23.5

Note: Science test results include CSTs, CMA, and CAPA in grades five, eight, and ten. The "Proficient or Advanced" is calculated by taking the total number of students who scored at Proficient or Advanced on the science assessment divided by the total number of students with valid scores.

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

### Career Technical Education Programs (School Year 2015-16)

Forest Charter School does not provide Career Technical Programs but does work with ROP.



### Career Technical Education Participation (School Year 2015-16)

Measure	CTE Program Participation
Number of pupils participating in CTE	1
% of pupils completing a CTE program and earning a high school diploma	100%
% of CTE courses sequenced or articulated between the school and institutions of postsecondary education	100%

### Courses for University of California (UC) and/or California State University (CSU) Admission

UC/CSU Course Measure	Percent
2015-16 Pupils Enrolled in Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission	49.79
2014-15 Graduates Who Completed All Courses Required for UC/CSU Admission	35.2

### State Priority: Other Pupil Outcomes

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

- Pupil outcomes in the subject areas of physical education.

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

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards
5	10.5	15.8	63.2
7	20.5	20.5	48.7
9	7.9	34.2	28.9

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

## C. Engagement

### State Priority: Parental Involvement

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

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

### Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2016-17)

The cornerstone of Forest's Personalized Learning Program is a positive collaboration on the part of participating students, parents, and professional educators. The nature of this collaboration engages parents as partners in the education of their children. Indeed, many parents enroll in Forest's program because they could provide their children an education that allowed them to integrate activities they would not have time for in a traditional school schedule. The collaborative nature of the relationship with parents i.e., parents as partners, affords numerous opportunities for parental involvement.

Parents have the opportunity to create life-long goals and support passions in their children that will fundamentally assist them in realizing future aspirations. Each student is addressed as an individual with unique gifts and talents. An individualized learning plan is set up by a team consisting of the student, their parents, and a Supervising Teacher to best insure the success of that particular student. The student, parent, and Supervising Teacher meet a minimum of once a month to ensure that the learning plan is on track and effective. In addition, the Career and College Planning office offers parents and students advice and access to resources to help students and their families in deciding or directing their post-secondary aspirations.

The governance structure of Forest Charter School also provides parents with an opportunity for involvement. The Charter Council consists of nine voting members: five parents with enrolled children, two certificated staff members, one high school student, and one member of the community. Parent members are elected to a two-year term by the school parent population, with one vote per family.

## State Priority: Pupil Engagement

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

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

**Dropout Rate and Graduation Rate (Four-Year Cohort Rate) \*School Graduation Rate here includes all County sponsored Charter Schools. The Forest Charter Graduation rate for the 14/15 school year was 90% and for the 15/16 school year was 93.2%.**

Indicator	School			District			State		
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Dropout Rate	32.80	32.80	36.40	32.80	32.80	36.40	11.40	11.50	10.70
Graduation Rate	49.39	46.02	46.93	49.39	46.02	46.93	80.44	80.95	82.27

## Completion of High School Graduation Requirements - Graduating Class of 2015 (One-Year Rate)

Group	Graduating Class of 2015		
	School	District	State
All Students	99	52	86
Black or African American	100	46	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	100	36	78
Asian	0	100	93
Filipino	0	67	93
Hispanic or Latino	80	46	83
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	38	85
White	100	80	91
Two or More Races	0	41	89
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	86	100	66
English Learners	0	32	54
Students with Disabilities	98	47	78

## State Priority: School Climate

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

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

### Suspensions and Expulsions

Rate	School			District			State		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Suspensions	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.7	0.7	4.4	3.8	3.7
Expulsions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1

### School Safety Plan (School Year 2016-17)

Forest Charter annually reviews and updates the safety plan. FCS safety plan is divided into three parts based on our three different learning centers. The main function of the safety plan is to spell out how we deal with fire and lock-down procedures. August 2016 was the last update including new evacuation and safety maps.

The school safety plan can be viewed at the Nevada City offices upon request.

## D. Other SARC Information

The information in this section is required to be in the SARC but is not included in the state priorities for LCFF.

### Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2016-17)

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status		In PI
First Year of Program Improvement		2011-2012
Year in Program Improvement*		Year 3
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	1
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	33.3

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

### Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)

Grade Level	2013-14			2014-15			2015-16					
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes		
		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+

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

### Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)

Subject	2013-14			2014-15			2015-16					
	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	3	120			4	113			4	113		
Mathematics	4	79			5	81			5	81		
Science	5	49			6	38	1		6	38	1	
Social Science	4	95	3		4	107	3		4	107	3	

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 2015-16)

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor	1.3	25
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	0	N/A
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	1.0	N/A
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0	N/A
Psychologist	1.6	N/A
Social Worker	0	N/A
Nurse	.1	N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	.8	N/A
Resource Specialist	2.55	N/A
Other	0	N/A

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

\*One Full Time Equivalent (FTE) equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time.

**Expenditures per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2014-15)**

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Supplemental/ Restricted	Basic/ Unrestricted	
School Site	\$9,171	N/A	N/A	\$62,549.23
District	N/A	N/A		
Percent Difference: School Site and District	N/A	N/A		
State	N/A	N/A	\$5,677	
Percent Difference: School Site and State	N/A	N/A		

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

**Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2015-16)**

N/A

**Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2014-15)**

Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary		
Mid-Range Teacher Salary		
Highest Teacher Salary		
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)		
Average Principal Salary (Middle)		
Average Principal Salary (High)		
Superintendent Salary		
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries		
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries		

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

**Advanced Placement (AP) Courses (School Year 2015-16)**

Subject	Number of AP Courses Offered*	Percent of Students In AP Courses
Computer Science		N/A
English	1	N/A
Fine and Performing Arts		N/A
Foreign Language		N/A
Mathematics	2	N/A
Science	1	N/A
Social Science	1	N/A
All courses	5	.1

Cells with N/A values do not require data.

\*Where there are student course enrollments of at least one student.

**Professional Development (Most Recent Three Years)**

Each year Forest Charter School provides three days for staff development for the whole staff. Individual staff members get other opportunities for staff development based on their discipline and available funds.