Linda Vista Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2008–2009

Alum Rock Union Elementary School District

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

Linda Vista Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2008–2009
Alum Rock Union 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 2008–2009 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_2009_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
100 Kirk Ave.
San Jose, CA 95127
Principal: Paddy Douglas
Phone: (408) 928-7800

How to Contact Our District
2930 Gay Ave.
San Jose, CA 95127
Phone: (408) 928-6800
http://www.arusd.org

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
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

©2009 Publishing 20/20

Linda Vista Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2008–2009
Alum Rock Union Elementary School District

Principal's Message

We are pleased to announce that we are now the Linda Vista Visual and Performing Arts Anchor School along with our partner Joseph George Middle School. We wish to thank Superintendent Manzo, The Board of Trustees, parents, staff, and community members for their wonderful support to make this dream a reality.

We believe that incorporating fine arts into the curriculum has both direct and indirect correlations to successful student achievement.

We will continue our strong academic focus with our strong team of outstanding educators.

We need your support and encouragement to assist your child in attending school on a regular basis and being on time. Helping your child to be responsible for returning schoolwork will lead him/her in the right direction towards a rewarding school year. Your encouragement and praise will give your child the confidence to make wise decisions.

We are confident in the professional abilities and commitment of our teachers to create an enriching learning experience for your child. We have a wonderful support staff that includes an administrative assistant, a school office assistant, cafeteria staff, custodians, bus drivers, and a librarian to contribute to your child's successful school year.

If concerns should arise, please contact your child's teacher first. Your school principal is also ready to assist, if necessary. Your child's successful educational experience is our business. We look forward to a wonderful school year with you!

Paddy Douglas, PRINCIPAL

Grade range and calendar
K–5
TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index
733
County Average: 820
State Average: 792

Student enrollment
704
County Average: 530
State Average: 518

Teachers
35
County Average: 26
State Average: 26

Students per teacher
20
County Average: 21
State Average: 20

School Expenditures

Linda Vista School offers intervention programs in reading language arts, and mathematics. The teachers identify students by name on the cusp of the California Standards Test (CST) in math and English Language Arts on the five performance levels (far below basic, below basic, basic, proficient, advanced) and provide in-class and before/after school intervention classes that specifically address student needs. Professional staff development is provided in differentiated instructional strategies in reading, math language arts and English Language Development. The intervention programs/strategies/personnel in place include:

Before/after school classes in language arts, reading, and mathematics in grades K-5

Saturday Academies for grades 2-5

Before/after school Homework Center in grades 1-5

Daily independent workshop time when teachers work with individual and small groups of students for thirty to forty minutes, using the Intervention Guides or the Re-teach sections of Imagine It!

Language! classes are held for grades 3-5, for students who are reading two or more grade levels below in reading language arts.

Flexible instructional grouping of English learners, Gifted And Talented Education, and under-performing students to allow for remediation and enrichment for a fifty minute block of time on a daily basis

Programs to teach students test-taking strategies

Literacy coach to support reading comprehension and fluency instruction

Extended school year for K-1 students

Small group intervention classes are held for grades 1 and 2 during choir two times a week

The following categorically funded services and personnel are utilized to help under-performing students meet state standards:

PERSONNEL

Full-time Literacy Coach to provide ongoing staff development, coaching, and direct assistance to students and teachers in the areas of assessment and remediation

Resource Teacher to provide services to targeted English learners with additional instruction and support

OTHER SERVICES

A school-wide rewards system recognizes student achievement, effort, attitude, and good attendance

Character Counts behavior modification/recognition program

YMCA daily homework center

Intervention programs for students at risk

Safety

To help ensure school safety, all visitors are required to check-in at the school office. In addition, the district provides extra yard duty supervisors, and all yard duty supervisors and school staff maintain a welcoming but controlled campus environment. The school grounds and playground are safe because they are well-supervised by staff before, during, and after school.

Safety programs for students include drug awareness, personal safety, and personal growth.

The San Jose Police Department Community Liaison assists the school principal with families who have truancy and supervision issues. A Student Attendance Review Board (SARB) is in place to reduce truancy.

Linda Vista Visual and Performing Arts Anchor School has a very detailed, comprehensive school safety plan that outlines protocols, systems, and procedures in the event of any/all emergencies. The plan also contains the yearly safety goals as determined by the students, staff, and parents. The Safety Plan is reviewed and revised annually by the Linda Vista Safety Committee before it is presented to the Alum Rock Union Elementary School District Board of Trustees for annual approval. It was last updated January 15, 2009. The Safety Plan and drill procedures are reviewed during the year with all staff. Safety alerts are shared with all staff as needed throughout the school year. In addition, all required drills (earthquake, fire, safety) are calendared and completed, and the results are shared with the staff.

The Linda Vista Safety Plan contains a comprehensive, enforceable, and continuous behavior policy, set of rules and regulations, dress code policy, protocols for safety/emergency drills, tardy policy, attendance policy, referral policy, Internet policy, and nondiscriminatory policy on student rights and responsibilities.

Buildings

The District makes every effort to ensure all schools are clean, safe, and functional. To assist in this effort, the district uses a facility survey instrument developed by the State of California Office of Public School Construction. The results of this survey are available at the school office and at the district office.

School facilities are being renovated according to the Field Act requirements of the State Building Code with a focus on earthquake safety. In the event that asbestos and lead containing building materials are found, they are removed according to Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), State, and Local requirements. Deferred maintenance funds have been used to properly maintain and renovate district buildings. Needed repairs and maintenance projects are completed in a timely manner.

Whenever possible, school facilities are upgraded to support and maintain a safe, clean and secure campus. Sufficient classroom, office, library, playground, staff space, and restroom facilities are allocated to support stakeholders' needs and the instructional program. The Alum Rock School District Maintenance and Grounds staff, in conjunction with day and night custodians, ensure the school buildings and grounds are safe, clean, and in good repair. Rigorous daily custodial schedules ensure that classrooms, lavatories, serving kitchens, eating areas, offices, and playgrounds are clean for both student and staff use. Regular oversight by district maintenance and grounds crews ensure that grass and landscaped areas are well maintained, and that the school's buildings, grounds and play areas are safe for use.

Safety fencing and steps were installed during the 2008-2009 school year, near the Hexplex bathroom area. In addition, Informational Technology installed a new clock/bell/PA system. The results of these renovations have improved our safety and have given us a more modern appearance.

During the 2009-2010 school year, our main student bathrooms will be modernized.

Parent Involvement

Linda Vista values and includes all stakeholders in all facets of the educational process. To encourage parent participation, Linda Vista maintains a system of two-way communication and employs a variety of ways to increase stakeholder communication. The School Accountability Report Card is available on the district's website, as well as pertinent school information, including school data and school programs. This information is also available to parents in the Principal's Newsletter, with is written in different languages. Because parent and community participation is essential to student achievement, Linda Vista School provides a number of parent and community involvement opportunities.

To ensure that all parents are directly involved in their children's education, Linda Vista School parents are informed about upcoming events and activities through grade level newsletters, the Principal Eagle Newsletter, Parent Teacher Association/Principal newsletter, and the school marquee. The following resources for parents are in place:

Parent literacy nights are conducted in Spanish and English for kindergarten and first grade parents. Teachers provide parent workshops on math skills for all students.

Community-based English Tutoring (CBET) is provided for parents who want to improve their English reading, writing, and speaking skills.

Student Success Team (SST) meets on an ongoing basis to pre-screen students with special needs.

A parent volunteer handbook was developed with the assistance of the PTA.

A room representative program ensures parent participation.

Bilingual PTA Community Liaison provides two-way communication to Spanish-speaking parents about school programs and activities.

Back-to-School Night in the fall helps parents understand the standards appropriate to their student's grade level and the procedures used to evaluate their student's progress.

Parent-teacher conferences are held in the fall and spring.

For further information, please contact the school principal, Paddy Douglas, at 408-928-7800.

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 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.

Linda Vista's API was 733 (out of 1000). This is a decline of 8 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.

CALIFORNIA
API
ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX

Met schoolwide growth target	**No**
Met growth target for prior school year	**No**
API score	**733**
Growth attained from prior year	**-8**
Met subgroup* growth targets	**No**

SOURCE: API based on spring 2009 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of December 2009.

*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 RANKINGS: Based on our 2007–2008 test results, we started the 2008–2009 school year with a base API of 741. 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 4 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 3 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 2008–2009 school year. Just for reference, 64 percent of elementary schools statewide met their growth targets.

API, Spring 2009



SOURCE: API based on spring 2009 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 12 out of 17 criteria for yearly progress. Because we fell short in five areas, we did not make 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): 46 percent on the English/language arts test and 47.5 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 650 or increase the API by one point from the prior year. Third, 95 percent of the student body must take the required standardized tests.

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

FEDERAL
AYP
ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

Met AYP	**No**
Met schoolwide participation rate	**Yes**
Met schoolwide test score goals	**No**
Met subgroup* participation rate	**Yes**
Met subgroup* test score goals	**No**
Met schoolwide API for AYP	**Yes**
Program Improvement school in 2009	**No**

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of December 2009. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2008–2009 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 46% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST?	DID 47.5% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST?
SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS	●	●	●	●
SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS				
Low income	●	●	●	●
Students learning English	●	●	●	●
STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY				
Hispanic/Latino	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of September 2009, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2008–2009 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**

TESTED SUBJECT	2008–2009 LOW SCORES	2008–2009 HIGH SCORES	2007–2008 LOW SCORES	2007–2008 HIGH SCORES	2006–2007 LOW SCORES	2006–2007 HIGH SCORES
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher		37%		38%		45%
Average elementary school Percent Proficient or higher		53%		47%		45%
MATH						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher		45%		53%		57%
Average elementary school Percent Proficient or higher		59%		55%		53%
SCIENCE						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher		30%		36%		23%
Average elementary school Percent Proficient or higher		49%		47%		37%

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2009 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 53 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 59 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		37%	94%	**SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:** About 16 percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY		63%	97%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA		53%	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
Boys		35%	220	**GENDER:** About three percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls		38%	206	
English proficient		50%	218	**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		22%	208	
Low income		32%	309	**INCOME:** About 17 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income		49%	117	
Learning disabled		9%	35	**LEARNING DISABILITIES:** Students classified as learning disabled scored lower than students without learning disabilities. The CST is not designed to test the progress of students with moderate to severe learning differences.
Not learning disabled		38%	391	
Asian American	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	29	**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		33%	330	
White/Other		83%	36	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2009 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.

Three-Year Trend: English/Language Arts



Percentage of students who took the test:
2007: 100%
2008: 93%
2009: 94%

SOURCE: CDE STAR research file: 2007, 2008, and 2009.

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		45%	96%	**SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:** About 14 percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY		69%	96%	
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		43%	226	**GENDER:** About four percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls		47%	208	
English proficient		55%	222	**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		34%	212	
Low income		42%	315	**INCOME:** About 11 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income		53%	119	
Learning disabled		9%	44	**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		48%	390	
Asian American	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	29	**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		40%	337	
White/Other		62%	37	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2009 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



SOURCE: CDE STAR research file: 2007, 2008, and 2009.

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		30%	93%	**SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:** About 19 percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY		61%	96%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA		49%	95%	

Subgroup Test Scores

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES / HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys		35%	48	**GENDER:** About 11 percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls		24%	45	
English proficient		47%	55	**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		5%	38	
Low income		24%	58	**INCOME:** About 16 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income		40%	35	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE	N/A	6	**LEARNING DISABILITIES:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled		31%	87	
Hispanic/Latino		25%	75	**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.

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2009 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



SOURCE: CDE STAR research file: 2007, 2008, and 2009.

STUDENTS

Students' English Language Skills

At Linda Vista, 53 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared with 68 percent of elementary school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	53%	64%	68%
English Learners	47%	36%	32%

SOURCE: Language Census for school year 2008–2009. 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 329 students classified as English Learners. At Linda Vista, 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	86%	64%	84%
Vietnamese	6%	14%	3%
Cantonese	2%	2%	1%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	3%	3%	2%
Korean	0%	1%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	1%	0%
All other	3%	15%	8%

SOURCE: Language Census for school year 2008–2009. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

Ethnicity

Most students at Linda Vista identify themselves as Hispanic/Latino. In fact, there are about seven times as many Hispanic/Latino students as Asian/Pacific Islander students, the second-largest ethnic group at Linda Vista. 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	2%	3%	7%
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	11%	32%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	77%	39%	50%
White/European American/ Other	10%	27%	32%

SOURCE: CBEDS census of October 2008. 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 $39,220 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2008–2009 school year. At Linda Vista, 72 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 56 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	72%	41%	56%
Parents with some college	46%	66%	55%
Parents with college degree	17%	46%	31%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2008–2009 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 46 percent of the students at Linda Vista have attended college and 17 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 59 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 Linda Vista varies across grade levels from a low of 18 students to a high of 33. Our average class size schoolwide is 21 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
Kindergarten	19	20	20
First grade	18	19	19
Second grade	18	19	19
Third grade	20	20	20
Fourth grade	33	29	28
Fifth grade	32	29	29

SOURCE: CBEDS census, October 2008. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

Discipline

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
Suspensions per 100 students			
2008–2009	1	2	5
2007–2008	1	3	6
2006–2007	5	4	5
Expulsions per 100 students			
2008–2009	0	0	0
2007–2008	0	0	0
2006–2007	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 2008–2009 school year, we had eight 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.

LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

Teacher Experience and Education

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Teaching experience	Average years of teaching experience	10	12	13
Newer teachers	Percentage of teachers with one or two years of teaching experience	23%	14%	9%
Teachers holding an MA degree or higher	Percentage of teachers with an MA or higher from a graduate school	17%	32%	36%
Teachers holding a BA degree alone	Percentage of teachers whose highest degree is a BA degree from a four-year college	83%	68%	64%

SOURCE: Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF), October 2008, completed by teachers during the CBEDS census. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

About 23 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 83 percent of our teachers hold only a bachelor's degree from a four-year college or university. About 17 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	91%	96%	98%
Trainee credential holders	Percentage of staff holding an internship credential	11%	3%	2%
Emergency permit holders	Percentage of staff holding an emergency permit	3%	1%	1%
Teachers with waivers	Lowest level of accreditation, used by districts when they have no other option	0%	0%	1%

SOURCE: PAIF, October 2008. 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.

About 91 percent of the faculty at Linda Vista hold a full credential. This number is lower than the average for all elementary schools in the state. About 11 percent of the faculty at Linda Vista hold 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. About three percent of our faculty hold an emergency permit. Very few elementary school teachers hold this authorization statewide (just one percent). About 94 percent of the faculty at Linda Vista hold the elementary (multiple-subject) credential. This number is above the average for elementary schools in California, which is 90 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	9%	4%	2%

SOURCE: Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF) of October 2008. 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. About nine percent of our teachers were working without full credentials, compared with two percent of teachers in elementary schools statewide.

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.

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 the most low-income students	First quartile of schools whose core courses are not taught by "highly qualified" teachers	1%
Schools with the fewest low-income students	Fourth quartile of schools whose core courses are not taught by "highly qualified" teachers	N/A

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

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 one percent, compared with one percent statewide. For schools with the highest percentage of low-income students, this factor is one percent, compared with zero percent statewide.

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	0.33
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.0
Speech/language/ hearing specialists	1.0
Resource specialists	0.0

SOURCE: CBEDS census, October 2008.

TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY: All data is the most current available as of December 2009. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2008–2009 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 2008 census); Language Census (March 2009); California Achievement Test and California Standards Tests (spring 2009 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (September 2009 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (September 2009).

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.

rev20091216_43-69369-6046213e/23822

Adequacy of Key Resources

Here you'll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2009–2010. Please note that these facts are based on evaluations our staff conducted in accordance with the Williams legislation.

This section also contains information about 2008–2009 staff development days, and, for high schools, percentages of seniors who met our district's graduation requirements.

TEACHERS

Teacher Vacancies

KEY FACTOR	2007–2008	2008–2009	2009–2010
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	29	30	30
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:

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.

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	2007–2008	2008–2009	2009–2010
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:.

Staff Development

Teachers take some time each year to improve their teaching skills and to extend their knowledge of the subjects they teach. Here you'll see the amount of time each year we set aside for their continuing education and professional development.

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
2008–2009	0.00
2007–2008	0.00
2006–2007	0.00

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 call for.

This information was collected on 10/01/2008.

NOTES:

		ARE THERE TEXTBOOKS OR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN USE?		ARE THERE ENOUGH BOOKS FOR EACH STUDENT?	
TAUGHT AT OUR SCHOOL?	SUBJECT	STANDARDS ALIGNED?	OFFICIALLY ADOPTED?	FOR USE IN CLASS?	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS HAVING BOOKS TO TAKE HOME?
☒	**English**	☒	☒	☒	100%
☒	**Math**	☒	☒	☒	100%
☒	**Science**	☒	☒	☒	100%
☒	**Social Science**	☒	☒	☒	100%
☐	**Foreign Languages**	☐	☐	☐	
☐	**Health**	☐	☐	☐	
☐	**Visual/Performing Arts**	☐	☐	☐	

Textbooks in Use

Here are some of the textbooks we use for our core courses.

SUBJECT AND TITLE	PUBLISHER	YEAR ADOPTED
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS		
Imagine It!	SRA	2008
Language 3rd Edition	Sopris West	2006
MATH		
California Math	Houghton Mifflin	2008
California Math Triumphs	Glencoe	2009
SCIENCE		
California Science	Pearson-Scott Foresman	2007
SOCIAL SCIENCE		
History-Social Science for California	Pearson-Scott Foresman	2006

FACILITIES

To determine the condition of our facilities, our district sent experts from our facilities team to perform an inspection using a survey called the Facilities Inspection Tool, which is 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.

INSPECTORS AND ADVISORS: This report was completed on 11/25/2009 by Ed Villarreal Jr.
The most recent facilities inspection occurred on 11/13/2009.

ADDITIONAL INSPECTORS: John Colendich.

AREA	RATING	REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED
Overall Rating	**Fair**	No apparent problems
A. Systems	**Good**	
1. Gas	**Good**	No apparent problems
2. Mechanical/HVAC	**Poor**	Mechancial Room (first wing) exposed wires; Mechanical Room (second wing) used for storage- very cluttered; dirty heater flue in room 4
3. Sewer	**Good**	No apparent problems
B. Interior Surfaces	**Fair**	
1. Interior Surfaces	**Fair**	Major water stains (rooms K1,3,18, 19, Administration Office, Nurse's Office); hole in Vice Principal's Office (missing clock or speaker)
C. Cleanliness	**Fair**	
1. Overall cleanliness	**Fair**	No apparent problems
2. Pest/Vermin	**Fair**	No apparent problems
D. Electrical Components	**Fair**	
1. Electrical Components	**Fair**	Ballasts out (rooms 13, 14, 25)
E. Restrooms/Fountains	**Fair**	
1. Restrooms	**Fair**	Hexplex restrooms (overall appearance uncleanliness, dryer hanging from wall, broken soap dispeners)
2. Drinking Fountains	**Good**	No apparent problems
F. Safety	**Good**	
1. Fire Safety	**Good**	No apparent problems

AREA	RATING	REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED
2. Hazardous Materials	**Good**	No apparent problems
G. Structural	**Fair**	
1. Structural Damage	**Fair**	Damage to outside wall in Hexplex
2. Roofs/Gutters	**Fair**	Possible roof leaks (stains)
H. External	**Good**	
1. Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences	**Fair**	Front Adminstrator's Office door needs work
2. Playgrounds/School Grounds	**Good**	No apparent problems

SCHOOL FINANCES, 2007–2008

We are required to report financial data from the 2007–2008 school year by the California Dept. of Education. More recent financial data is available on request from the district office.

Spending per Student

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) for the 2007-2008 school year.

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.

Next to the figures for the district and state averages, we show the percentage by which the school's spending varies from the district and state averages. For example, we calculate the school's variance from the district average using this formula:

$$\frac{\text{(SCHOOL AMOUNT – DISTRICT AVERAGE)}}{\text{DISTRICT AVERAGE}}$$

TYPE OF FUNDS	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE
Unrestricted funds ($/student)	$5,868.00	$5,928.00	-1.01%	$5,495.00	6.79%
Restricted funds ($/student)	$2,924.00	$3,236.00	-9.64%	$3,099.00	-5.65%
Total ($/student)	$8,793.00	$9,164.00	-4.05%	$8,594.00	2.32%

Compensation for Staff with Teaching Credentials

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we report our compensation per full-time equivalent (FTE) certificated staff.* 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.

CERTIFICATED STAFF*	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE
Salary ($/certificated staff)	$56,811.00	$65,216.00	-12.89%	$72,020.00	-21.12%
Benefits ($/certificated staff)	$12,915.00	$13,472.00	-4.13%	$15,548.00	-16.93%
Total ($/certificated staff)	$69,726.00	$78,688.00	-11.39%	$87,568.00	-20.38%

* 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.

» Data Almanac

This Data Almanac provides more-detailed information than the School Accountability Report Card as well as 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	704
African American	2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	6%
Filipino	4%
Hispanic or Latino	77%
Pacific Islander	1%
White (not Hispanic)	9%
Multiple or no response	0%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	67%
English Learners	49%
Students with disabilities	13%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CBEDS, October 2008. 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	135
Grade 1	118
Grade 2	137
Grade 3	107
Grade 4	103
Grade 5	104
Grade 6	0
Grade 7	0
Grade 8	0
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2008.

Average Class Size by Grade Level

GRADE LEVEL	2006–2007	2007–2008	2008–2009
Kindergarten	20	19	19
Grade 1	20	20	18
Grade 2	19	20	18
Grade 3	19	21	20
Grade 4	36	32	33
Grade 5	30	33	32
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	20	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: CBEDS, October 2008.

Average Class Size by Grade Level, Detail

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

	2006–2007			2007–2008			2008–2009		
GRADE LEVEL	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+
Kindergarten	5	1	0	5	1	0	6	0	0
Grade 1	4	2	0	4	2	0	6	0	0
Grade 2	5	1	0	3	2	0	7	0	0
Grade 3	5	0	0	4	1	0	5	0	0
Grade 4	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	1	2
Grade 5	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	2	1
Grade 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Combined K–3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Combined 3–4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Combined 4–8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2008.

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.

	SCHOOL			DISTRICT
TEACHERS	2006–2007	2007–2008	2008–2009	2008–2009
With Full Credential	33	31	32	647
Without Full Credential	2	5	3	87

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2008, 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 four, five, and all six tests. More information about **physical fitness testing and standards** is available on the CDE Web site.

	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING HEALTHY FITNESS ZONES		
GRADE LEVEL	FOUR OF SIX STANDARDS	FIVE OF SIX STANDARDS	SIX OF SIX STANDARDS
Grade 5	16%	34%	34%
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. Data is reported by Educational Data Systems.

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.

	SCHOOL PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			DISTRICT PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			STATE PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
SUBJECT	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**
English/ language arts	45%	37%	36%	33%	35%	38%	43%	46%	50%
Mathematics	57%	53%	44%	41%	43%	47%	40%	43%	46%
Science	23%	36%	29%	27%	37%	38%	38%	46%	50%

SOURCE: California Standards Tests (CST) results, spring 2009 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

STAR Test Results by 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.

	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
STUDENT GROUP	**ENGLISH/ LANGUAGE ARTS 2008–2009**	**MATHEMATICS 2008–2009**	**SCIENCE 2008–2009**
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	48%	69%	N/A
Filipino	53%	53%	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	33%	40%	25%
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	53%	58%	N/A
Boys	34%	42%	33%
Girls	39%	46%	24%
Economically disadvantaged	32%	41%	23%
English Learners	22%	34%	5%
Students with disabilities	23%	20%	15%
Students receiving migrant education services	8%	42%	N/A

SOURCE: California Standards Tests (CST) results, spring 2009 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

NAEP: California's 4th and 8th Graders Compared to Students Nationally

Federal education officials want parents to understand how their state's students compare to students nationally. For this purpose, they created the test called the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). It is sometimes called the Nation's Report Card. Students in grades four, eight, and twelve take this test in nine subject areas. The NAEP test results are not valid for schools or districts. For that reason, you only see results below for students statewide.

Reading and Math Results

This table shows the average NAEP score (scores range from zero to 500) for the state and the nation, and the percentage of California students grouped into each of three achievement levels (Basic, Proficient, and Advanced). We compare our state's fourth and eighth graders with their peers in the U.S. in reading and math.

	AVERAGE SCALE SCORE		PERCENTAGE OF CA STUDENTS AT EACH ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL		
SUBJECT AND GRADE LEVEL	STATE	NATIONAL	BASIC	PROFICIENT	ADVANCED
Reading 2007, Grade 4	209	220	30%	18%	5%
Reading 2007, Grade 8	251	261	41%	20%	2%
Mathematics 2007, Grade 4	232	239	41%	25%	5%
Mathematics 2007, Grade 8	270	282	36%	18%	5%

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

Participation Rates for Students with Disabilities and English Learners

This table shows the percentage of the nation's and California's students with disabilities and English Learners who took the test called the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

	STATE PARTICIPATION RATE		NATIONAL PARTICIPATION RATE	
SUBJECT AND GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	ENGLISH LEARNERS	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	ENGLISH LEARNERS
Reading 2007, Grade 4	74%	93%	65%	80%
Reading 2007, Grade 8	78%	92%	66%	77%
Mathematics 2007, Grade 4	79%	96%	84%	94%
Mathematics 2007, Grade 8	85%	96%	78%	92%

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

For further information, you can read what the California Department of Education says about the **differences between the California Standards Tests and the National Assessment of Educational Progress**. The NAEP Web site includes background information for parents about the **Nation's Report Card**. Educators can learn more by going to the **NAEP Web site**.

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	2006–2007	2007–2008	2008–2009
Statewide rank	5	6	4
Similar-schools rank	8	9	3

SOURCE: The API Base Report from August 2009.

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.

	ACTUAL API CHANGE			API
SUBGROUP	2006–2007	2007–2008	2008–2009	2008–2009
All students at the school	+21	-28	-8	733
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
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	+13	-25	-9	716
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Economically disadvantaged	+19	-21	-3	710
English Learners	+8	-27	-16	709
Students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in October 2009.

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 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	Yes
Participation rate in mathematics	Yes
Percent Proficient in English/language arts	No
Percent Proficient in mathematics	No
Met Academic Performance Index (API)	Yes

SOURCE: The AYP Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2009.

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	3 of 3
The year the district entered PI	2004
Number of schools currently in PI	7
Percentage of schools currently in PI	25%

SOURCE: The Program Improvement Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2009.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES

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 2008–09 data in most cases. Therefore, 2007–08 data are used for report cards prepared during 2009–10."

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 2007–2008			
Total expenses	$124,016,638	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	$9,148	$8,267	$8,594
FISCAL YEAR 2006–2007			
Total expenses	$111,397,673	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	$8,491	$7,789	$8,117

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

District Salaries, 2007–2008

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2007–2008 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	$46,567	$41,866
Midrange teacher's salary	$72,497	$68,220
Highest-paid teacher's salary	$84,619	$86,536
Average principal's salary (elementary school)	$97,379	$107,858
Superintendent's salary	$198,739	$178,938
Percentage of budget for teachers' salaries	41%	42%
Percentage of budget for administrators' salaries	7%	6%

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

rev20100119_43-69369-6046213e/23822