

Peter Burnett School

School Accountability Report Card, 2011–2012
Wiseburn Elementary School District



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



Published by
SCHOOL WISE PRESS

Peter Burnett School

School Accountability Report Card, 2011–2012 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 2011–2012 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.

Please note that words that appear in a smaller, bold typeface are links in the online version of this report to more information. You can find a list of those linked words and their Web page URLs at:

http://www.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links_2012_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, or would like to request a hardcopy version, please contact our 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 2012–2013](#)
[Data Almanac](#)



Published by
SCHOOL WISE PRESS
466 Green Street, Suite 303
San Francisco, CA 94133
Phone: (415) 432-7800
www.schoolwisepress.com

©2012 Publishing 20/20

Peter Burnett School

School Accountability Report Card, 2011–2012
Wiseburn Elementary School District

» Principal's Message

Peter Burnett Elementary School 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 through five.

In 2011–2012 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. The Accelerated Reader Program provided opportunities for our students to soar academically. All Burnett students were able to increase their vocabulary by participating in the Accelerated Reader Program.

The staff continued to implement professional learning communities, whereby teachers and staff collaborate monthly to improve student achievement. We also implemented Response to Intervention, where students receive immediate and specific academic and behavioral assistance if they require it.

There are many reasons why Peter Burnett students are successful. Parents, teachers, and community members are all committed to preparing our children for the future. By understanding what our children need, we have been able to add more programs to ensure success.

The 2011–2012 School Year has brought in more parents to support our Growing Great Program that teaches principles of good nutrition. The parents again took the lead in our Hands-on Art Program, assisting with lessons in classrooms and providing valuable insight to children. There are many wonderful aspects of Peter Burnett School.

Laura Sullivan, PRINCIPAL

**Grade range
and calendar**

3–5

TRADITIONAL

**Academic
Performance Index**

872

County Average: 815

State Average: 814

Student enrollment

405

County Average: 607

State Average: 535

Major Achievements

- We continue to focus our efforts on improving the scores of our English Learners and have noticed great improvement.
- Our math and reading support for students who need academic support proved to be successful.
- All of our teachers focus on Accelerated Reader, which helps students, grow academically. Our fourth grade teachers focused on improving student writing. Teachers used the Six-Traits Writing Assessment along with Step Up to Writing. Our fourth grade students scored in the 90 percent range.
- Many of our students participated in the Los Angeles County Spelling Bee and are anxiously waiting to show their skills during the 2012-2013 School Year.

Focus for Improvement

- Teachers will continue to embrace the concept of professional learning communities based on the work of Richard and Rebecca DuFour. We are working with grade-level teams along with our Common Core consultants to keep teachers abreast of changing standards and Common Core practices. Our Response to Intervention (RTI) model for teachers is used to provide immediate feedback to support academic and behavioral concerns. 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 proficiency on grade-level goals.
- 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.

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. 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 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 872 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 12 points compared with 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 2010–2011 test results, we started the 2011–2012 school year with a base API of 860. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared with all elementary schools in California, our school ranked 8 out of 10.

SIMILAR SCHOOL RANKINGS: We also received a second ranking that compared us with the 100 schools with the most similar students, teachers, and class sizes. Compared with these schools, our school ranked 7 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 met our assigned growth targets during the 2011–2012 school year. Just for reference, 59 percent of elementary schools statewide met their growth targets.

CALIFORNIA API ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
Met schoolwide growth target	Yes
Met growth target for prior school year	Yes
API score	872
Growth attained from prior year	+12
Met subgroup* growth targets	Yes

SOURCE: API based on spring 2012 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of December 2012.

*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. N/A - Results not available.

API, Spring 2012



SOURCE: API based on spring 2012 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 21 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), the California Modified Assessment (CMA), and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA): 78.4 percent on the English/language arts test and 79.0 percent on the math test. All ethnic, English Learners, special education, and socioeconomic subgroups of students also must meet these goals. Second, the schools must achieve an API of at least 740 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	Yes
Met schoolwide participation rate	Yes
Met schoolwide test score goals	Yes
Met subgroup* participation rate	Yes
Met subgroup* test score goals	Yes
Met schoolwide API for AYP	Yes
Program Improvement school in 2012	No

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of October 2012. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2011–2012 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. 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, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 78.4% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 79.0% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?
SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS	●	●	●	●
SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS				
Low income	●	●	●	●
Students with disabilities	●	●	●	●
Students learning English	●	●	●	●
STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY				
Hispanic/Latino	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of October 2012, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2011–2012 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 AYP.

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 with 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 2012 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.

HOW HARD ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS? Experts consider California's standards to be among the most clear and rigorous in the country. Just 59 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 63 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			73%	96%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 14 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			58%	94%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			59%	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
Boys			67%	193	GENDER: About 13 percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			80%	193	
English proficient			78%	292	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: 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.
English Learners			57%	94	
Low income			64%	199	INCOME: About 19 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			83%	187	
Learning disabled			53%	45	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			76%	337	
African American			71%	48	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			70%	249	
White/Other			88%	50	
Two or more races	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	20	


SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 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
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			80%	96%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 17 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			63%	89%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			63%	90%	

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			79%	193	GENDER: About two percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			81%	191	
English proficient			83%	290	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: 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.
English Learners			69%	94	
Low income			72%	199	INCOME: About 17 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			89%	185	
Learning disabled			76%	45	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			80%	336	
African American			70%	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			79%	249	
White/Other			92%	48	
Two or more races	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	21	


SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 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.



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			78%	93%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 19 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			59%	92%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			59%	93%	

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			76%	54	GENDER: About three percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			79%	63	
English proficient			85%	90	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	27	
Low income			72%	68	INCOME: About 13 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			85%	49	
Learning disabled	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	15	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			77%	100	
African American	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	17	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			74%	77	
White/Other	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	13	


SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 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.



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 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.

STUDENTS

Students' English Language Skills

At Burnett, 84 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared with 70 percent of elementary school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	84%	68%	70%
English Learners	16%	32%	30%

SOURCE: Language census for the 2011–2012 school year. 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 65 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	89%	88%	84%
Vietnamese	3%	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%	6%	9%

SOURCE: Language census for the 2011–2012 school year. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

Ethnicity

Most students at Burnett identify themselves as Hispanic/Latino. In fact, there are about five times as many Hispanic/Latino students as White students, the second-largest ethnic group at Burnett. The state of California allows citizens to choose more than one ethnic identity, or to select “two or more races” 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	12%	8%	6%
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	4%	10%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	65%	65%	53%
White	13%	15%	25%

SOURCE: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), October 2011. 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 \$41,348 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2011–2012 school year. At Burnett, 52 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 58 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	52%	65%	58%
Parents with some college	77%	50%	57%
Parents with college degree	46%	29%	33%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2011–2012 school year. Parents' education level is collected in the spring at the start of testing. Rarely do all students answer these questions.

The parents of 77 percent of the students at Burnett have attended college and 46 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 92 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 27 students to a high of 32. Our average class size schoolwide is 29 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY GRADE	OUR SCHOOL	OUR DISTRICT
Third grade	28	28
Fourth grade	32	31
Fifth grade	27	28

SOURCE: California Department of Education, SARC Research File. District averages represent elementary schools only.

Safety

The Burnett staff monitors the school grounds for 10 minutes before and 15 minutes after school as well as at all recesses and 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, where they sign in and receive a Burnett badge to wear throughout their stay.

Our School Safety Plan is revised annually. We last revised it in October 2012. The School Safety Plan includes procedures for emergencies, exit routes, and inventories of emergency supplies. The plan is available to all community members and is located in the main office. The Burnett Staff has an opportunity to discuss the plan and participate in school drills and staff meetings related to our school safety plan. We conduct fire, intruder lockdown, shelter-in-place, and earthquake drills monthly. During the fall we participate in the annual earthquake simulation drill (The Great Shakeout).

Discipline

We abide by our district's 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 Character Counts in the classroom. Teachers use logical consequences to monitor behavior and natural consequences that 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. We use white slips for school infractions. Students may be suspended or expelled in extreme situations.

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) provided by our PTA 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 thirty minutes.

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 core subjects (math, language arts, science, and social studies). Most teachers in grades four and five use the Homework Hotline to inform parents about nightly homework assignments 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 175 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 2:10 p.m. to make time for teacher collaboration and meetings. Our third grade students are on an Early Bird/Late Bird schedule, with some students attending from 8:30 a.m. to 2:10 p.m. and others attend from 9:20 a.m. to 3 p.m. All students attend school from 8:30 a.m. to 2:10 p.m. on Wednesdays. We also offer math and reading help, art, choir, band, and performing arts after school. 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 academic and financial decisions. Parents of English Learners are vital to our English Language Advisory Committee 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 in classrooms and also, support programs throughout the school. Mrs. Sweeney serves as a teacher liaison for our PTA. Parents sponsor both Hands-on-Art and Growing Great Programs. Parents participate in our annual Rock- It- For –Burnett/In and Out Concert. We also buy needed supplies with money from PTA fundraisers. 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

Laura Sullivan's fourth year as principal adds to the 18 years of experience as an administrator and 18 years as a classroom teacher.

Several groups help to make decisions that affect our school. Parents, teachers, administrators, and other school personnel compose our School Site Council, which makes many important budgetary decisions. Our English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC) includes parents of English Learners, who advise our School Site Council and help to shape programs for English Learners.

Our Leadership Team, made up of the principal and one teacher from each of the various grade levels, gather input from classroom teachers and help to create staff meeting agendas. Teachers meet bimonthly to analyze Common Core goals, student work, discuss teaching methods, make curricular decisions, and monitor the effectiveness of our programs.

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%
Fully credentialed teachers	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	100%	N/A	N/A
Teachers lacking a full credential	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	0%	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: This information provided by the school district. Data on NCLB standards is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file.

PLEASE NOTE: Comparative data (county average and state averages) for some of the data reported in the SARC is unavailable as of December 2012.

"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.

More facts about our teachers, called for by the 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 2012–2013 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.

When more than 40 percent of the students in a school are receiving subsidized lunches, that school is considered by the California Department of Education to be a school with higher concentrations of low-income students. About 70 percent of the state’s schools are in this category. When less than 25 percent of the students in a school are receiving subsidized lunches, that school is considered by the CDE to be a school with lower concentrations of low-income students. About 19 percent of the state’s schools are in this category.

DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT
Districtwide	Percentage of core courses not taught by “highly qualified” teachers (HQT)	1%
Schools with more than 40% of students from lower-income homes	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	1%
Schools with less than 25% of students from lower-income homes	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	0%

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

Staff Development

In 2011–2012 our teachers attended two days of staff development training during the school year. Staff Development days were devoted to learning about Common Core Standards, differentiated (customized) instruction, and Shared Best Practices/Writing. 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.

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
2011–2012	0.0
2010–2011	0.0
2009–2010	N/A

SOURCE: This information is supplied by the school district.

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 college-level courses 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

The table to the right lists the number of full-time equivalent qualified support personnel who provide counseling and other pupil support services in our school. These specialists often work part time at our school and some may work at more than one school in our district. 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)
Academic counselors	0.0
Behavioral/career counselors	N/A
Librarians and media staff	0.0
Psychologists	0.0
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.0
Speech/language/hearing specialists	0.0
Resource specialists	1.0

SOURCE: Data provided by the school district.

Specialized Programs and Staff

At Burnett students have many opportunities to participate in activities and afterschool programs. Chess club, intervention, homework support, Band, Drama, Student Council, and Dance are open to students in grades three through five. In March we hold a chess match between Burnett and Anza schools.

A counselor from Pepperdine University comes to our school once a week to meet with students individually and in groups depending on students' needs. She also leads Lunch Bunch (a student support group during lunch). Outside agencies offer many afterschool enrichment programs.

Gifted and Talented Education (GATE)

Our GATE program officially begins in the third grade. Students join this program if they have high scores on standardized and cognitive tests, or because their teachers or parents have recommended them for their exceptional academic abilities. Teachers work collaboratively to provide 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). The classes, which provide novelty, complexity, depth, and acceleration of learning, are conducted by STAR Education, a nonprofit organization.

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 2010–2011 we offered programs to students in grades three through five, some of whom 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. 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. Lunch Bunch counseling and group guidance are available weekly for students working on social skills, peer relations, and self esteem.

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 that includes parents and school staff. Its purpose is to monitor the English Learner program and give input on the master plan for student services. Next year we hope to continue our English class for parents.

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. Each classroom has four or more 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 projector. We also have a new computer media center with 35 computers.

We recently added a new MPR, kitchen, conference room and a classroom for our Rainbow River Program (before and after school childcare).

We have one full-time day custodian and two part-time custodians, who keep our facilities clean throughout the day and evening as needed.

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 [Facilities Inspection Tool](#) 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 started by our library technician. 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.

Our school librarian assisted boys and girls by providing Accelerated Reader tests for them, tracking new vocabulary words, and supporting them in the computer lab/Learning Resource Center. Several students along with our librarian formed a Reading Club and a Writing Club. Students use their lunch time to read, write, and discuss books. The students learned the power of a pen by publishing some of their original creations for the Wiseburn Library Writing Contest.

Computers

We have two computer labs 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 recess time. 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 four networked computers and a printer for students use. Teachers have laptop computers that use the district's wireless technology. All teachers have access to email and the Internet. Staff members 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 2012–2013 school year and whether those [textbooks](#) covered the California Content Standards.

Curriculum

For many 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 information about the content standards for each subject at each grade level on the Web site of the [California Department of Education \(CDE\)](#). California adopted new Common Core Standards for English/language arts and math in August 2010. However, the full implementation of those standards is still a few years off. Please refer to the [CDE FAQs](#) for details about the new standards.

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 in need of academic support. We use funding to support English Language Development and intervention classes. Read Naturally, Lexia, and Study Island are used to support both programs. Through our annual fund-raisers, our PTA raises funds for classroom supplies, field trips, library books, and special assemblies. The Wiseburn Education Foundation raises money to help fund our credentialed music teacher.

Spending per Student (2010–2011)

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 378 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)	\$4,243	\$2,604	63%	\$5,434	-22%
Restricted funds (\$/student)	\$900	\$1,058	-15%	\$2,889	-69%
TOTAL (\$/student)	\$5,143	\$3,663	40%	\$8,323	-38%

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.

* Districts allocate most of their costs to school sites and attribute other costs to the district office. When calculating the district average for school level spending per student, we include these district related costs in the denominator. This will often cause most schools to fall below the district average.

Total Expenditures, by Category (2010–2011)

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 (all certificated staff)	\$954,353	\$179,614	\$1,133,967	58%
Other staff salaries	\$232,545	\$95,615	\$328,160	17%
Benefits	\$234,745	\$45,825	\$280,570	14%
Books and supplies	\$90,265	\$17,131	\$107,396	6%
Equipment replacement	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Services and direct support	\$92,030	\$2,000	\$94,030	5%
TOTAL	\$1,603,938	\$340,185	\$1,944,123	

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.

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

Compensation per Staff with Teaching Credentials (2010–2011)

The total of what our certificated staff members earn appears below. A certificated staff person is a school employee who is required by the state to hold teaching credentials, including full-time, part-time, substitute or temporary teachers, and most administrators. You can see the portion of 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) certificated staff member. A teacher/administrator/pupil services person who works full time counts as 1.0 FTE. Those who work only half time count as 0.5 FTE.

CATEGORY	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE *	SCHOOL VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE
Salaries	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$74,075	N/A
Retirement benefits	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$6,062	N/A
Health and medical benefits	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$10,417	N/A
Other benefits	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$635	N/A
TOTAL	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$91,189	N/A

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.

* Districts allocate most of their staff costs to school sites, but attribute other staff costs to the district office. One example is a reading resource teacher or librarian who works at all school sites. When calculating the district average for compensation per staff member, we include these district related costs in the denominator. This will often cause most schools to fall below the district average.

Total Certificated Staff Compensation (2010–2011)

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 staff member.

CATEGORY	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL *
Salaries	\$1,133,967	80%
Retirement benefits	\$108,017	8%
Health and medical benefits	\$152,362	11%
Other benefits	\$20,191	1%
TOTAL	\$1,414,537	

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 December 2012. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2011–2012 school year after the publication date of this report. We rely on the following sources of information from the California Department of Education: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) (October 2011); Language Census (March 2012); California Standards Tests (spring 2012 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (November 2012 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (October 2012).

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.

rev20130109_19-65169-6023816e/17227

» Adequacy of Key Resources 2012–2013

Here you'll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2012–2013. 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	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	16	15	16
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, February 08, 2013.

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	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
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	0
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, February 08, 2013.

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?	FROM THE MOST RECENT OFFICIAL ADOPTION?	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, February 08, 2013.

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	Fair	Our school is not in good repair, according to the criteria established by the Office of Public School Construction. Some of our deficiencies are critical, or may be widespread. Maintenance or minor repairs are required in several areas. We scored between 75 and 90 percent on the 15 categories of our evaluation.
A. SYSTEMS	Good	
Gas Leaks		No apparent problems.
Mechanical Problems (Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning)		No apparent problems.
Sewer System		No apparent problems.
B. INTERIOR		
Interior Surfaces (Walls, Floors, and Ceilings)	Poor	[STATUS AS OF Sep 24 2012] Stained ceiling tiles
C. CLEANLINESS	Good	
Overall Cleanliness		No apparent problems.
Pest or Vermin Infestation		No apparent problems.
D. ELECTRICAL		
Electrical Systems and Lighting	Good	No apparent problems.
E. RESTROOMS/FOUNTAINS	Good	
Bathrooms		No apparent problems.
Drinking Fountains (Inside and Out)		No apparent problems.
F. SAFETY	Good	
Fire Safety (Sprinkler Systems, Alarms, Extinguishers)		No apparent problems.
Hazardous Materials (Lead Paint, Asbestos, Mold, Flammables, etc.)		No apparent problems.
G. STRUCTURAL	Good	
Structural Damage (Cracks in Walls and Foundations, Sloping		No apparent problems.

AREA	RATING	DESCRIPTION
Ceilings, Posts or Beams Missing)		
Roofs		No apparent problems.
H. EXTERNAL	Poor	
Playground/School Grounds		[STATUS AS OF Sep 24 2014] Play Surface Damage
Windows, Doors, Gates, Fences (Interior and Exterior)		No apparent problems.
OTHER DEFICIENCIES	N/A	No apparent problems.

INSPECTORS AND ADVISORS: This report was completed on Friday, February 08, 2013 by Wendy Tsubaki (Superintendent's Secretary). The facilities inspection occurred on Monday, September 24, 2012. We employed the following staff or businesses in completing this report: Mr. Bill Denney, Maintenance Manager, Wiseburn School District The Facilities Inspection Tool was completed on Friday, February 08, 2013.

» Data Almanac

This Data Almanac provides additional information about students, teachers, student performance, accountability, and district expenditures.



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	405
Black/African American	12%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	2%
Filipino	1%
Hispanic or Latino	65%
Pacific Islander	1%
White (not Hispanic)	13%
Two or more races	4%
Ethnicity not reported	1%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	52%
English Learners	34%
Students with disabilities	14%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CALPADS, October 2011. 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	143
Grade 4	133
Grade 5	129
Grade 6	0
Grade 7	0
Grade 8	0
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2011.

Average Class Size by Grade Level

GRADE LEVEL	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
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	21	24	28
Grade 4	31	31	32
Grade 5	30	30	27
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	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2011. Information for 2009–2010 provided by the school district.

Average Class Size by Grade Level, Detail

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

GRADE LEVEL	2009–2010			2010–2011			2011–2012		
	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+
Kindergarten	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 1	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 3	1	4	0	1	6	0	1	36	0
Grade 4	0	4	0	0	5	0	0	21	14
Grade 5	0	5	0	0	4	0	7	28	0
Grade 6	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined K–3	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 3–4	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 4–8	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2011. Information for 2009–2010 provided by the school district.

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
	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012	2011–2012
With Full Credential	18	18	N/A	N/A
Without Full Credential	0	0	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Information provided by school district.

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 shows the percentage of students at our school who scored within the "healthy fitness zone" on four, five, and all six tests. More information about [physical fitness testing and standards](#) is available on the CDE Web site.

GRADE LEVEL	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING HEALTHY FITNESS ZONES		
	MET FOUR OR MORE STANDARDS	MET FIVE OR MORE STANDARDS	MET ALL SIX STANDARDS
Grade 5	61%	48%	33%
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Physical fitness test data is produced annually as schools test their students on the six Fitnessgram Standards. This information is from the 2011–2012 school year.

Suspensions and Expulsions

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 2011–2012 school year, we had six 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.

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Suspensions per 100 students			
2011–2012	1	1	N/A
2010–2011	1	1	5
2009–2010	1	1	6
Expulsions per 100 students			
2011–2012	0	0	N/A
2010–2011	0	0	0
2009–2010	0	0	0

SOURCE: Data is from the Consolidated Application published by the California Department of Education. The numbers above are a ratio of suspension or expulsion events, per 100 students enrolled. District and state averages represent elementary schools only.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

California Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

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. We also include results from the California Modified Assessment and California Alternative Performance Assessment (CAPA).

STAR Test 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		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
English/ language arts	73%	66%	73%	72%	71%	73%	52%	54%	56%
Mathematics	71%	76%	78%	52%	51%	51%	48%	50%	51%
Science	76%	80%	78%	72%	81%	66%	54%	57%	60%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2012 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

STAR Test Results by Student Subgroup: Most Recent Year

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

STUDENT GROUP	STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	ENGLISH/ LANGUAGE ARTS 2011–2012	MATHEMATICS 2011–2012	SCIENCE 2011–2012
African American	71%	69%	82%
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	0%	0%	0%
Filipino	0%	0%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	69%	76%	74%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0%	0%	0%
White (not Hispanic)	88%	92%	100%
Two or more Races	82%	82%	0%
Boys	66%	77%	76%
Girls	79%	80%	79%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	63%	69%	72%
English Learners	57%	68%	52%
Students with disabilities	53%	64%	80%
Receives migrant education services	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2012 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. APIs 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 with 100 statistically matched schools that have similar teachers and students.

API RANK	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
Statewide rank	8	8	8
Similar-schools rank	10	10	7

SOURCE: The API Base Report from June 2012.

API Changes by Subgroup: Three-Year Comparison

API changes for all students and student subgroups: 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.

SUBGROUP	ACTUAL API CHANGE			API
	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012	2011–2012
All students at the school	+12	-3	+12	872
Black/African American	N/A	-34	+7	862
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	+21	-1	+22	865
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	N/A	+23	+16	923
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	-11	928
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	+20	-11	+15	838
English Learners	+26	+8	+20	842
Students with disabilities	N/A	+20	+19	773

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in November 2012. Students from all elementary, middle and high schools are included in the district and state columns for comparison.

API Scores by Subgroup

This table includes Academic Performance Index results for our school, our district, and the state.

SUBGROUP	SCHOOL		DISTRICT		STATE	
	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API
All students	393	872	1,933	882	4,664,264	788
Black/African American	47	862	395	892	313,201	710
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	N/A	2	N/A	31,606	742
Asian	9	N/A	56	905	404,670	905
Filipino	7	N/A	44	938	124,824	869
Hispanic or Latino	256	865	1,094	866	2,425,230	740
Pacific Islander	3	N/A	24	820	26,563	775
White (non Hispanic)	49	923	206	920	1,221,860	853
Two or more races	18	928	77	933	88,428	849
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	208	838	905	851	2,779,680	737
English Learners	132	842	412	828	1,530,297	716
Students with disabilities	69	773	258	776	530,935	607

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in November 2012. Students from all elementary, middle and high schools are included in the district and state columns for comparison.

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

(c) an API of at least 740 or growth of at least one point.

AYP for the District

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

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

SOURCE: The AYP Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in October 2012.

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 2012.

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 2010–2011			
Total expenses	\$16,558,725	\$8,497,573,732	\$46,278,595,991
Expenses per student	\$6,826	\$7,789	\$8,323
FISCAL YEAR 2009–2010			
Total expenses	\$15,986,887	\$8,704,399,331	\$47,205,560,698
Expenses per student	\$6,885	\$7,973	\$8,452

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

District Salaries, 2010–2011

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2010–2011 school year. This table compares our average salaries with 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	\$42,639	\$40,962
Midrange teacher's salary	\$70,238	\$63,212
Highest-paid teacher's salary	\$84,579	\$80,545
Average principal's salary (elementary school)	\$102,357	\$102,057
Superintendent's salary	\$166,701	\$152,557
Percentage of budget for teachers' salaries	45%	40%
Percentage of budget for administrators' salaries	6%	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	2008	2010
Pearson California Science	Science	2007	2008
Pearson California Science - Spanish	Science	2007	2008
Houghton Mifflin	Social Studies	2006	2006