



Richard Henry Dana School

School Accountability Report Card, 2007–2008

Wiseburn Elementary School District

» An annual report to the community about teaching, learning, test results, resources, and measures of progress in our school.

Richard Henry Dana School

School Accountability Report Card, 2007–2008
Wiseburn Elementary School District

This School Accountability Report Card (SARC) provides information that can be used to evaluate and compare schools. State and federal laws require all schools to publish a SARC each year.

The information in this report represents the 2007–2008 school year, not the current school year. In most cases, this is the most recent data available. We present our school's results next to those of the average middle school in the county and state to provide the most meaningful and fair comparisons. To find additional facts about our school online, please use the [DataQuest](#) tool offered by the California Department of Education.

If you are reading a printed version of this report, note that words that appear in a smaller, bold typeface are links in the online version of this report to even more information. You can find a master list of those linked words, and the Web page addresses they are connected to, at:

http://www.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links_2008_en.html

Reports about other schools are available on the [California Department of Education Web site](#). Internet access is available in local libraries.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact the school office.

How to Contact Our School

5504 W. 135 Street
Hawthorne, CA 90250
Principal: Aileen Harbeck
Phone: (310) 725-4700

How to Contact Our District

13530 Aviation Blvd.
Hawthorne, CA 90250
Phone: (310) 643-3025
<http://www.wiseburn.k12.ca.us>



» Contents

ONLINE USERS: CLICK ON A TITLE TO JUMP TO THAT SECTION

Principal's Message
Measures of Progress
Student Achievement
Students
Climate for Learning
Leadership, Teachers, and Staff
Resources
School Expenditures
Adequacy of Key Resources
Data Almanac



Published by
SCHOOL WISE PRESS
385 Ashton Ave., Ste. 200
San Francisco, CA 94112
Phone: (415) 337-7971
www.schoolwisepress.com

©2008 Publishing 20/20

Richard Henry Dana School

School Accountability Report Card, 2007–2008
Wiseburn Elementary School District

» Principal's Message

At Dana Middle School, we are working very hard to prepare our students for the world they will soon inherit. From early in the morning until very late in the afternoon, Dana is a hub of opportunity and activity. Our diverse school culture reflects a vitality, an enthusiasm, and a commitment that all students can and will be successful. Student success and safety are always our top priorities. The Dana community of professionals reflects an unparalleled work ethic. Our staff is continuously striving to ensure the success of all students, as evidenced by the numerous staff members who are on our campus well into the evening collaborating with colleagues or planning lessons. Approximately ten percent of our teachers are experienced high school teachers, and 100 percent of our teachers hold valid California teaching credentials.

Aileen Harbeck, PRINCIPAL

Grade range and calendar

6–8

TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index

785

County Average: 731
State Average: 747

Student enrollment

822

County Average: 977
State Average: 662

Teachers

34

County Average: 43
State Average: 30

Students per teacher

24

County Average: 23
State Average: 22

Students per computer

7

County Average: 4
State Average: 4

Major Achievements

- Dana Middle School was named a California Distinguished School during the 2000–2001 school year and again in April of 2005. This designation is valid for four academic years.
- In 2006 Dana Middle School was named a School to Watch, one of 88 middle schools in the United States. More than just a recognition program, Schools to Watch is an opportunity to be connected with other high-achieving schools where the community believes that “even if you are on the right track, you’ll get run over if you just sit there.” (Will Rogers).
- After winning first and second place at regional competitions in Odyssey of the Mind, our team went to the state finals. The first Dana Lego Robotics Team received several second and third place awards in their local qualifying tournament.
- Thirteen Dana students were invited to submit their projects for the 2007 LA County Science Fair. One of our students received an impressive first place award in physics, as well as first and second place awards for his work in aerodynamics/hydrodynamics at the 2007 California State Science Fair.
- The Dana MATE team (Marine Advanced Technology Education) was honored with the Guts and Glory Award at the 2008 Southern California Regional Flyoff. Dana students also participated in the 2008 Aerospace Corporation Herndon Competition.
- In the DTASC Fall Festival 2007 we won the following awards: First Place/Division A for Technical Theatre Graphics/Publicity, Technical Theatre Set/Lights, and Technical Theatre Costume/Makeup. We won Fourth Place/Division A for Large Group Comedy and Honorable Mention/Division A for Student Adaptation of Children Literature.
- In the DTASC Shakespeare Festival 2007 we won the following awards: 2007 Shakespeare Wise Fools First Place/Division A and Fourth Place/Division B; Technical Theatre Sets/Lights/Graphics First Place/Division A; DIVA Sweepstakes Fourth Place; Audition Monologue First Place/Division B; Lovers: For Better or Worse Division A Honorable Mention. In the Sweepstakes/Division B we received Honorable Mention; Absurdist Playwrights Honorable Mention; Cross-Gender Shakespeare Honorable Mention. In Sweepstakes/Division A we received Cross Audition Monologue Honorable Mention; Character Costume Honorable Mention; Richard III Honorable Mention; Plays using Myths, Parables, or Folktales Honorable Mention; Large Group Drama Honorable Mention; and Sweepstakes Honorable Mention.

Focus for Improvement

- Our new school building has enabled us to offer more courses and programs for students, provide more training for our staff, and expand our services to families. We want to increase our students’ awareness of their learning and potential, and to increase professional sharing and parent/community interest in Dana Middle School. The results we are looking for include student academic success, a decrease in student performance reviews and disciplinary actions, an increase in parent satisfaction with students’ learning, and an increase in community interest and support via volunteerism and donations.
- We plan to increase learning by growing the Advancement Via Individual Development (AVID) program campuswide, by further developing our Targeted Learning in Content (TLC) program, and by expanding intervention programs in math and language arts skill development.
- We will continue to emphasize access to technology using open source software, online learning opportunities, and our e-mentoring program. Learning alliances with local universities, aerospace corporations, and local businesses will provide students with technology, mentoring, and tutoring, and connect Dana Middle School with aspiring educators.
- We are presently partnering with the Richstone Center to offer family counseling services and health services to Dana families and community members. Through grants and fund-raising, we have developed partnerships with community members and local businesses.

- MyAccess, an interactive online writing program, is available to all students at DMS through various curricular areas. Students can brainstorm, write, revise, and submit papers online and receive immediate feedback on how to improve their writing. This new tool has been an exciting addition to our school-wide emphasis on writing.
- Parents and students are able to access grades, teacher comments, and information on class assignments online through PowerSchool using confidential password information provided to all families. This Web-based student-information system is designed to connect home with school and provide parents and students with an email link to communicate with teachers from home.
- We have new opportunities to assess and place students in appropriate math classes and to analyze test scores using Datawise software. Through Datawise, teachers examine student test data and tailor instruction for each student. It has become the catalyst for important schoolwide conversations about goal-setting and classroom instruction. Students use Datawise to take assessments online in our new computer labs. Results from these assessments are available immediately and provide teachers and students with helpful information about academic strengths and areas for improvement.

MEASURES OF PROGRESS

Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is California’s way of comparing schools based on student test scores. The index was created in 1999 to help parents and educators recognize schools that show progress and identify schools that need help. A school’s API determines whether it receives recognition or sanctions. It is also used to compare schools in a statewide ranking system. The California Department of Education (CDE) calculates a school’s API using student test results from the California Standards Tests, the California Achievement Test, and, for high schools, the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE). APIs range from 200 to 1000. The CDE expects all schools to eventually obtain APIs of at least 800. [Additional information on the API](#) can be found on the CDE Web site.

CALIFORNIA API ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
Met schoolwide growth target	Yes
Met growth target for prior school year	No
API score	785
Growth attained from prior year	+20
Met subgroup* growth targets	No
Underperforming school	No

Dana’s API was 785 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 20 points compared to last year’s API. All students took the test. You can find three years of detailed API results in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.


API RANKINGS: Based on our 2006–2007 test results, we started the 2007–2008 school year with an API base score of 765. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared to all middle schools in California, our school ranked 7 out of 10.

SIMILAR SCHOOL RANKINGS: We also received a second ranking that compared us to the 100 schools with the most similar students, teachers, and class sizes. Compared to these schools, our school ranked 8 out of 10. The CDE recalculates this factor every year. To read more about the specific elements included in this calculation, refer to the [CDE Web site](#).

API GROWTH TARGETS: Each year the CDE sets specific API “growth targets” for every school. It assigns one growth target for the entire school, and it sets additional targets for ethnic groups, English Learners, special education students, or socioeconomic subgroups of students that make up a significant portion of the student body. Schools are required to meet all of their growth targets. If they do, they may be eligible to apply for awards through the California School Recognition Program and the Title I Achieving Schools Program.

We did not meet some or all of our assigned growth targets during the 2007–2008 school year. Just for reference, 49 percent of middle schools statewide met their growth targets.

API, Spring 2008



SOURCE: API based on spring 2008 test cycle. State average represents middle schools only.
NOTE: Only groups of students that represent at least 15 percent of total enrollment are calculated and displayed as student subgroups.

Adequate Yearly Progress

In addition to California’s accountability system, which measures student achievement using the API, schools must also meet requirements set by the federal education law known as **No Child Left Behind** (NCLB). This law requires all schools to meet a different goal: **Adequate Yearly Progress** (AYP).

We met 22 out of 25 criteria for yearly progress. Because we fell short in three areas, we did not make AYP.

To meet AYP, middle schools must meet three criteria. First, a certain percentage of students must score at or above Proficient levels on the California Standards Tests (CST): 35.2 percent on the English/language arts test and 37 percent on the math test. All ethnic and socioeconomic subgroups of students also must meet these goals. Second, the schools must achieve an API of at least 620 or increase the API by one point from the prior year. Third, 95 percent of the student body must take the required standardized tests.

If even one subgroup of students fails to meet just one of the criteria, the school fails to meet AYP. While all schools must report their progress toward meeting AYP, only schools that receive federal funding to help economically disadvantaged students are actually penalized if they fail to meet AYP goals. Schools that do not make AYP for two or more years in a row in the same subject enter **Program Improvement** (PI). They must offer students transfers to other schools in the district and, in their second year in PI, tutoring services as well.

FEDERAL AYP ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS	
Met AYP	No
Met schoolwide participation rate	Yes
Met schoolwide test score goals	Yes
Met subgroup* participation rate	Yes
Met subgroup* test score goals	No
Met schoolwide API for AYP	Yes
Program Improvement school in 2008	No

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of November 2008. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students’ test results in the 2007–2008 school year or earlier.

*Ethnic groups, English Learners, special ed students, or socioeconomic groups of students that make up 15 percent or more of a school’s student body. These groups must meet AYP and API goals. R/P - Results pending due to challenge by school. N/A - Results not available.

Adequate Yearly Progress, Detail by Subgroup

● MET GOAL ● DID NOT MEET GOAL — NOT ENOUGH STUDENTS

	English/Language Arts		Math	
	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST?	DID 35.2% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST?	DID 37% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST?
SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS	●	●	●	●
SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS				
Low income	●	●	●	●
Students learning English	●	●	●	●
STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY				
African American	●	●	●	●
Hispanic/Latino	●	●	●	●
White/Other	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of November 2008, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2007–2008 school year. The green dots represent goals we met; red dots indicate goals we missed. Just one red dot means that we failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress.

Note: Dashes indicate that too few students were in the category to draw meaningful conclusions. Federal law requires valid test scores from at least 50 students for statistical significance.


STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Here you'll find a three-year summary of our students' scores on the California Standards Tests (CST) in selected subjects. We compare our students' test scores to the results for students in the average middle school in California. On the following pages we provide more detail for each test, including the scores for different subgroups of students. In addition, we provide links to the California Content Standards on which these tests are based. If you'd like more information about the CST, please contact our principal or our teaching staff. To find [grade-level-specific scores](#), you can refer to the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Web site. Other tests in the [STAR program](#) can be found on the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site.

California Standards Tests

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

■ FAR BELOW BASIC ■ BELOW BASIC ■ BASIC ■ PROFICIENT ■ ADVANCED



SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2008 test cycle. State average represents middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.

Frequently Asked Questions About Standardized Tests

WHERE CAN I FIND GRADE-LEVEL REPORTS? Due to space constraints and concern for statistical reliability, we have omitted grade-level detail from these test results. Instead we present results at the schoolwide level. You can view the results of far more students than any one grade level would contain, which also improves their statistical reliability. Grade-level results are online on the [STAR Web site](#). More information about student test scores is available in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

WHAT DO THE FIVE PROFICIENCY BANDS MEAN? Test experts assign students to one of these five proficiency levels, based on the number of questions they answer correctly. Our immediate goal is to help students move up one level. Our eventual goal is to enable all students to reach either of the top two bands, Advanced or Proficient. Those who score in the middle band, Basic, have come close to attaining the required knowledge and skills. Those who score in either of the bottom two bands, Below Basic or Far Below Basic, need more help to reach the Proficient level.

WHY ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS (CST) AND THE CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST (CAT/6) SCORED DIFFERENTLY? When students take the CST, they can score at any of the proficiency levels: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, or Far Below Basic. In theory all students in California could score at the top. The CAT/6 is a nationally normed test, which means that students are scored against each other nationally. This scoring method is similar to grading “on the curve.” CAT/6 scores are expressed as a ranking on a scale from 1 to 99.

HOW HARD ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS? Experts consider California’s standards to be among the most clear and rigorous in the country. Just 47 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 56 percent scored Proficient or Advanced in math. You can review the [California Content Standards](#) on the CDE Web site.

ARE ALL STUDENTS’ SCORES INCLUDED? No. Only students in grades two through eleven are required to take the CST. When fewer than 11 students in one grade or subgroup take a test, state officials remove their scores from the report. They omit them to protect students’ privacy, as called for by federal law.

CAN I REVIEW SAMPLE TEST QUESTIONS? Sample test questions for the CST are on the [CDE’s Web site](#). These are actual questions used in previous years.

WHERE CAN I FIND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION? The CDE has a wealth of resources on its Web site. The STAR Web site publishes detailed reports for schools and districts, and assistance packets for parents and teachers. This site includes explanations of [technical terms](#), scoring methods, and the [subjects](#) covered by the tests for each grade. You’ll also find a [guide](#) to navigating the STAR Web site as well as help for understanding how to [compare test scores](#).

English/Language Arts (Reading and Writing)

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

FAR BELOW BASIC **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			61%	99%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 14 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			42%	99%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			47%	98%	

Subgroup Test Scores

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):


FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			52%	396	GENDER: About 18 percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			70%	396	
English proficient			62%	767	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	25	
Low income			57%	357	INCOME: About six percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			63%	435	
Learning disabled			15%	65	LEARNING DISABILITIES: Students classified as learning disabled scored lower than students without learning disabilities. The CST is not designed to test the progress of students with moderate to severe learning differences.
Not learning disabled			64%	727	
African American			66%	160	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Asian American			75%	30	
Hispanic/Latino			57%	427	
White/Other			64%	129	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

The graph to the right shows how our students’ scores have changed over the years. We present each year’s results in a vertical bar, with students’ scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

You can read the California standards for **English/language arts** on the CDE’s Web site.



Math (Excluding Algebra)

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

FAR BELOW BASIC **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			36%	80%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About six percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			37%	79%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			42%	78%	

Subgroup Test Scores

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			35%	318	GENDER: About the same percentage of boys and girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			36%	320	
English proficient			36%	613	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	25	
Low income			32%	301	INCOME: About seven percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			39%	337	
Learning disabled			7%	60	LEARNING DISABILITIES: Students classified as learning disabled scored lower than students without learning disabilities. The CST is not designed to test the progress of students with moderate to severe learning differences.
Not learning disabled			38%	578	
African American			41%	133	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Asian American	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	19	
Hispanic/Latino			32%	343	
White/Other			35%	107	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.

N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.


N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

All sixth and most seventh graders take the same math courses. Starting as early as seventh grade, however, some students take algebra, while others take a general math course. We report algebra results separately. Here we present our students' scores for all math courses except algebra.

The graph to the right shows how our students' scores have changed over the years. We present each year's results in a vertical bar, with students' scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

You can read the [math standards](#) on the CDE's Web site.

Three-Year Trend: Math



SOURCE: CDE STAR research file: 2006, 2007, and 2008.

Algebra I

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

FAR BELOW BASIC **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			27%	28%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 15 percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California. About one percent fewer students took algebra than did students in the average middle school in the state.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			37%	29%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			42%	29%	

Subgroup Test Scores

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			25%	69	GENDER: About three percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			28%	74	
English proficient			27%	143	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	N/A	
Low income			22%	55	INCOME: About eight percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			30%	88	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	3	LEARNING DISABILITIES: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled			26%	140	
African American	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	26	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Hispanic/Latino			24%	80	
White/Other	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	19	


SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

We report our students’ algebra results separately because of the central importance of algebra in the California math standards. It is also a gateway course for college-bound students, who should start high school ready for geometry.

The graph to the right shows how our students’ scores have changed over the years. We present each year’s results in a vertical bar, with students’ scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

About 28 percent of our students took the algebra CST, compared to 29 percent of all middle school students statewide. You can review the **algebra** standards on the CDE’s Web site.

Three-Year Trend: Algebra I



History/Social Science

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

FAR BELOW BASIC **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			48%	98%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 11 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			33%	99%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			37%	99%	

Subgroup Test Scores

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**


GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			57%	123	GENDER: About 18 percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			39%	121	
English proficient			48%	240	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	4	
Low income			39%	110	INCOME: About 16 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			55%	134	
Learning disabled	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	22	LEARNING DISABILITIES: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled			50%	222	
African American			49%	47	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Hispanic/Latino			45%	139	
White/Other			54%	39	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

The graph to the right shows how our eighth grade students' scores have changed over the years. We present each year's results in a vertical bar, with students' scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

You can read the [history/social science standards](#) on the CDE's Web site.

Three-Year Trend: History/Social Science



Science

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

FAR BELOW BASIC **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			66%	98%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 15 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			47%	98%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			51%	98%	

Subgroup Test Scores

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**


GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			66%	123	GENDER: About two percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			64%	121	
English proficient			66%	240	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	4	
Low income			59%	110	INCOME: About 11 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			70%	134	
Learning disabled	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	22	LEARNING DISABILITIES: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled			70%	222	
African American			64%	47	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Hispanic/Latino			62%	139	
White/Other			69%	39	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

The graph to the right shows how our eighth grade students’ scores have changed over the years. We present each year’s results in a vertical bar, with students’ scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

Although we teach science at all grade levels, only our eighth graders took the California Standards Test in this subject. You can read the [science standards](#) on the CDE’s Web site.

Three-Year Trend: Science



California Achievement Test (CAT/6)

The CAT/6 differs from the CST in three ways. First, in the spring of 2008, only students in grades three and seven took this test. Second, the CAT/6 is taken by students in other states, which enables us to see how our students are doing compared to other students in the nation. Third, the CAT/6 is scored by comparing students to each other on a scale from 1 to 99, much like being graded “on the curve.” In contrast, the CST scores students against five defined criteria.

SUBJECT	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
READING				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	25%	17%	22%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	55%	42%	48%
LANGUAGE				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	31%	23%	27%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	55%	42%	47%
MATH				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	24%	22%	26%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	56%	47%	52%


SOURCE: The scores for the CAT/6 are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Therefore, our test score results may vary from other CDE test score reports when missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results.
N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.

STUDENTS SCORING ABOVE AVERAGE: This view of test scores shows the percentage of our students who scored in the top half of students nationally (at the 50th percentile and higher). At Dana, 55 percent of students scored at or above average in reading (compared to 48 percent statewide); 55 percent scored at or above average in language (compared to 47 percent statewide); and 56 percent scored at or above average in math (compared to 52 percent statewide). The subject with the most students scoring at or above average was math.

HIGH-SCORING STUDENTS: This view of test scores shows the percentage of our students who scored in the top quarter of students nationally (above the 75th percentile). At Dana, 25 percent of students scored at the top in reading (compared to 22 percent statewide); 31 percent scored at the top in language (compared to 27 percent statewide); and 24 percent scored at the top in math (compared to 26 percent statewide). The subject with the most students scoring at the top was language.

Our CAT/6 Results Compared

Students take this test only in grades three and seven. The values displayed to the right represent the percentage of our students who scored at or above average compared to their peers in the county and state.



SOURCE: Spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

Other Measures of Student Achievement

Measuring student achievement is an ongoing process that involves teachers, students, and families. Along with standardized testing, we administer common writing assessments three times a year using the MyAccess! Program. We are in the process of developing common assessments within all curricular areas using the Datawise data desegregation program. This year teachers identified student strengths and areas for improvement and set two goals based on areas of weakness. DataWise tests were then developed to assess progress toward these goals. With both programs, student results are immediately available to plan lessons that address student needs. Test and writing assessment results are available to both students and parents at parent/teacher conferences or by request.

Staff development days devoted to customized instruction have further helped our staff to set goals, develop alternate assessments in the classroom, and design curriculum to address school goals related to student areas of struggle. Quizzes, tests, project-based assessments, group assessments, informal observations, and homework all combine to provide a complete picture of each student's progress.

We have expanded the use of Accelerated Math, a math support program that identifies student math levels and assigns appropriate support for students. This program, now online, offers regular assessment, individualized plans for support, and regular updates on student improvement or difficulties. It is now an integral part of our math classes and has been adopted into Targeted Learning in Content classes and afterschool math intervention classes.

Student academic information is now available to all families online via PowerSchool. This new option of viewing grades, attendance, and teacher comments online puts parents directly in touch with student academic progress at all times and increases communication between school and home. Progress reports and report cards are sent home to families four times a year, at the end of each quarter. Teachers also provide progress reports through PowerSchool grading and reporting program as needed.

Parent conferences are scheduled twice a year, allowing for personal meetings between teachers and parents/guardians. If a student is in need of additional academic support in language arts or math, the homeroom teacher recommends the student for placement in an academic support program. This year, we will be offering student-led conferences in the spring to further involve students in their own learning and engage parents in these interactive conferences. Student Success Team meetings are held at the request of a teacher or parent and are facilitated by a school administrator with the district psychologist in attendance. At these meetings student needs and family concerns are discussed and a plan for the student's success is developed.

STUDENTS

Students’ English Language Skills

At Dana, 98 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared to 80 percent of middle school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	98%	76%	80%
English Learners	2%	24%	20%

SOURCE: Language Census for school year 2007–2008. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

Languages Spoken at Home by English Learners

Please note that this table describes the home languages of just the 15 students classified as English Learners. At Dana, the language these students most often speak at home is Spanish. In California it’s common to find English Learners in classes with students who speak English well. When you visit our classrooms, ask our teachers how they work with language differences among their students.

LANGUAGE	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Spanish	100%	90%	86%
Vietnamese	0%	1%	2%
Cantonese	0%	2%	1%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	0%	1%	1%
Korean	0%	1%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	0%	1%
All other	0%	5%	7%

SOURCE: Language Census for school year 2007–2008. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

Ethnicity

Most students at Dana identify themselves as Hispanic/Latino. In fact, there are about two times as many Hispanic/Latino students as White/European American/Other students, the second-largest ethnic group at Dana. The state of California allows citizens to choose more than one ethnic identity, or to select “multiethnic” or “decline to state.” As a consequence, the sum of all responses rarely equals 100 percent.

ETHNICITY	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
African American	19%	10%	8%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	7%	10%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	51%	62%	47%
White/European American/Other	22%	17%	34%

SOURCE: CBEDS census of October 2007. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

Family Income and Education

The [free or reduced-price meal](#) subsidy goes to students whose families earned less than \$38,203 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2007–2008 school year. At Dana, 43 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared to 52 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	43%	61%	52%
Parents with some college	69%	46%	54%
Parents with college degree	33%	25%	30%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2007–2008 school year. Parents’ education level is collected in the spring at the start of testing. Rarely do all students answer these questions. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

The parents of 69 percent of the students at Dana have attended college, and 33 percent have a college degree. This information can provide some clues to the level of literacy children bring to school. One precaution is that the students themselves provide this data when they take the battery of standardized tests each spring, so it may not be completely accurate. About 91 percent of our students provided this information.

CLIMATE FOR LEARNING

Average Class Sizes

The average class size at Dana varies from a low of 29 students to a high of 32. Our average class size schoolwide is 31 students. The average class size for middle schools in the state is 27 students. This table shows the average class sizes of our core courses compared to those of the county and state.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZES OF CORE COURSES	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English	31	26	26
History	32	29	28
Math	29	28	27
Science	32	29	28

SOURCE: CBEDS census, October 2007. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

Safety

Nothing takes priority over our students’ physical and emotional safety. Teachers regularly review the rules for safe, responsible behavior in school and on the grounds. We have a closed campus. Visitors must enter the school through the main door and sign in at the office, and students are not allowed off campus during the school day.

We revise our School Safety Plan annually. The plan includes procedures for emergencies, exit routes, and inventories of emergency supplies. The plan is updated annually and is coordinated with the District Safety Plan. We work closely with the Hawthorne Police Department and Los Angeles County Fire Department to coordinate these plans. Each classroom in the school district has a shelter-in-place box in the unlikely event students and teachers are confined to classrooms for an extended period of time. There is a well-equipped emergency supply bin at each school site in addition to the shelter-in-place boxes.

Discipline

We have a comprehensive discipline program. We recognize that discipline begins with positive rewards for appropriate behavior and with enjoyable and engaging positive activities. Several Dana Middle School staff, parents, and community members developed our Consequence Matrix, which is a fair, reasonable, measured, progressive, equitable list of positive and negative consequences. It incorporates appropriate student behavior and predictable consequences for breaking school rules and is published in our student planner. Teachers review it in Targeted Learning in Content classes

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Suspensions per 100 students			
2007–2008	11	11	20
2006–2007	8	8	20
2005–2006	6	6	18
Expulsions per 100 students			
2007–2008	0	0	0
2006–2007	0	0	1
2005–2006	0	0	0

SOURCE: Data is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file. Data represents the number of incidents reported, not the number of students involved. District and state averages represent middle schools only.

and at school welcome assemblies at the beginning of the school year. We send a copy home and ask parents to review it and return it signed by both parent(s) and child. We also teach a comprehensive curriculum on Character Education as well as the prevention of bullying and sexual harassment.

Our Safe School Plan, established in 1995, also contributes to our having a safe, clean, orderly environment. Our School Site Council monitors the plan and updates it regularly.

At times we find it necessary to suspend students who break school rules. We report only suspensions in which students are sent home for a day or longer. We do not report in-school suspensions, in which students are removed from one or more classes during a single school day. Expulsion is the most serious consequence we can impose. Expelled students are removed from the school permanently and denied the opportunity to continue learning here.

During the 2007–2008 school year, we had 89 suspension incidents. We had no incidents of expulsion. To make it easy to compare our suspensions and expulsions to those of other schools, we represent these events as a ratio (incidents per 100 students) in this report. Please note that multiple incidents may involve the same student.

Homework

The Wiseburn Schools recognize that homework contributes toward building responsibility, self-discipline, and lifelong learning habits. Teachers believe that time spent on homework directly influences students' ability to meet the district's academic standards. Homework is seen as a routine part of the student's life in Wiseburn.

Parent involvement is an integral part of homework. We support families through homework hotlines, teacher/classroom Web sites, and regular parent-teacher conferencing. Homework tips are provided through articles in parent newsletters and parent nights. Parents receive explanations of classroom curriculum design and homework at Back to School Night and through classroom communications and progress reports. All students receive school planners and school binders at the beginning of the academic year to support development of organizational skills and ownership of learning. We expect parents to review and approve their children's homework every night. We have afterschool intervention programs throughout the year for students in need.

Schedule

Block scheduling provides extended time for teachers to connect with students and to understand and appreciate individual needs and personalities. On Mondays teachers meet with all students in all periods. On Tuesdays through Fridays, three 90-minute instructional periods provide time for teacher-directed, independent, and group work. Targeted Learning in Content (TLC) period gives students extended individualized reading through Accelerated Reader online and math practice via Accelerated Math online. In addition, one day a week students review progress in classes through grade checks and a student binder review facilitated by their TLC teacher.

School begins at 8:30 a.m. and ends at 2:45 p.m. Before-school programs start at 7:30 a.m. and go until 8:15 a.m. Lunch period is 45 minutes long. Afterschool programs and activities begin at 3 p.m. and last until 4 p.m., except for our childcare program, which ends at 6 p.m. Winter break is two weeks long and Spring break one week long. We use a modified schedule Thanksgiving week.

Parent Involvement

"None of us is as smart as all of us," states Ken Blanchard. Dana encourages active participation by parents and benefits tremendously from the skills and contributions of our community. We have many ways for parents to participate in the life of our school, and we depend on parents to keep our programs running smoothly. Several times a year, we host a Principal's Coffee for each grade level to answer questions and gain input from our families. Parents join our School Site Council, which works with our administration to make financial decisions. Our PTA works with teachers to hold Jumpstart Days at the beginning of the school year. It also supports dances and celebrations, field trips, drama productions, robotics clubs, and our Math Counts program, and gives our students and staff a multitude of other opportunities. PTA hosts a variety of events and fundraisers, including our big Spooktacular Halloween carnival. We always need new volunteers! To find out more about becoming involved in our school, please call our principal, Aileen P. Harbeck, at (310) 725-4700.

LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

Leadership

Aileen P. Harbeck is the new DMS principal. She served as assistant principal for three years and as a humanities teacher for two years. Formerly a high school vice-principal for 11 years, Mrs. Harbeck has 25 years of experience in education. She has a teaching credential and master of science in education, as well as a clear California administrative credential. Mrs. Harbeck serves as a member of the California Middle Grade Partnership as a regional coordinator, is a member of the Association of California School Administrators/California Professional Educators Association, participates in visitation teams for the National Schools to Watch program, and has presented at CLMS conferences.

Many members of our school and community support our schoolwide decision-making process. The School Leadership team leads our schoolwide strategic planning process. Students, school staff, community members, and parents make up our School Site Council, which sets priorities for our budget. Student Leadership supports student decisions, and the Principal's Advisory Council supports the school administration in understanding student needs and concerns. Teachers belong to curricular/departamental and grade-level teams and to various committees.

Teacher Experience and Education

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Teaching experience	Average years of teaching experience	15	11	12
Newer teachers	Percentage of teachers with one or two years of teaching experience	18%	16%	15%
Teachers holding an MA degree or higher	Percentage of teachers with a master's degree or higher from a graduate school	47%	39%	35%
Teachers holding a BA degree alone	Percentage of teachers whose highest degree is a bachelor's degree from a four-year college	53%	61%	65%

SOURCE: Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF), October 2007, completed by teachers during the CBED5 census. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

About 18 percent of our teachers have fewer than three years of teaching experience, which is above the average for new teachers in other middle schools in California. Our teachers have, on average, 15 years of experience. About 53 percent of our teachers hold only a bachelor's degree from a four-year college or university. About 47 percent have completed a master's degree or higher.

Credentials Held by Our Teachers

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Fully credentialed teachers	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	100%	90%	93%
Trainee credential holders	Percentage of staff holding an internship credential	0%	7%	5%
Emergency permit holders	Percentage of staff holding an emergency permit	0%	8%	4%
Teachers with waivers	Lowest level of accreditation, used by districts when they have no other option	0%	0%	0%

SOURCE: PAIF, October 2007. This is completed by teachers during the CBEDS census. County and state averages represent middle schools only. A teacher may have earned more than one credential. For this reason, it is likely that the sum of all credentials will exceed 100 percent.

All of the faculty at Dana hold a full credential. This number is higher than the average for all middle schools in the state. None of the faculty at Dana holds a trainee credential, which is reserved for those teachers who are in the process of completing their teacher training. In comparison, five percent of middle school teachers throughout the state hold trainee credentials. None of our faculty holds an emergency permit. Very few middle school teachers hold this authorization statewide (just four percent). All of the faculty at Dana hold the secondary (single-subject) credential. This number is above the average for middle schools in California, which is 82 percent. You can find three years of data about teachers’ credentials in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

Indicators of Teachers Who May Be Underprepared

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Core courses taught by a teacher not meeting NCLB standards	Percentage of core courses not taught by a “highly qualified” teacher according to federal standards in NCLB	0%	N/A	0%
Out-of-field teaching	Percentage of algebra and science courses taught by a teacher who lacks the appropriate credential for the course	18%	35%	35%
Teachers lacking a full credential	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	0%	10%	7%

SOURCE: Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF) of October 2007. Data on NCLB standards is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file.

“HIGHLY QUALIFIED” TEACHERS: The federal law known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requires districts to report the number of teachers considered to be “highly qualified.” These “highly qualified” teachers must have a full credential, a bachelor’s degree, and, if they are teaching a core subject (such as reading, math, science, or social studies), they must also demonstrate expertise in that field. The table above shows the percentage of core courses taught by teachers who are considered to be less than “highly qualified.” There are exceptions, known as the **High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE)** rules, that allow some veteran teachers to meet the “highly qualified” test who wouldn’t otherwise do so.

TEACHING OUT OF FIELD: When a teacher lacks a subject area authorization for a course she is teaching, that course is counted as an **out-of-field** section. The students who take that course are also counted. For example, if an unexpected vacancy in a biology class occurs, and a teacher who normally teaches English literature (and who lacks a subject area authorization in science) fills in to teach for the rest of the year, that teacher would be teaching out of field. See the detail for algebra and science in the Out-of-Field Teaching table. About 18 percent of our core courses were taught by teachers who were teaching out of their field of expertise, compared to 35 percent of core courses taught by such middle school teachers statewide.

CREDENTIAL STATUS OF TEACHERS: Teachers who lack full credentials are working under the terms of an emergency permit, an internship credential, or a waiver. They should be working toward their credential, and they are allowed to teach in the meantime only if the school board approves. None of our teachers was working without full credentials, compared to seven percent of teachers in middle schools statewide.

Out-of-Field Teaching, Detail by Selected Subject Areas

CORE COURSE	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Algebra	Percentage of algebra courses taught by a teacher lacking the appropriate subject area authorization	0%	24%	26%
Science	Percentage of science courses taught by a teacher lacking the appropriate subject area authorization	30%	41%	40%

SOURCE: PAIF, October 2007. This is completed by teachers during the CBEDS census. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

In this more detailed analysis, you’ll find the percentage of algebra courses taught by teachers who lack subject-area authorization in math. While algebra teachers in some middle schools might not formally be required to hold this math subject-area authorization, it is better if they do. We have applied the same criteria to science courses taught at all middle school grade levels. Note that school board policy determines which grade levels are secondary grade levels and require teachers to hold a secondary (single-subject) credential, and which are primary grade levels requiring an elementary (multiple-subject) credential.

More facts about our teachers, called for by the recent Williams legislation of 2004, are available on our Accountability Web page, which is accessible from our district Web site. You will find specific facts about [misassigned teachers](#) and [teacher vacancies](#) in the 2008–2009 school year.

Districtwide Distribution of Teachers Who Are Not “Highly Qualified”

Here, we report the percentage of core courses in our district whose teachers are considered to be less than “highly qualified” by NCLB’s standards. We show how these teachers are distributed among schools according to the percentage of low-income students enrolled.

The CDE has divided schools in the state into four groups (quartiles), based on the percentage of families who qualify and apply for free or reduced-price

DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN STATE
Districtwide	Percentage of core courses not taught by “highly qualified” teachers (HQT)	0%	8%
Schools with the most low-income students	First quartile of schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	N/A	5%
Schools with the fewest low-income students	Fourth quartile of schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	N/A	11%

SOURCE: Data is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file.

lunches. The one-fourth of schools with the most students receiving subsidized lunches are assigned to the first group. The one-fourth of schools with the fewest students receiving subsidized lunches are assigned to the fourth group. We compare the courses and teachers assigned to each of these groups of schools to see how they differ in “highly qualified” teacher assignments.

The average percentage of courses in our district not taught by a “highly qualified” teacher is zero percent, compared to eight percent statewide.

Staff Development

Our district chose to involve all teachers and administrators in individualized instruction training. Two staff development days were dedicated to this topic to help teachers meet the learning needs of all students. All first- and second-year teachers were sent as a team to a two-day conference on differentiated instruction, where teachers learned about researched-based strategies that can be used in the middle school classroom. This team of teachers became on-campus experts and presented information to our staff.

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
2007–2008	3.0
2006–2007	3.0
2005–2006	3.0

SOURCE: Wiseburn Elementary School District

Staff meetings were devoted to training teachers to implement three new programs, including the MyAccess! online writing program; Datawise program for viewing student assessment data and developing common assessments across the curriculum; and Accelerated Math online for use in math classes, Targeted Learning in Content (TLC), and math extra support classes. We used staff meetings and release days to help teachers with these programs. A high interest in using data to make decisions about instruction and assessment has promoted the use of these new programs in all curricular areas.

Teachers are asked to complete a survey annually to identify interest areas for future staff development programs. All staff and department meetings are planned based on the overall emphasis on individualized instruction for the year.

Evaluating and Improving Teachers

We evaluate probationary teachers over a two-year period. We complete observations of tenured teachers every two years. We give new teachers a new-teacher information at orientation that details this process. The principal and the assistant principal meet with specified probationary teachers in the fall to determine individual goals for the year and to set dates for observations and meetings between teachers and observing administrators after each observation. We take our goals from the Wiseburn School District Standards for Teachers. After the initial observation, there is a second observation early in the second semester and a final meeting with the observing administrator. Before they are observed, teachers give administrators a lesson plan.

In addition to these formal observations, administrators make informal, drop-in observations throughout the year. Observations focus on active progress toward goals, classroom environment, teacher strengths and areas for improvement, and student engagement in the lesson. All observations follow guidelines set by the teacher’s contract and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The principal and assistant principal meet informally throughout the year to discuss teacher effectiveness. The principal makes final determination of a teacher’s competency.

The teacher being reviewed signs records of classroom observations. Copies of these records are provided to the Director of Human Resources for the Wiseburn School District. All records of observations are considered confidential.

Substitute Teachers

Our school has experienced little difficulty in obtaining qualified substitute teachers, even though a decrease in the number of available substitutes exists. Wiseburn will continue in its goal to provide qualified substitutes to cover classes for teachers who are absent. When substitutes are not available, nonteaching personnel may assist in the instruction of the students under the supervision of credentialed staff. Students may also be distributed to other classes for instruction. Specialist teachers may be assigned to the regular classroom, if necessary.

Specialized Resource Staff

Our school may employ social workers, speech and hearing specialists, school psychologists, nurses, and technology specialists. These specialists often work part time at our school and some may work at more than one school in our district. Their schedules will change as our students’ needs change. For these reasons, the staffing counts you see here may differ from the staffing provided today in this school. For more details on [statewide ratios of counselors, psychologists, or other pupil services](#) staff to students, see the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site. [Library facts](#) and frequently asked questions are also available there.

STAFF POSITION	STAFF (FTE)
Counselors	1.0
Librarians	0.0
Psychologists	0.0
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.0
Speech/language/hearing specialists	0.0
Resource specialists	0.0

SOURCE: CBEDS census, October 2007.

ACADEMIC GUIDANCE COUNSELORS: Our school has one full-time equivalent academic counselor, which is equivalent to one counselor for every 822 students. Just for reference, California districts employed about one academic counselor for every 773 middle school students in the state. More information about [counseling and student support](#) is available on the CDE Web site.

Specialized Programs and Staff

Dana Middle School has language arts and mathematics support classes called Reading and Math Safari. Our Academic Support Club program provides afterschool homework intervention. The Guided Study program is a more intensive support class offered four days a week for our more academically challenged students.

Dana Middle School’s Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program is available to all students and staff. It is aligned both with the American School Counselor Association National Model for School Counseling Programs and the National Standards for School Counseling Programs. Our full-time counselor runs the program, which has various components. Individual and group counseling is available for academic, career, and personal/social development issues. Students themselves may choose to see the counselor, or they may be referred by teachers, parents, counselors, peers, staff, or administrators.

The Support Personnel Accountability Report Card (SPARC) is a major component of Dana’s Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program. This public document, sponsored by the Los Angeles County Office of Education, details the components of a Student Support Personnel Team and the Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program of a school. Dana Middle School has been awarded an Academy Award for two years running and is currently awaiting award status for 2007.

Our counseling program also includes counselor interns, student interventions, and programs in character education, peer tutoring, peer mediation, bullying and harassment, parent involvement, middle and high school transition, and planning for high school, college, and beyond. Our goal is that no student goes without support and that all students have a place to go to feel safe and heard.

Our elective classes include art and advanced art, computer applications, concert band, drama, leadership, peer tutoring, Spanish, technical theater, world music drumming, yearbook, AVID, and serving as teacher assistant.

We use the Targeted Learning in Content advisory period schoolwide to promote student learning and organization using AVID methodologies. Each student coordinates all school work in a single binder with the help of teachers. Work from the binders is placed in a student’s portfolio for our spring student-led conferences. The cycle of student awareness of learning and achieving is continuous across all classrooms.

GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION (GATE): Please see our GATE program from previous years. A number of course and class offerings are available to students to challenge them in their areas of strength. In addition, an afterschool program offered by STAR teaches students how to design Web-based games and use Flash animation.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM: Dana provides a wide array of programs and services to our identified special education students. We employ four full-time special educators, two certificated Resource Specialist Program (RSP) teachers, and two certificated Special Day Class (SDC) teachers. Each program also has two part-time assistants. We have required numerous additional part-time one-on-one assistants who shadow students who need behavioral or learning strategy supports.

In the RSP program, students can stay in the regular classroom with accommodations to the curriculum and receive support as part of their schedule. Students also receive support in the RSP Dolphin Center. Seventh and eighth graders took two specialized courses, Algebra Foundations and Humanities Basics, through a model based on the Learning Center but with peers in small groups.

We have two SDCs: one for sixth and seventh grade, and the other for seventh and eighth grade. These classes provide more specialized instruction in small groups and modifications to the general education curriculum. All students identified with special education needs were mainstreamed for a portion of their day in the least restrictive environment with necessary supports and services in order to gain access to peers and instruction. Students with special education receive services through a combination of programs and services, thus making special education fluid and tailored to their unique needs according to their Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs).

Both district and nonpublic agency staff provided services such as occupational therapy and counseling. Students received speech/language services and adaptive PE through the Los Angeles County Office of Education. A part-time school psychologist is on site regularly. A full-time school counselor on site assisted the school with disability awareness, guidance lessons, and overall support for students, staff, and parents. Many students with special needs participated in afterschool clubs, such as drama, music, and leadership. The district works with numerous agencies for consultation and direct services as needed.

ENGLISH LEARNER PROGRAM: The primary goal of our program for English Learners is to develop their proficiency in English and in the district's core curriculum as rapidly and effectively as possible. In addition to the core curriculum, the program provides English Language Development instruction so that the students develop fluency in speaking, listening, reading, and writing in English. Teachers who work with English Learners hold Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) credentials or certificates issued by the state of California. After students have acquired a good working knowledge of English and meet our criteria, they are reclassified as fluent and are monitored for two years to ensure progress in the core curriculum.

Each school with at least 21 English Learners has an English Language Advisory Committee composed of parents and school staff. Its purpose is to monitor the English Learner program and give input on the master plan for student services.

RESOURCES

Buildings

In September of 2007 we moved into a new, \$33 million, state-of-the-art building on existing Dana Middle School property. Ten buildings, including classrooms, a gym, a multipurpose room, computer labs, a community and professional development room, a library media center, and specialized buildings will make up nearly 83,000 square feet of space for student learning. The existing Dana Middle School, with one 75-year-old building, is a functional facility.

More facts about the [condition of our school buildings](#) are available in an online supplement to this report called for by the Williams legislation of 2004. What you will find is an assessment of more than a dozen aspects of our buildings: their structural integrity, electrical systems, heating and ventilation systems, and more. The important purpose of this assessment is to determine if our buildings and grounds are safe and in good repair. If anything needs to be repaired, this assessment identifies it and targets a date by which we commit to make those repairs. The guidelines for this assessment were written by the [Office of Public School Construction](#) (OPSC) and were brought about by the Williams legislation. You can look at the six-page [survey form](#) used for the assessment on the Web site of the OPSC.

Library

Our new library media center opened in September of 2007. Our middle school library has a part-time library clerk and two part-time computer aides. Students come to the library media center at least once every two weeks with their social science classes. All other classes schedule use of the library media center as needed. Students can check out books and other resources at lunch and during Targeted Learning in Content (TLC) period, when they do recreational reading. We review and update the book collection annually. The library media center currently has five new computers.

Computers

We have 125 computers available for student use, which means that, on average, there is one computer for every seven students. There are 38 classrooms connected to the Internet.

RESOURCES	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Students per computer	7	4	4
Internet-connected classrooms	38	50	35

SOURCE: CBEDS census of October 2007. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

The new Dana Middle School has two computer labs; one is in the library media center and the other is a dedicated lab. There are two technology labs with 35 computers in each. Students learn about keyboarding, desktop publishing, making spreadsheets, word processing, presentations, and database applications, and they access numerous curriculum-related programs. Each classroom has five student computers in each. All of our student computers use Open Office, an open source suite of software programs. Each teacher has a laptop for presenting lessons and projecting material onto a screen using an LCD projector. Computer access is available in many of the classrooms. The library media center lab is available to all students before and after school, lunch, and on a drop-in basis.

Textbooks

We choose our textbooks from lists that have already been approved by state education officials. For a list of some of the textbooks we use at our school, see the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

We have also reported additional facts about our textbooks called for by the Williams legislation of 2004. This online report shows whether we had a textbook for each student in each core course during the 2008–2009 school year and whether those [textbooks](#) covered the California Content Standards.

For more than six years, panels of scholars have decided what California students should learn and be able to do. Their decisions are known as the California Content Standards, and they apply to all public schools in the state. The textbooks we use and the tests we give are based on these content standards, and we expect our teachers to be firmly focused on them. Policy experts, researchers, and educators consider our state's standards to be among the most rigorous and challenging in the nation.

You can find the [content standards](#) for each subject at each grade level on the Web site of the California Department of Education (CDE).

SCHOOL EXPENDITURES

Dana Middle School received funds for state and federally funded special projects such as Gifted and Talented Education (GATE), English Learners, Peer Assistance Review, library, School Improvement Program, special education, Chapter II, and Eisenhower Funds.

Spending per Student (2006–2007)

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we first report our overall spending per student. We base our calculations on our average daily attendance (ADA), which was 776 students.

We've broken down expenditures by the type of funds used to pay for them. Unrestricted funds can be used for any lawful purpose. Restricted funds, however, must be spent for specific purposes set out by legal requirements or the donor. Examples include funding for instructional materials, economic impact aid, and teacher- and principal-training funds.

TYPE OF FUNDS	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE
Unrestricted funds (\$/student)	\$3,871	\$4,351	-11%	\$5,300	-27%
Restricted funds (\$/student)	\$1,383	\$944	47%	\$2,817	-51%
TOTAL (\$/student)	\$5,254	\$5,295	-1%	\$8,117	-35%

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.

Total Expenditures, by Category (2006–2007)

Here you can see how much we spent on different categories of expenses. We're reporting the total dollars in each category, not spending per student.

CATEGORY	UNRESTRICTED FUNDS	RESTRICTED FUNDS	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL*
Teacher salaries	\$2,062,353	\$332,946	\$2,395,299	59%
Other staff salaries	\$251,312	\$205,514	\$456,826	11%
Benefits	\$442,581	\$92,279	\$534,860	13%
Books and supplies	\$118,675	\$126,629	\$245,304	6%
Equipment replacement	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Services and direct support	\$129,083	\$315,610	\$444,693	11%
TOTAL	\$3,004,004	\$1,072,978	\$4,076,982	

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.

* Totals may not add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

Compensation per Teacher (2006–2007)

The total of what our teachers earn appears below. You can see the portion of teacher pay that goes to salary and three types of benefits.

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we first report our compensation per full-time equivalent (FTE) teacher. A teacher who works full time counts as 1.0 FTE teacher. A teacher who works only half time counts as 0.5 FTE teacher. We had 34 FTE teachers working in our school.

CATEGORY	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE
Salaries	\$64,623	\$64,515	0%	\$62,157	4%
Retirement benefits	\$5,566	\$5,405	3%	\$6,557	-15%
Health and medical benefits	\$3,850	\$3,828	1%	\$10,416	-63%
Other benefits	\$756	\$570	33%	\$453	67%
TOTAL	\$74,795	\$74,319	1%	\$79,583	-6%

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.

Total Teacher Compensation (2006–2007)

Here you can see how much we spent on different categories of compensation. We’re reporting the total dollars in each category, not compensation per teacher.

CATEGORY	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL*
Salaries	\$2,197,179	86%
Retirement benefits	\$189,231	7%
Health and medical benefits	\$130,906	5%
Other benefits	\$25,697	1%
TOTAL	\$2,543,013	

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.
 * Totals may not add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY: All data is the most current available as of November 2008. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2007–2008 school year after the publication date of this report. We rely on the following sources of information from the California Department of Education: California Basic Education Data System (CBEDS) (October 2007 census); Language Census (March 2008); California Achievement Test and California Standards Tests (spring 2008 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (October 2008 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (November 2008).

DISCLAIMER: School Wise Press, the publisher of this accountability report, makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of this information but offers no guarantee, express or implied. While we do our utmost to ensure the information is complete, we must note that we are not responsible for any errors or omissions in the data. Nor are we responsible for any damages caused by the use of the information this report contains. Before you make decisions based on this information, we strongly recommend that you visit the school and ask the principal to provide the most up-to-date facts available.

rev20081215_19-65169-6023832m/17229

» Adequacy of Key Resources

Here you'll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2008–2009. Please note that these facts are based on evaluations our staff conducted in accordance with the Williams legislation.



TEACHERS

Teacher Vacancies

The Williams legislation asked districts to disclose how frequently full-time teachers were not permanently assigned to a classroom. There are two general circumstances that can lead to the unfortunate case of a classroom without a full-time, permanently assigned teacher. Within the first 20 days of the start of school, we can be surprised by too many students showing up for school, or too few teachers showing up to teach. After school starts, however, teachers can also be surprised by sudden changes: family emergencies, injuries, accidents, etc. When that occurs, it is our school's and our district's responsibility to fill that teacher's vacancy with a qualified, full-time and permanently assigned replacement. For that reason, we report teacher vacancies in two parts: at the start of school, and after the start of school.

KEY FACTOR	2006–2007	2007–2008	2008–2009
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	33	31	172
Number of classes which lacked a permanently assigned teacher within the first 20 days of school	0	0	0
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Number of classes where the permanently assigned teacher left during the year	0	0	0
Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher	0	0	0

NOTES: This report was completed on Friday, October 31, 2008.

Teacher Misassignments

A “misassigned” teacher is one who lacks the appropriate subject-area authorization for a class she is teaching.

Under the terms of the Williams settlement, schools must inform the public of the number of their teachers who are misassigned. It is possible for a teacher who lacks the authorization for a subject to get special permission—in the form of an emergency permit, waiver, or internship authorization—from the school board or county office of education to teach the subject anyway. This permission prevents the teacher from being counted as misassigned.

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	2006–2007	2007–2008	2008–2009
Teacher Misassignments	Total number of classes taught by teachers without a legally recognized certificate or credential	0	0	0
Teacher Misassignments in Classes that Include English Learners	Total number of classes that include English learners and are taught by teachers without CLAD/BCLAD authorization, ELD or SDAIE training, or equivalent authorization from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing	0	0	22
Other Employee Misassignments	Total number of service area placements of employees without the required credentials	0	0	0

NOTES: This report was completed on Friday, October 31, 2008.

TEXTBOOKS

The main fact about textbooks that the Williams legislation calls for described whether schools have enough books in core classes for all students. The law also asks districts to reveal whether those books are presenting what the California content standards calls for. This information is far more meaningful when viewed along with the more detailed description of textbooks contained in our School Accountability Report Card (SARC). There you'll find the names of the textbooks used in our core classes, their dates of publication, the names of the firms that published them, and more.

SUBJECT	ARE THERE TEXTBOOKS OR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN USE?		ARE THERE ENOUGH BOOKS FOR EACH STUDENT?	
	STANDARDS ALIGNED?	OFFICIALLY ADOPTED?	FOR USE IN CLASS?	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS HAVING BOOKS TO TAKE HOME?
English	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Math	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Science	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Social Studies	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Foreign Languages	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Health Sciences	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Visual and Performing Arts	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%

NOTES: This report was completed on Friday, October 31, 2008. This information was collected on Wednesday, October 01, 2008.

FACILITIES

To determine the condition of our facilities, our district sent experts from our facilities team to inspect them. They used a survey, called the Facilities Inspection Tool, issued by the Office of Public School Construction. Based on that survey, we've answered the questions you see on this report. Please note that the information reflects the condition of our buildings as of the date of the report. Since that time, those conditions may have changed.

AREA	RATING	DESCRIPTION
Overall Rating	Exemplary	Our school meets most or all of the standards for good repair, established by the Office of Public School Construction. If we have any deficiencies, they are not significant. We scored between 98 and 100 percent on the 15 categories of our evaluation.
1. Gas Leaks	Good	No apparent problems.
2. Mechanical Problems (Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning)	Good	No apparent problems.
3. Windows, Doors, Gates, Fences (Interior and Exterior)	Good	No apparent problems.
4. Interior Surfaces (Walls, Floors, and Ceilings)	Fair	Water damage to ceiling tiles in multipurpose room. Tiles replaced
5. Hazardous Materials (Lead Paint, Asbestos, Mold, Flammables, etc.)	Good	No apparent problems.
6. Structural Damage (Cracks in Walls and Foundations, Sloping Ceilings, Posts or Beams Missing)	Good	No apparent problems.
7. Fire Safety (Sprinkler Systems, Alarms, Extinguishers)	Good	No apparent problems.
8. Electrical Systems and Lighting	Good	No apparent problems.
9. Pest or Vermin Infestation	Good	No apparent problems.
10. Drinking Fountains (Inside and Out)	Good	No apparent problems.
11. Bathrooms	Good	No apparent problems.
12. Sewer System	Good	No apparent problems.
13. Roofs	Good	No apparent problems.
14. Playground/School Grounds	Good	No apparent problems.
15. Overall Cleanliness	Good	No apparent problems.
Other Deficiencies	N/A	No apparent problems.

INSPECTORS AND ADVISORS: This report was completed on Monday, October 27, 2008 by Bill Denney (M/O Manager). The facilities inspection occurred on Wednesday, October 01, 2008. There were no other inspectors used in the completion of this form. The Facilities Inspection Tool was completed on Wednesday, October 01, 2008.

» Data Almanac

This Data Almanac provides more-detailed information than the School Accountability Report Card or data that covers a period of more than one year. It presents the facts and statistics in tables without narrative text.



STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

Student Enrollment by Ethnicity and Other Characteristics

The ethnicity of our students, estimates of their family income and education level, their English fluency, and their learning-related disabilities.

GROUP	ENROLLMENT
Number of students	822
African American	19%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	3%
Filipino	2%
Hispanic or Latino	51%
Pacific Islander	2%
White (not Hispanic)	15%
Multiple or no response	8%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	43%
English Learners	3%
Students with disabilities	9%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CBEDS, October 2007. Data about students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged, English Learners, or learning disabled come from the School Accountability Report Card unit of the California Department of Education.

Student Enrollment by Grade Level

Number of students enrolled in each grade level at our school.

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS
Kindergarten	0
Grade 1	0
Grade 2	0
Grade 3	0
Grade 4	0
Grade 5	0
Grade 6	289
Grade 7	279
Grade 8	254
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2007.

Average Class Size by Core Course

The average class size by core courses.

SUBJECT	2005–2006	2006–2007	2007–2008
English	31	31	31
History	31	32	32
Math	30	28	29
Science	32	31	32

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2007.

Average Class Size by Core Course, Detail

The number of classrooms that fall into each range of class sizes.

SUBJECT	2005–2006			2006–2007			2007–2008		
	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+
English	2	15	11	2	16	10	0	23	5
History	0	15	10	0	14	9	0	18	4
Math	1	17	7	4	23	1	3	21	3
Science	0	14	12	0	18	7	0	14	9

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2007.

Teacher Credentials

The number of teachers assigned to the school with a full credential and without a full credential, for both our school and the district.

TEACHERS	SCHOOL			DISTRICT
	2005–2006	2006–2007	2007–2008	2007–2008
With Full Credential	35	37	38	113
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	1

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2007, Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF) section.

Physical Fitness

Students in grades five, seven, and nine take the California Fitness Test each year. This test measures students’ aerobic capacity, body composition, muscular strength, endurance, and flexibility using six different tests. The table below shows the percentage of students at our school who scored within the “healthy fitness zone” on all six tests. Our 2007–2008 results are compared to other students’ results in the county and state. More information about [physical fitness testing and standards](#) is available on the CDE Web site.

CATEGORY	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Boys in Fitness Zone	43%	26%	30%
Girls in Fitness Zone	61%	30%	35%
Fifth graders in Fitness Zone	N/A	24%	27%
Seventh graders in Fitness Zone	52%	29%	33%
Ninth graders in Fitness Zone	N/A	31%	29%
All students in Fitness Zone	52%	28%	32%

SOURCE: Physical fitness test data is produced annually as schools test their students on the six Fitnessgram Standards. Data is reported by Educational Data Systems. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

California Standards Tests (CST)

The California Standards Tests (CST) show how well students are doing in learning what the state content standards require. The CST include English/language arts and mathematics in grades six through eight; science in grade eight; and history/social science in grade eight. Student scores are reported as performance levels.

CST Results for All Students: Three-Year Comparison

The percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards) for the most current three-year period.

SUBJECT	SCHOOL PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			DISTRICT PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			STATE PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
English/ language arts	53%	52%	61%	56%	56%	60%	42%	43%	46%
History/social science	46%	42%	48%	46%	42%	48%	33%	33%	36%
Mathematics	40%	41%	34%	53%	51%	50%	40%	40%	43%
Science	43%	46%	65%	43%	44%	60%	35%	38%	46%

SOURCE: California Standards Tests (CST) results, spring 2008 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

CST Results by Student Group: Most Recent Year

The percentage of students, by group, achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards) for the most recent testing period.

STUDENT GROUP	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			
	ENGLISH/ LANGUAGE ARTS 2007–2008	HISTORY/ SOCIAL SCIENCE 2007–2008	MATHEMATICS 2007–2008	SCIENCE 2007–2008
African American	66%	49%	40%	64%
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	73%	N/A	59%	N/A
Filipino	76%	N/A	47%	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	56%	45%	30%	62%
Pacific Islander	45%	N/A	21%	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	64%	54%	33%	69%
Boys	52%	57%	33%	66%
Girls	69%	39%	34%	64%
Economically disadvantaged	57%	N/A	30%	59%
English Learners	20%	N/A	8%	N/A
Students with disabilities	15%	N/A	8%	18%
Students receiving migrant education services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: California Standards Tests (CST) results, spring 2008 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

ACCOUNTABILITY

California Academic Performance Index (API)

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of the academic performance and progress of schools in California. API scores range from 200 to 1000, with a statewide target of 800. Detailed information about the API can be found on the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/>.

API Ranks: Three-Year Comparison

The state assigns statewide and similar-schools API ranks for all schools. The API ranks range from 1 to 10. A statewide rank of 1 means that the school has an API in the lowest 10 percent of all middle schools in the state, while a statewide rank of 10 means that the school has an API in the highest 10 percent of all middle schools in the state. The similar-schools API rank reflects how a school compares to 100 statistically matched schools with similar teachers and students.

API RANK	2005–2006	2006–2007	2007–2008
Statewide rank	7	7	7
Similar-schools rank	10	9	8

SOURCE: The API Base Report from August 2008.

API Changes by Student Group: Three-Year Comparison

API changes for all students and student groups: the actual API changes in points added or lost for the past three years, and the most recent API. Note: "N/A" means that the student group is not numerically significant.

STUDENT GROUP	ACTUAL API CHANGE			API SCORE
	2005–2006	2006–2007	2007–2008	2007–2008
All students at the school	+1	-2	+20	785
African American	+16	+5	+27	804
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	-2	-7	+28	770
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	+4	-3	+0	793
Economically disadvantaged	+18	-11	+29	766
English Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in October 2008.

Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Intervention Programs

The federal law known as No Child Left Behind requires that all schools and districts meet all three of the following criteria in order to attain Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):

- (a) a 95-percent participation rate on the state’s tests;
- (b) a CDE-mandated percentage of students scoring Proficient or higher on the state’s English/language arts and mathematics tests; and
- (c) an API of at least 590 or growth of at least one point.

AYP for the District

Whether the district met the federal requirement for AYP overall, and whether the school and the district met each of the AYP criteria.

AYP CRITERIA	DISTRICT
Overall	No
Graduation rate	N/A
Participation rate in English/language arts	No
Participation rate in mathematics	No
Percent Proficient in English/language arts	Yes
Percent Proficient in mathematics	Yes
Met Academic Performance Index (API)	Yes

SOURCE: The AYP Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in November 2008.

Intervention Program: District Program Improvement (PI)

Districts receiving federal Title I funding enter Program Improvement (PI) if they do not make AYP for two consecutive years in the same content area (English/language arts or mathematics) and for each grade span or on the same indicator (API or graduation rate). After entering PI, districts advance to the next level of intervention with each additional year that they do not make AYP.

INDICATOR	DISTRICT
PI stage	Not in PI
The year the district entered PI	N/A
Number of schools currently in PI	0
Percentage of schools currently in PI	0%

SOURCE: The Program Improvement Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in October 2008.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES

Total expenses include only the costs related to direct educational services to students. This figure does not include food services, land acquisition, new construction, and other expenditures unrelated to core educational purposes. The expenses-per-student figure is calculated by dividing total expenses by the district’s average daily attendance (ADA). More information is available on the [CDE’s Web site](#).

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	OUR DISTRICT	SIMILAR DISTRICTS	ALL DISTRICTS
FISCAL YEAR 2006–2007			
Total expenses	\$15,413,105	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$7,301	\$7,789	\$8,117
FISCAL YEAR 2005–2006			
Total expenses	\$14,234,240	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$6,791	\$7,229	\$7,521

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

District Salaries, 2006–2007

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2006–2007 school year. According to the CDE’s SARC Data Definitions, “State certification/release dates for fiscal data occur in middle to late spring, precluding the inclusion of 2007–08 data in most cases. Therefore, 2006–07 data are used for report cards prepared during 2008–09.” This table compares our average salaries to those in districts like ours, based on both enrollment and the grade level of our students. In addition, we report the percentage of our district’s total budget dedicated to teachers’ and administrators’ salaries. The costs of health insurance, pensions, and other indirect compensation are not included.

SALARY INFORMATION	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Beginning teacher’s salary	\$42,448	\$39,773
Midrange teacher’s salary	\$69,924	\$61,167
Highest-paid teacher’s salary	\$84,200	\$78,093
Average principal’s salary (middle school)	\$112,882	\$102,064
Superintendent’s salary	\$204,996	\$140,582
Percentage of budget for teachers’ salaries	45%	41%
Percentage of budget for administrators’ salaries	7%	6%

SOURCE: School Accountability Report Card unit of the California Department of Education.

TEXTBOOKS**Textbook Adoption List**

TITLE	SUBJECT	DATE OF PUBLICATION	ADOPTION DATE
Holt Literature and Language Arts	Language Arts	2003	2003
Concepts and Skills	Math	2001	2001
McDougal Little - Algebra Structure and Method	Math	2004	2004
Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra, Calif. Edition	Math	2001	2001
Structure and Method	Math	2001	2001
Holt Rinehart and Winston California Science	Science	2007	2008
McDougal Little	Social Studies	2006	2006