



## **Peter Burnett 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.

# Peter Burnett 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 elementary 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](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

5403 W. 138th St.  
Hawthorne, CA 90250  
Principal: Laura Sullivan  
Phone: (310) 725-2151

### 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](http://www.schoolwisepress.com)

©2008 Publishing 20/20

# Peter Burnett School

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

## » Principal's Message

Welcome to Peter Burnett Elementary School, which was named after the first governor of the state of California. Burnett is one of four schools in the Wiseburn School District. It is located in the southern (Hollyglen) section of the district and serves students in grades three to five.

In 2007–2008 the Peter Burnett community, including staff, students, principal, parents, and community members, worked together to improve student achievement and well-being. We added new programs and interventions to help students improve academically and socially. We continue to use research-based intervention programs to help improve students' reading and math skills. Character Counts is a schoolwide program that teaches and promotes the positive character traits of trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship. In 2007–2008 the staff continues to implement professional learning communities, whereby teachers and staff collaborate weekly to improve student achievement. We also implemented Response to Intervention, where students receive immediate and specific academic and behavioral assistance if they require it.

In 2007–2008 we also continued the Adopt-A-Book program, which has been very popular and has added over 700 new books to our library.

There are many wonderful aspects of Peter Burnett School. We hope you stop by and visit soon!

Laura Sullivan, PRINCIPAL

### Grade range and calendar

**3–5**

TRADITIONAL

### Academic Performance Index

**811**

County Average: 767

State Average: 776

### Student enrollment

**414**

County Average: 615

State Average: 523

### Teachers

**17**

County Average: 31

State Average: 26

### Students per teacher

**24**

County Average: 20

State Average: 20

### Students per computer

**3**

County Average: 4

State Average: 4

**Major Achievements**

- In 2007–2008 our API was 811. Although our API dropped two points, we focused our efforts on improving the scores of our English Learners and noticed improvement.
- Our math and reading support for students who need academic support proved to be successful. Based on standardized test results, the majority of students participating in the Read Naturally program gained at least 35 points in their reading/language arts scores.
- Our fourth grade teachers focused on improving student writing. Teachers used the Six-Traits Writing Assessment along with Step Up to Writing and noticed a great improvement. In 2006–2007 about 25 percent of fourth graders scored Proficient on the California Standards Tests writing test. In 2007–2008 about 75 percent scored Proficient.
- Our Character Counts program helps students understand why positive values and character will help them succeed. Our Love and Logic program emphasized consequences for misbehavior and healthy decision making. In 2007–2008 we also implemented an antibullying program and a behavioral intervention process. These programs continue to help students learn to take responsibility for their actions and their learning. The number of suspensions continues to drop as a result of our programs.

**Focus for Improvement**

- Continue to use Character Counts, behavioral interventions, antibullying programs, and Love and Logic in the classroom and at home.
- Use DataWise (a data analysis program) to assess the strengths and improvement focus areas for each grade level. Teachers will plan lessons around these focus areas.
- Continue to embrace the concept of professional learning communities based on the work of Richard and Rebecca DuFour. We sent a team to attend training offered by the Los Angeles County Office of Education. Teachers and staff collaborate to set learning goals, create common assessments, and provide necessary interventions for students who need more time and resources to achieve the goals.
- Continue to use Response to Intervention. We have created a pyramid of support measures in reading and behavior and will begin looking at developing a similar pyramid for math as well.
- Continue to use effective differentiated (customized) instruction strategies. All of our teachers attended a two-day workshop on differentiated instruction. Teachers have implemented a variety of strategies to match instruction to individual student needs; these include providing tiered lessons, learning contracts, and extension activities.

**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.

Burnett’s API was 811 (out of 1000). This is a decline of 2 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 813. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared to all elementary 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, 59 percent of elementary schools statewide met their growth targets.

CALIFORNIA <b>API</b> ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
<b>Met schoolwide growth target</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met growth target for prior school year</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>API score</b>	<b>811</b>
<b>Growth attained from prior year</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>Met subgroup* growth targets</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Underperforming school</b>	<b>No</b>

SOURCE: API based on spring 2008 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of November 2008.

\*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.

**API, Spring 2008**



SOURCE: API based on spring 2008 test cycle. State average represents elementary 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 all 25 criteria for yearly progress. As a result, we succeeded at making AYP.

To meet AYP, elementary 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 <b>AYP</b> ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS	
<b>Met AYP</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met schoolwide participation rate</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met schoolwide test score goals</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met subgroup* participation rate</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met subgroup* test score goals</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met schoolwide API for AYP</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Program Improvement school in 2008</b>	<b>No</b>

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?
<b>SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS</b>	●	●	●	●
<b>SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS</b>				
Low income	●	●	●	●
Students with disabilities	●	●	●	●
Students learning English	●	●	●	●
<b>STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY</b>				
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 elementary 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 elementary 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
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			58%	96%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About 11 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			44%	98%	
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			47%	97%	

### 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
<b>Boys</b>			57%	206	<b>GENDER:</b> About two percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
<b>Girls</b>			59%	187	
<b>English proficient</b>			66%	310	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> English Learners scored lower on the CST than students who are proficient in English. Because we give this test in English, English Learners tend to be at a disadvantage.
<b>English Learners</b>			24%	82	
<b>Low income</b>			52%	164	<b>INCOME:</b> About ten percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
<b>Not low income</b>			62%	228	
<b>Learning disabled</b>			43%	46	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> 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.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			60%	347	
<b>African American</b>			57%	60	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> 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.
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>			54%	224	
<b>White/Other</b>			65%	74	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary 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**

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
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			56%	96%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> The same percentage of students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced as did students at the average elementary school in California.
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			55%	94%	
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			56%	94%	

**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
<b>Boys</b>			57%	207	<b>GENDER:</b> About four percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
<b>Girls</b>			53%	187	
<b>English proficient</b>			60%	310	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> English Learners scored lower on the CST than students who are proficient in English. Because we give this test in English, English Learners tend to be at a disadvantage.
<b>English Learners</b>			36%	83	
<b>Low income</b>			49%	166	<b>INCOME:</b> About ten percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
<b>Not low income</b>			59%	227	
<b>Learning disabled</b>			45%	47	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> 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.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			57%	347	
<b>African American</b>			47%	59	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> 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.
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>			51%	227	
<b>White/Other</b>			67%	73	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary 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 [math standards](#) on the CDE's Web site.

**Three-Year Trend: Math**



**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
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			48%	97%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About one percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			44%	97%	
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			47%	96%	

**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
<b>Boys</b>			51%	78	<b>GENDER:</b> About eight percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
<b>Girls</b>			43%	65	
<b>English proficient</b>			53%	119	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was too small to be statistically significant.
<b>English Learners</b>	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	24	
<b>Low income</b>			41%	64	<b>INCOME:</b> About 12 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
<b>Not low income</b>			53%	79	
<b>Learning disabled</b>	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	18	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was too small to be statistically significant.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			48%	125	
<b>African American</b>	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	25	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> 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.
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>			43%	79	
<b>White/Other</b>			66%	32	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary 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).

The science standards test was administered only to fifth graders. Of course, students in all grade levels study science in these areas: physical science, life science, earth science, and investigation and experimentation. For background, you can review the **science standards** by going to 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
<b>READING</b>				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	16%	12%	15%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	51%	33%	39%
<b>LANGUAGE</b>				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	27%	17%	19%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	56%	43%	47%
<b>MATH</b>				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	36%	28%	30%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	60%	53%	56%


SOURCE: The scores for the CAT/6 are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary 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 Burnett, 51 percent of students scored at or above average in reading (compared to 39 percent statewide); 56 percent scored at or above average in language (compared to 47 percent statewide); and 60 percent scored at or above average in math (compared to 56 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 Burnett, 16 percent of students scored at the top in reading (compared to 15 percent statewide); 27 percent scored at the top in language (compared to 19 percent statewide); and 36 percent scored at the top in math (compared to 30 percent statewide). The subject with the most students scoring at the top was math.

### 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 elementary schools only.

### **Other Measures of Student Achievement**

In addition to standardized test results, we use informal classroom observations, homework, class work, quizzes, and end-of-unit tests to assess each student's strengths and areas that need attention. Students keep portfolios of their written work as evidence of their growth as writers. Our English Learners take the California English Language Development Test every year. Some learning-disabled students take the California Alternative Performance Assessment instead of the California Standards Test and California Achievement Test.

At the beginning and at the end of each school year, our students take district tests in math. At the beginning and end of each trimester, students take district tests in writing and language arts that measure the degree to which they are meeting state standards. Each grade-level teaching team uses common assessments in reading to determine areas of strength and instructional focus. Teachers and parents can print individual student reports analyzing each student's mastery of the standards. We send home progress reports in the middle of each trimester and report cards at the end of each trimester. We hold parent conferences in November and March and more frequently for students who are struggling at school.

**STUDENTS**

**Students’ English Language Skills**

At Burnett, 88 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared to 68 percent of elementary school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	88%	63%	68%
English Learners	12%	37%	32%

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

**Languages Spoken at Home by English Learners**

Please note that this table describes the home languages of just the 50 students classified as English Learners. At Burnett, 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	90%	89%	85%
Vietnamese	2%	1%	3%
Cantonese	0%	2%	1%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	0%	1%	1%
Korean	0%	2%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	0%	0%
All other	8%	5%	8%

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

**Ethnicity**

Most students at Burnett 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 Burnett. 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	14%	9%	7%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	6%	10%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	54%	64%	50%
White/European American/Other	27%	17%	32%

SOURCE: CBEDS census of October 2007. County and state averages represent elementary 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 Burnett, 43 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared to 55 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	43%	63%	55%
Parents with some college	65%	47%	54%
Parents with college degree	31%	27%	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 elementary schools only.

The parents of 65 percent of the students at Burnett have attended college, and 31 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 94 percent of our students provided this information.

**CLIMATE FOR LEARNING**

**Average Class Sizes**

Because funding for class-size reduction was focused on the early grade levels, our school’s class sizes, like those of most elementary schools, differ across grade levels.

The average class size at Burnett varies across grade levels from a low of 20 students to a high of 31. Our average class size schoolwide is 25 students. The average class size for elementary schools in the state is 22 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY GRADE	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Third grade	20	20	20
Fourth grade	31	28	28
Fifth grade	29	28	29

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

**Safety**

The Burnett staff monitor the school grounds for ten minutes before and 15 minutes after school as well as at all recesses and at lunchtime. Teachers and the principal regularly review the rules for safe, responsible behavior in school and on the playground with students. We have a closed campus that is fully fenced. Visitors must enter the school through the main office and sign in, and they receive a red badge to wear throughout their stay.

We revise our School Safety Plan annually; we last revised it on October 24, 2006. The plan includes procedures for emergencies, exit routes, and inventories of emergency supplies. The plan is available to all community members in our office, and we discuss it with staff during a schoolwide staff meeting at the beginning of each school year. We conduct fire, intruder, lockdown, and earthquake drills monthly. In the spring we hold an earthquake simulation drill.

**Discipline**

We abide by our district’s strict behavior code. We send a printed copy of this code home to parents and review it with our students throughout the year. At Burnett we focus on developing responsibility and self-control in each child. Our expectations for appropriate behavior are consistent throughout the grades, but our disciplinary approach depends on the individual needs of the child.

Our teachers focus on the positive and maintain warm and constructive atmospheres in their classrooms. Many teachers use Love and Logic in the classroom. Teachers use logical consequences (for example, asking students to pick up litter around the school if they throw their milk cartons on the ground instead of in the trash) and natural consequences (for example, students are cold playing outside if they have forgotten their coats); these are very effective in developing students’ self-discipline. Rarely do we have serious discipline problems.

We expect parents to be active partners in helping their children to conduct themselves responsibly. When necessary, our principal meets with children and their parents to devise a behavior plan. Students are suspended or expelled only for extremely serious problems, such as chronic outbursts, physical violence, or repeated acts of vandalism.

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.

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
<b>Suspensions per 100 students</b>			
2007–2008	0	1	6
2006–2007	1	1	6
2005–2006	2	1	5
<b>Expulsions per 100 students</b>			
2007–2008	0	0	0
2006–2007	0	0	0
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 elementary schools only.

During the 2007–2008 school year, we had no 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**

Homework varies by grade level. Most third grade teachers give students homework packets that may include unfinished class work, math problems, or assignments in writing and reading. Fourth and fifth grade students use agendas (planning calendars) we provide to record daily and weekly homework assignments. Teachers assign homework Monday through Thursday. All students must read with parents or other family members every night for at least half an hour. Fifth graders receive more homework to prepare them for middle school.

Students may complete long-term projects at home in addition to the 45 to 60 minutes of nightly homework they receive in the core subjects (math, language arts, science, and social studies). Teachers in grades four and five use the Homework Hotline to inform parents about nightly homework and upcoming projects, tests, and events. We encourage parents to supervise homework and support their children's efforts.

### **Schedule**

The school year begins the first week in September and ends the third week of June. It includes 180 days of instruction. Our fourth and fifth grade classes begin at 8:30 a.m. and end at 3 p.m. except on Wednesdays, when school ends at 2:05 to make time for teacher collaboration and meetings. Our third grade students are on an "early-bird/late-gater" schedule, with some students attending from 8:30 a.m. to 2:10 p.m. and others attending from 9:20 a.m. to 3 p.m. All students attend school from 8:30 a.m. to 2:05 p.m. on Wednesdays. We also offer math and reading help, art, choir, band, tennis, and performing arts after school. Office hours are from 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.

### **Parent Involvement**

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. Parents can join our School Site Council, which works with the administration to help make financial decisions. Parents of English Learners are vital to our ELAC and to our outreach efforts on behalf of new families. Many teachers use parent volunteers to help with special projects in the classroom and to chaperone on field trips.

Our PTA helps staff members and funds our Hands-on-Art program and our yearly Jog-A-Thon. We also buy needed supplies with money from PTA fund-raisers. We ask all parents to attend Back-to-School Night in the fall, Open House in the spring, and parent-teacher conferences in November and March. We always need new volunteers! To find out more about volunteering at the school, call our principal, Laura Sullivan, at (310) 725-2151.



**LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF**

**Leadership**

This is Laura Sullivan’s first year as our principal. She has five years of experience as a principal and 18 as a teacher. Several groups help to make decisions that affect our school. Parents, administrators, and staff compose the School Site Council (SSC), which makes many important budgetary decisions. Our English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC) includes parents of English Learners, which advises our SSC and helps to shape our program for English Learners. Our Leadership Team, made up of the principal and one teacher from each grade level, gathers input from classroom teachers and helps to create staff meeting agendas. Teachers meet bimonthly to analyze test scores and student work, to discuss teaching methods, to make curricular decisions, and to monitor the effectiveness of our programs.

**Teacher Experience and Education**

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Teaching experience	Average years of teaching experience	10	13	13
Newer teachers	Percentage of teachers with one or two years of teaching experience	26%	9%	11%
Teachers holding an MA degree or higher	Percentage of teachers with a master’s degree or higher from a graduate school	42%	39%	34%
Teachers holding a BA degree alone	Percentage of teachers whose highest degree is a bachelor’s degree from a four-year college	58%	61%	66%

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

About 26 percent of our teachers have fewer than three years of teaching experience, which is above the average for new teachers in other elementary schools in California. Our teachers have, on average, ten years of experience. About 58 percent of our teachers hold only a bachelor’s degree from a four-year college or university. About 42 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%	97%	97%
Trainee credential holders	Percentage of staff holding an internship credential	0%	2%	2%
Emergency permit holders	Percentage of staff holding an emergency permit	0%	3%	2%
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 elementary 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 Burnett hold a full credential. This number is close to the average for all elementary schools in the state. None of the faculty at Burnett holds a trainee credential, which is reserved for those teachers who are in the process of completing their teacher training. In comparison, two percent of elementary school teachers throughout the state hold trainee credentials. None of our faculty holds an emergency permit. Very few elementary school teachers hold this authorization statewide (just two percent). All of the faculty at Burnett hold the elementary (multiple-subject) credential. This number is above the average for elementary schools in California, which is 91 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%
Teachers lacking a full credential	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	0%	3%	3%

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.

**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 three percent of teachers in elementary schools statewide.

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

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.

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

### Staff Development

In 2007–2008 our teachers attended three days of staff training during the school year. These days were devoted to learning about implementing differentiated (customized) instruction. When planning staff training, teachers and administrators look at student test scores and review the most pressing issues of the previous year to choose specific topics. We also sent a survey to all teachers in June 2006 to help determine staff training needs.

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

SOURCE: Wiseburn Elementary School District

We dismiss students at 1:45 p.m. on Wednesdays to allow time for teachers to collaborate in their professional learning teams, both within and across grade levels.

### Evaluating and Improving Teachers

Our teachers are evaluated regularly in accordance with state law. The district requires annual evaluations for probationary teachers. To ensure continued development of professional skills, staff development and training activities are required within the district. Staff attends conferences and workshops at district expense. Many members of the teaching staff took at least one college-level course last year, and all participated in other professional development activities such as conferences and workshops.

### 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	0.0
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.

## Specialized Programs and Staff

One of our third grade teachers runs a chess club during lunch for both beginning and advanced players. It meets once a week and is open to students in grades three through five. In March this teacher helps coordinate a chess match between Burnett and Anza schools.

We have a credentialed music teacher who teaches music once a week for fourth and fifth graders. He also holds afterschool and before-school lessons for students participating in band and choir. Our band and choir meet weekly after school.

Our fourth and fifth grade students take PE twice a week with teachers and coaches from the YMCA.

We have afterschool academic support programs in math and reading for students who need extra help in these areas. We also offer Read Naturally for our English Learners. A counselor comes to our school two days a week to meet with students individually and in groups depending on students' needs. She also leads Lunch Bunch on those days. Outside agencies offer many afterschool enrichment programs, including tennis, band, choir, art, performing arts, and hip-hop classes, which are offered in winter and spring.

**GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION (GATE):** Our GATE program officially begins in the third grade. Students join this program because they have high scores on standardized tests and cognitive tests, or because their teachers have recommended them for their exceptional academic abilities. Teachers work collaboratively to specialize instruction for students according to their intellectual capabilities. Teachers use instructional strategies such as tiered instruction, learning contracts, and enrichment activities with gifted and high achieving students. Gifted students can also participate in a weekly afterschool program (in which students learn in small groups outside of class) conducted by STAR Education, a nonprofit organization that provides enrichment and education services to schools. The GATE parent advisory committee meets several times a year to review and modify the program. We schedule GATE family nights in the fall and spring to allow families to participate in activities that encourage higher-level thinking.

**SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM:** During 2007–2008 we served 64 students in grades three through five who had Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). Our full-time Resource Specialist Program (RSP) teacher worked with students both within their regular classrooms and outside the classroom. Four part-time classified aides assist in the RSP program. We also have a Special Day Class for students in need of more intensive, specially designed instruction and modification to the core curriculum.

Our special education staff met with general educators and parents regularly to ensure that all students are meeting their goals and short-term objectives. Additional staff supported students by shadowing them in classrooms and helping with modifications to the curriculum. General education staff used the expertise of the special education team on site and through the district for ideas on individualizing instruction. Special Education Local Planning Area staff was also available throughout the year to support staff and student needs. Teachers were keenly aware of the accommodations needed to support inclusion of students with special needs in the least restrictive environment. The school psychologist was on site weekly to support at-risk learners and to support identified students. A part-time at-risk counselor assisted with staff training, consultation, and pullout services for pupils in need. Lunch Bunch counseling and group guidance is available weekly for students working on social skills, peer relations, and self esteem. Other students received direct counseling services through district psychological counseling staff. Speech/language and other supports were available through the Los Angeles County Office of Education staff on site weekly. Students with special education needs participate in afterschool clubs and activities along with their general education peers.

**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 CLAD (Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development) 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 that comprises 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

The original building at Burnett was built in 1956; it was completely refurbished and reopened in 1997. All classrooms and the office building were upgraded with new walls, windows, doors, white boards, floors, sinks, and counters. The bathrooms were completely refurbished as well. Each classroom has three computers with Internet access. All buildings have heat and air-conditioning. Renovations also included the addition of a computer lab with 30 desktops and an LCD. We also have four portable buildings that are in good condition, although they have reduced our playground space.

We have a day custodian and a night custodian who keep our facilities clean. Each classroom is cleaned every day, and the rest rooms are cleaned daily and throughout the day as needed. District maintenance staff pick up litter, remove graffiti, and maintain our landscaping regularly.

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

We have a very inviting library that holds approximately 9,000 volumes. Our library technician is in the library daily. Students visit the library/computer lab weekly with their classes. They may also visit during recesses, lunch period, and after school.

We have a special program called Adopt-A-Book that our library technician started. Students purchase books for our library and donate them in someone else's name. Last year we added over 300 new books to our library. Each year we purchase new books and resources for our library using money from our biannual book fairs and from the gracious donations of our PTA.

**Computers**

We have 120 computers available for student use, which means that, on average, there is one computer for every three students. There are 18 classrooms connected to the Internet.

RESOURCES	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
<b>Students per computer</b>	3	4	4
<b>Internet-connected classrooms</b>	18	32	29

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

We have two mobile laptop carts with 20 laptops each and 30 desktop computers in our computer lab available for teachers to use. Our full-time library/computer technician maintains the computers and instructs teachers on how to use different kinds of software. She also helps students who come to the lab at lunchtime. Teachers bring their students to our computer lab once a week, where they learn to type, conduct research on the Internet, do math on simple spreadsheets, and create PowerPoint presentations. Students can also build their math, reasoning, and reading skills using special software that complements the curriculum.

All of our classrooms have at least three networked computers and a printer for students to use. Teachers have laptop computers that use the district’s wireless technology. All teachers have access to email and the Internet. They use computers to keep attendance, record grades, analyze test results, and correspond via email with parents and colleagues.

**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**

We use funds from California’s School Improvement Program to pay for aides who assist teachers in the classroom. We use state Supplemental Instruction funds for our afterschool help programs, in which teachers tutor students who are struggling academically. We used funding from the California English Language Acquisition Program to hire a bilingual classroom assistant who, along with the principal, runs the Read Naturally program for our struggling English Learners; we also used these funds to buy supplemental materials for our English Learners. Our PTA raises funds for classroom supplies, field trips, library books, and special assemblies through our annual fund-raisers. The Wiseburn Education Foundation raises money to help fund our credentialed music teacher.

**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 373 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)	\$4,277	\$4,351	-2%	\$5,300	-19%
Restricted funds (\$/student)	\$819	\$944	-13%	\$2,817	-71%
<b>TOTAL (\$/student)</b>	<b>\$5,096</b>	<b>\$5,295</b>	<b>-4%</b>	<b>\$8,117</b>	<b>-37%</b>

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	\$1,054,194	\$160,251	\$1,214,445	64%
Other staff salaries	\$198,959	\$85,124	\$284,083	15%
Benefits	\$251,985	\$38,216	\$290,201	15%
Books and supplies	\$17,837	\$21,262	\$39,099	2%
Equipment replacement	N/A	\$0	N/A	N/A
Services and direct support	\$72,293	\$644	\$72,937	4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,595,268</b>	<b>\$305,497</b>	<b>\$1,900,765</b>	

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 18 FTE teachers working in our school.

CATEGORY	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE
Salaries	\$64,990	\$64,515	1%	\$62,157	5%
Retirement benefits	\$5,003	\$5,405	-7%	\$6,557	-24%
Health and medical benefits	\$3,707	\$3,828	-3%	\$10,416	-64%
Other benefits	\$856	\$570	50%	\$453	89%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$74,556</b>	<b>\$74,319</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>\$79,583</b>	<b>-6%</b>

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	\$1,169,825	87%
Retirement benefits	\$90,051	7%
Health and medical benefits	\$66,730	5%
Other benefits	\$15,399	1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,342,005</b>	

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\_19-65169-6023816e/17227



## » 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
<b>TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR</b>			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	17	17	16
Number of classes which lacked a permanently assigned teacher within the first 20 days of school	0	0	0
<b>TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR</b>			
Number of classes where the permanently assigned teacher left during the year	0	1	0
Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher	0	1	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
<b>Teacher Misassignments</b>	Total number of classes taught by teachers without a legally recognized certificate or credential	0	0	0
<b>Teacher Misassignments in Classes that Include English Learners</b>	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	1
<b>Other Employee Misassignments</b>	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
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Good</b>	Our school is in good repair, according to the criteria established by the Office of Public School Construction. Our deficiencies are minor ones resulting from common wear and tear, and there are few of them. We scored between 85 and 97 percent on the 15 categories of our evaluation.
<b>1. Gas Leaks</b>	<b>Good</b>	No apparent problems.
<b>2. Mechanical Problems (Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning)</b>	<b>Good</b>	No apparent problems.
<b>3. Windows, Doors, Gates, Fences (Interior and Exterior)</b>	<b>Good</b>	No apparent problems.
<b>4. Interior Surfaces (Walls, Floors, and Ceilings)</b>	<b>Good</b>	No apparent problems.
<b>5. Hazardous Materials (Lead Paint, Asbestos, Mold, Flammables, etc.)</b>	<b>Good</b>	Peeling exterior paint. will be repainted during the summer break.
<b>6. Structural Damage (Cracks in Walls and Foundations, Sloping Ceilings, Posts or Beams Missing)</b>	<b>Good</b>	No apparent problems.
<b>7. Fire Safety (Sprinkler Systems, Alarms, Extinguishers)</b>	<b>Poor</b>	No apparent problems.
<b>8. Electrical Systems and Lighting</b>	<b>Good</b>	No apparent problems.
<b>9. Pest or Vermin Infestation</b>	<b>Good</b>	No apparent problems.
<b>10. Drinking Fountains (Inside and Out)</b>	<b>Good</b>	Adjustments required in classrooms 1-18. Work completed by 5/08.
<b>11. Bathrooms</b>	<b>Good</b>	sinks and partitions need repair. Will be completed during summer break.
<b>12. Sewer System</b>	<b>Good</b>	No apparent problems.
<b>13. Roofs</b>	<b>Good</b>	No apparent problems.
<b>14. Playground/School Grounds</b>	<b>Good</b>	No apparent problems.
<b>15. Overall Cleanliness</b>	<b>Good</b>	No apparent problems.
<b>Other Deficiencies</b>	<b>N/A</b>	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 Tuesday, September 30, 2008. There were no other inspectors used in the completion of this form. The Facilities Inspection Tool was completed on Tuesday, September 30, 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	414
African American	14%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	2%
Filipino	2%
Hispanic or Latino	54%
Pacific Islander	1%
White (not Hispanic)	17%
Multiple or no response	10%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	39%
English Learners	21%
Students with disabilities	16%

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	141
Grade 4	123
Grade 5	150
Grade 6	0
Grade 7	0
Grade 8	0
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2007.

### Average Class Size by Grade Level

GRADE LEVEL	2005–2006	2006–2007	2007–2008
Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 3	20	20	20
Grade 4	30	30	31
Grade 5	29	30	29
Grade 6	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined K–3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 3–4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 4–8	N/A	25	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2007.

### Average Class Size by Grade Level, Detail

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

GRADE LEVEL	2005–2006			2006–2007			2007–2008		
	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+
Kindergarten	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade 3	7	1	0	7	0	0	8	0	0
Grade 4	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	5	0
Grade 5	0	4	0	0	4	0	0	5	0
Grade 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Combined K–3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Combined 3–4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Combined 4–8	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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
<b>With Full Credential</b>	18	19	19	113
<b>Without Full Credential</b>	1	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
<b>Boys in Fitness Zone</b>	35%	23%	26%
<b>Girls in Fitness Zone</b>	48%	30%	32%
<b>Fifth graders in Fitness Zone</b>	41%	26%	29%
<b>Seventh graders in Fitness Zone</b>	N/A	28%	30%
<b>Ninth graders in Fitness Zone</b>	N/A	36%	27%
<b>All students in Fitness Zone</b>	41%	27%	29%

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 elementary schools only.

**STUDENT PERFORMANCE**

**California Standards Tests (CST)**

The California Standards Tests (CST) show how well students are learning what the state content standards require. The CST include English/language arts and mathematics in grades two through five and science in grade five.

**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	57%	60%	58%	56%	56%	60%	42%	43%	46%
Mathematics	62%	54%	55%	53%	51%	50%	40%	40%	43%
Science	38%	43%	48%	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	MATHEMATICS 2007–2008	SCIENCE 2007–2008
African American	57%	47%	40%
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	79%	93%	N/A
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	54%	51%	43%
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	65%	67%	66%
Boys	53%	57%	51%
Girls	59%	53%	43%
Economically disadvantaged	52%	49%	41%
English Learners	23%	36%	21%
Students with disabilities	33%	45%	44%
Students receiving migrant education services	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 elementary schools in the state, while a statewide rank of 10 means that the school has an API in the highest 10 percent of all elementary 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	8	8	7
Similar-schools rank	10	8	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
<b>All students at the school</b>	+3	-2	-2	811
<b>African American</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>American Indian or Alaska Native</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Asian</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Filipino</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	+4	-3	-12	796
<b>Pacific Islander</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>White (non Hispanic)</b>	+7	+6	+14	847
<b>Economically disadvantaged</b>	+6	-5	+10	792
<b>English Learners</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	748
<b>Students with disabilities</b>	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
<b>FISCAL YEAR 2006–2007</b>			
Total expenses	\$15,413,105	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$7,301	\$7,789	\$8,117
<b>FISCAL YEAR 2005–2006</b>			
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 (elementary school)	\$108,636	\$97,851
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
HM Reading: A Legacy of Literature	Language Arts	2003	2003
Houghton Mifflin Lectura: Herencia y futuro	Language Arts	2003	2003
Harcourt Math	Math	2002	2002
Pearson California Science	Science	2007	2008
Pearson California Science - Spanish	Science	2007	2008
Houghton Mifflin	Social Studies	2006	2006