



Joseph George Middle School

School Accountability Report Card, 2011–2012

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.



Published by
SCHOOL WISE PRESS

Joseph George Middle School

School Accountability Report Card, 2011–2012 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 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 middle school in the county and state to provide the most meaningful and fair comparisons. To find additional facts about our school online, please use the [DataQuest](#) tool offered by the California Department of Education.

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

277 Mahoney Dr.
San Jose, CA 95127
Principal: Melissa Howell
Phone: (408) 928-7600

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 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

Joseph George Middle School

School Accountability Report Card, 2011–2012
Alum Rock Union Elementary School District

» Principal's Message

Joseph George Middle School is located in East San Jose within the community of Alum Rock. George was designated a Visual and Performing Arts Anchor School (VAPA) in the spring of 2008. The integration of visual and performing arts instructional strategies began in fall of 2008 within the Social Studies and PE classes. VAPA strategies were used in English Language Arts in 2009, in mathematics in 2010, and in the sciences in 2011. Students who have not scored proficient or advanced in English Language Art are provided additional support during a block period. Joseph George Middle School offers students the opportunity to select a zero period PE class to meet elective requirements.

We are proud to offer the following elective classes: Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced Band, Drum Corps, Choir, Beginning, Intermediate and Advance Art, Historical Theater, Journalism, beginning and advanced Dance, and Leadership. Joseph George provides the staff, students, and parents a Showcase of student talent a minimum of twice a year at scheduled VAPA Showcase Events.

We utilize state approved curriculum in all subject areas and provide technology resources in the form of Promethean Technology interactive classrooms, computers, and teacher resources to enhance instruction. Each student receives core subject supplementary materials along with guides to effectively utilize them according to the standards being taught.

Our teachers have begun utilizing data to inform instruction by creating formative assessments through our academic data management systems—OARS and Cruncher. Through this process, we took steps to collaborate by department and create methods to increase student achievement. This endeavor is in the beginning phase, but we anticipate further enhancement in the future. In addition, trainings have been offered and completed by teachers in areas such as differentiation of instruction and effective teaching strategies.

To promote social and civic responsibility, students participate in Character Counts monthly activities. We also offer a variety of extracurricular programs such as, organized sports, arts and music. Every year, we hold a "Turkey Trot" race; a physical fitness exercise for students, parents, and staff. Students also participate in local VAPA Showcases and music concerts.

To completely support our students, along with our VAPA program, we offer an afterschool tutoring program. MESA (Mathematics, Engineering and Science Achievement) is a community-based afterschool math and science program. We also offer participation in our yearbook, Leadership, and the science fair; all of which give students opportunities to expand their knowledge and skills.

Grade range and calendar

6–8

TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index

725

County Average: 825

State Average: 791

Student enrollment

623

County Average: 716

State Average: 634

We want you to know that parents are important and valuable partners in the formal process of educating children. We find that the majority of our parents are working and we have been highly successful with “just-in-time” volunteering. We request assistance through our email list, our monthly meetings at the Principal’s Coffee and on our website. Parents assist us with teachers’ duplicating requests, mailers home at the beginning of school and financial support through fundraisers and donations. We feel highly supported by parents and guardians concerning the common goal of student academic improvement.

Our Back-to-School night, book fairs, English Learner Advisory Committee, Principal’s Coffee, School Site Council, Turkey Trot, sports events, awards assemblies, Open House, VAPA Showcases and promotion ceremonies are all well attended. We welcome parents to visit classrooms and participate in the planning and implementation of our activities and programs.

All of us at Joseph George Middle School are eager to work with you in creating the best educational experience possible. Please let us know how we can assist you and your family in this exciting journey!

Melissa Howell, PRINCIPAL

School Expenditures

The Joseph George Middle School, School Site Council convenes monthly to review the school budget and to assess program implementation and outcomes.

The following services are provided by the regular program to enable underperforming students to meet academic standards:

- Teachers identify at-risk or low-performing students and provide in-class intervention
- After school intervention programs provide additional instruction to students falling below benchmark in the areas of reading, writing and math

These additional services are provided for underperforming students to help them meet standards:

- Ongoing staff development is provided in differentiated instructional practices in the areas of reading language arts, math, and Visual and Performing Arts integration
- Teachers and principal meet to analyze and assess student data to determine if English learners are meeting standards
- Staff development is provided to help teachers improve instruction in language arts, writing, and math including the Step-Up-To Writing, Language! and Math Triumphs

Safety

Joseph George Middle School has a very detailed, comprehensive school safety plan that outlines protocols, systems, and procedures in the event of any/all emergencies. School grounds are carefully monitored by school staff at all times. Joseph George Middle School has a School Resource Officer (SJPD) five days a week for four hours a day, strategically coordinated around brunch, lunch and student dismissal times. Teachers supervise selected areas of the school before school, at brunch and lunch, and at student dismissal. All outer gates are closed and locked during the school day. The plan also contains the yearly safety goals as determined by the students, staff, and parents. The Safety Plan is developed by the George Safety Committee before it is presented to the Alum Rock Union Elementary School District Board of Trustees for annual approval. The plan was last approved in December 2011.

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 are calendared and completed, and the results are shared with staff. The George Safety Plan has a comprehensive, enforceable, and continuous behavior policy, set of rules and regulations, dress code policy, set of protocols for safety/emergency drills, tardy policy, attendance policy, referral policy, non-discriminatory policy on student rights and responsibilities, campus security policy, harassment policy, and Internet safety policy.

All visitors are required to check-in at the school office. Fire drills and disaster procedures are specifically outlined and regularly updated and practiced. Safety programs include drug awareness, personal safety, and personal growth. To ensure a safe environment, the district provides SJPD School Resource Officers. The school grounds and playground are safe because they are well-supervised by staff before, during, and after school.

The physical safety of the facilities is supervised through a district manager who supports three custodians and a landscaper. Our safety plan is part of our School Site Plan and is revised twice a year using a cycle of inquiry process. School Site Council members approve the plan and participate in its management. School rules are published in the free student handouts, posted on the school website, and available in the front office any time.

The staff reviews how to recognize and intervene in harassment and bullying at staff meetings each semester.

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.

George Middle School was built in 1970. 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.

School facilities are comprised of five classroom wings, an administrative building, cafeteria, boys/girls locker room, music building, dance studio, and community MESA classroom. 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 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 ensures that grass and landscaped areas are well maintained, and that the school's buildings, grounds and play areas are safe for use.

Maintenance, Grounds and the Custodial staff continues to work together to provide a safe, clean and well maintained learning environment to help support student achievement.

Parent Involvement

George values and includes all stakeholders in all facets of the educational process. We have many ways for parents to participate in the educational experience at Joseph George. To encourage parent participation, George maintains a system of open two-way communication and employs a variety of methods to increase stakeholder communication. Not only is the School Accountability Report Card available on the district's website and Joseph George Webpage, but pertinent school information, including results of the school evaluation process, school data, and school programs are also available to parents in the principal's monthly and weekly newsletters, which are written in English and Spanish.

Because parent and community participation is essential to student achievement, George School provides a number of parent and community involvement opportunities. Parents and community members are encouraged to become involved in all aspects of activity at Joseph George. Parents may participate in school committees such as School Site Council (SSC), English Learners Advisory Committee (ELAC), District English Learners Advisory Committee (DELAC), and the District Advisory Committee (DAC). The School Site Council is composed of parents, staff, and student representatives. This important committee reviews and revises the Single School Plan for Student Achievement. Other opportunities for parents to volunteer include helping in the library, assisting teachers in classrooms, chaperoning dances, coaching sports, organizing clubs or activities, and speaking to students about their jobs or hobbies.

Parents are also encouraged to attend Back-to-School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, Winter and Spring Concerts, various sport competitions, and Honors Night. Our Annual Winter Showcase held in December is attended by 500+ community members, parents, and students.

For more information, please contact the principal Mrs. Melissa Howell, at 408-928-7600.

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.

George's API was 725 (out of 1000). This is a decline of 13 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 738. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared with all middle 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 6 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 2011–2012 school year. Just for reference, 53 percent of middle schools statewide met their growth targets.

CALIFORNIA API ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
Met schoolwide growth target	No
Met growth target for prior school year	Yes
API score	725
Growth attained from prior year	-13
Met subgroup* growth targets	No

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 middle schools only.

NOTE: Only groups of students that represent at least 15 percent of total enrollment are calculated and displayed as student subgroups.

Adequate Yearly Progress

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

We met eight out of 17 criteria for yearly progress. Because we fell short in nine areas, we did not make AYP.

To meet AYP, middle schools must meet three criteria. First, a certain percentage of students must score at or above Proficient levels on the California Standards Tests (CST), 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	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	No
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 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 middle school in California. On the following pages we provide more detail for each test, including the scores for different subgroups of students. In addition, we provide links to the California Content Standards on which these tests are based. If you'd like more information about the CST, please contact our principal or our teaching staff. To find [grade-level-specific scores](#), you can refer to the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Web site. Other tests in the [STAR program](#) can be found on the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site.

California Standards Tests

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

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



SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 test cycle. State average represents middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.

Frequently Asked Questions About Standardized Tests

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

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

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			45%	89%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 14 percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			69%	94%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE 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			41%	306	GENDER: About nine percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			50%	249	
English proficient			59%	406	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			8%	149	
Low income			45%	555	INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested who were not from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	N/A	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	18	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			46%	535	
Asian American			75%	40	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.
Filipino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	27	
Hispanic/Latino			42%	456	


SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.

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

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

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

You can read the California standards for [English/language arts](#) on the CDE's Web site.



Math (Excluding Algebra)

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			37%	76%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 15 percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			60%	67%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			52%	71%	

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			34%	261	GENDER: About six percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			40%	214	
English proficient			50%	322	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			8%	153	
Low income			37%	475	INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested who were not from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	N/A	
Learning disabled			3%	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			38%	428	
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.
Filipino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	24	
Hispanic/Latino			32%	397	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.


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

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

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

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

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



Algebra I

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			29%	27%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 21 percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California. About six percent fewer students took algebra than did students in the average middle school in the state.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			63%	38%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			50%	33%	

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			30%	64	GENDER: About the same percentage of boys and girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			29%	45	
English proficient			32%	93	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	16	
Low income			29%	109	INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested who were not from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	N/A	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	3	LEARNING DISABILITIES: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled			29%	106	
Asian American	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	11	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			25%	87	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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

About 27 percent of our seventh and eighth grade students took the algebra CST, compared with 33 percent of all middle school students statewide. You can review the **math** standards on the CDE's Web site.



History/Social Science

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			29%	100%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 23 percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			62%	99%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			52%	98%	

Subgroup Test Scores

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


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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			33%	104	GENDER: About ten percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			23%	78	
English proficient			43%	115	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			3%	67	
Low income			29%	182	INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested who were not from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	N/A	
Learning disabled			8%	36	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			34%	146	
Asian American	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	12	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			27%	151	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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



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			54%	84%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About ten percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			74%	94%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			64%	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			59%	86	GENDER: About 12 percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			47%	66	
English proficient			72%	104	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			15%	48	
Low income			54%	152	INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested who were not from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	N/A	
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			55%	146	
Asian American	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	11	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			52%	124	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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



STUDENTS

Students' English Language Skills

At George, 70 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared with 83 percent of middle school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	70%	80%	83%
English Learners	30%	20%	17%

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

Languages Spoken at Home by English Learners

Please note that this table describes the home languages of just the 187 students classified as English Learners. At George, the language these students most often speak at home is Spanish. In California it's common to find English Learners in classes with students who speak English well. When you visit our classrooms, ask our teachers how they work with language differences among their students.

LANGUAGE	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Spanish	90%	74%	85%
Vietnamese	2%	10%	2%
Cantonese	0%	1%	1%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	7%	3%	2%
Korean	0%	1%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	0%	0%
All other	1%	11%	8%

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

Ethnicity

Most students at George identify themselves as Hispanic/Latino. In fact, there are about eight times as many Hispanic/Latino students as Asian/Pacific Islander students, the second-largest ethnic group at George. 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	1%	3%	7%
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	11%	30%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	84%	40%	50%
White	3%	23%	28%

SOURCE: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), October 2011. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

Family Income and Education

The [free or reduced-price meal](#) subsidy goes to students whose families earned less than \$41,348 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2011–2012 school year. At George, 80 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 55 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	80%	38%	55%
Parents with some college	37%	67%	57%
Parents with college degree	13%	48%	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 37 percent of the students at George have attended college and 13 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 95 percent of our students provided this information.

CLIMATE FOR LEARNING**Average Class Sizes**

The table at the right shows average class sizes for core courses. The average class size of all courses at George varies from a low of 21 students to a high of 23. Our average class size schoolwide is 22 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZES OF CORE COURSES	OUR SCHOOL	OUR DISTRICT
English	21	26
History	22	27
Math	21	24
Science	23	27

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

LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

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	7%	N/A	0%
Out-of-field teaching	Percentage of core courses taught by a teacher who lacks the appropriate subject area authorization for the course	8%	N/A	N/A
Fully credentialed teachers	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	84%	N/A	N/A
Teachers lacking a full credential	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	16%	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Data on NCLB standards is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file. Information on teachers lacking a full credential provided by the school district.

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.

TEACHING OUT OF FIELD: When a teacher lacks a subject area authorization for a course she is teaching, that course is counted as **out-of-field**. The students who take that course are also counted. For example, if an unexpected vacancy in a biology class occurs, and a teacher who normally teaches English literature (and who lacks a subject area authorization in science) fills in to teach for the rest of the year, that teacher would be teaching out of field.

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 16 percent of our teachers were working without full credentials.

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.

		CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT
DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	
Districtwide	Percentage of core courses not taught by “highly qualified” teachers (HQT)	5%
Schools with more than 40% of students from lower-income homes	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	5%
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.

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.

ACADEMIC GUIDANCE COUNSELORS: Our school has one full-time equivalent academic counselor, which is equivalent to one counselor for every 415 students. Just for reference, California districts employed about one academic counselor for every 656 middle school students in the state. More information about [counseling and student support](#) is available on the CDE Web site.

STAFF POSITION	STAFF (FTE)
Academic counselors	1.5
Behavioral/career counselors	1.0
Librarians and media staff	0.5
Psychologists	0.3
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.0
Speech/language/hearing specialists	0.5
Resource specialists	2.0

SOURCE: Data provided by the school district.

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.

rev20121220_43-69369-6068910m/24048

» 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.

This section also contains information about 2011–2012 staff development days, and, for high schools, percentages of seniors who met our district's graduation requirements.



TEACHERS

Teacher Vacancies

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	26	31	31
Number of classes that lacked a permanently assigned teacher within the first 20 days of school	0	2	0
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Number of classes where the permanently assigned teacher left during the year	1	0	5
Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher	1	0	0

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	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

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 we set aside for the past three years for their continuing education and professional development.

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
2011–2012	0.00
2010–2011	0.00
2009–2010	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 10/11/2012.

NOTES: Annual inspection confirms sufficient California standards-based textbooks for all students.

TAUGHT AT OUR SCHOOL?	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?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	English	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Math	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Social Science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Foreign Languages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Health	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Visual/Performing Arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Textbooks in Use

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

SUBJECT AND TITLE	PUBLISHER	YEAR ADOPTED
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS		
California Literature	Pearson	2010
Language! 4 th Edition	Sopris West	2009
MATH		
Prentice Hall California Math	Pearson	2008
California Math Triumphs	Glencoe	2009
SCIENCE		
Focus on Science	Glencoe/McGraw Hill	2007
SOCIAL SCIENCE		
History Alive!	Teacher's Curriculum Institute	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 10/22/2012 by Primo Velazquez. The most recent facilities inspection occurred on 10/22/2012.

ADDITIONAL INSPECTORS: There were no other inspectors used in the completion of this form.

AREA	RATING	REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED
Overall Rating	Good	No apparent problems
A. Systems	Good	
1. Gas		No apparent problems
2. Mechanical/HVAC		Replace water heater, B-Wing Custodian Room; A/C unit making a lot of noise, Rm B3; Check A/C, Rm C2; Heaters are not working, Gym Bldg.
3. Sewer		No apparent problems
B. Interior Surfaces	Good	
1. Interior Surfaces		Replace doorknobs under sink, Rm D3; Hole & sign of water damage on ceiling, Rm E8; Replace base board, Boys' PE Bldg., Girls' PE Bldg
C. Cleanliness	Good	
1. Overall cleanliness		Room used as storage. Previously a restroom. M5
2. Pest/Vermin		No apparent problems
D. Electrical Components	Fair	
1. Electrical Components		Replace balasts, Annex, Kitchen/Cafeteria, Office Faculty Room, B-wing Bookroom, Rm B4, C2, C3,C5, Womens' RR, P2, P3, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, Girls' PE Bldg, Boys' PE Bldg, Gym Bldg; Replace outlet covers, Rm C1, C2, D3, D4, D5, D7, Boys' PE Bldg., E7, M5; Lights out, Rm E2, E4; Replace light switches, Boys' PE Bldg.;Repair fixture, Girls' PE Bldg.
E. Rest Rooms/Fountains	Fair	
1. Rest Rooms		Leaking toilets, D-Wing Girls' RR, Boys' PE Bldg.; RR needs to be painted, Replace Soap/handtowel dispensers, B-Wing Boys' RR; Holes by toilets, D-Wing Girls' RR

2. Drinking Fountains	Good	Replace faucets, Annex, Kitchen/Cafeteria, Nurse's Office, Mens' RR, Womens' RR, Library, Rm C3, P1, P3, Girls' PE RR, B-Wing RR ; Replace bubler on sink, Rm B4, C1, Library, P2, D1, D2, D4, D5, D7; Sink is plugged, Rm E3; Water lines clogged with debree, Annex Bldg.
F. Safety	Good	
1. Fire Safety		Missing fire extinguisher, Rm P3, E8
2. Hazardous Materials		No apparent problems
G. Structural	Good	
1. Structural Damage		Replace ceiling tiles, Library, A2, B1, C1, P1, P2, D2, D4, D-Wing Custodian Room; Cracked ceiling tile, E2
2. Roofs/Gutters		No apparent problems
H. External	Good	
1. Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences		Siding panel is peeling off wall, Rm E2; Door is hard to open, Rm M5; Repair window glass by door, C5; Replace window glass, Annex Bldg.
2. Playgrounds/School Grounds		No apparent problems

SCHOOL FINANCES, 2010–2011

We are required by the California Dept. of Education to report financial data from the 2010–2011 school year. 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).

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:

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

TYPE OF FUNDS	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE
Unrestricted funds (\$/student)	\$4,916	\$5,585	-12%	\$5,434	-10%
Restricted funds (\$/student)	\$3,619	\$3,020	20%	\$2,889	25%
Total (\$/student)	\$8,534	\$8,605	-1%	\$8,323	3%

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)	\$58,506	\$66,851	-12%	\$74,075	-21%
Benefits (\$/certificated staff)	\$17,479	\$17,499	0%	\$17,115	2%
Total (\$/certificated staff)	\$75,985	\$84,350	-10%	\$91,189	-17%

* 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 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	623
Black/African American	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	6%
Filipino	5%
Hispanic or Latino	84%
Pacific Islander	0%
White (not Hispanic)	3%
Two or more races	0%
Ethnicity not reported	0%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	100%
English Learners	55%
Students with disabilities	13%

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	0
Grade 4	0
Grade 5	0
Grade 6	224
Grade 7	213
Grade 8	186
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2011.

Average Class Size by Core Course

The average class size by core courses.

SUBJECT	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
English	21	20	21
History	21	22	22
Math	21	23	21
Science	21	26	23

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

Average Class Size by Core Course, Detail

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

SUBJECT	2009–2010			2010–2011			2011–2012		
	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+
English	0	27	0	12	12	1	8	18	0
History	0	27	0	6	11	0	11	7	0
Math	0	27	0	6	11	0	7	11	0
Science	0	27	0	4	12	0	6	11	0

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2011. Data for 2009–2010 provided by the 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	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7	44%	25%	7%
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 136 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	22	20	N/A
2010–2011	19	23	16
2009–2010	13	19	18
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 middle schools only.

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. We also present three years' of data about the number of teachers who lacked the appropriate subject-area authorization for one or more classes they taught.

TEACHERS	SCHOOL			DISTRICT
	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012	2011–2012
With Full Credential	23	28	26	542
Without Full Credential	8	4	5	32
Teaching out of field	N/A	N/A	0	18

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

California Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

The California Standards Tests (CST) show how well students are doing in learning what the state content standards require. The CST include English/language arts and mathematics in grades six through eight; science in grade eight; and history/social science in grade eight. Student scores are reported as performance levels. 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	40%	45%	44%	42%	48%	52%	52%	54%	56%
History/social science	23%	43%	29%	36%	46%	46%	44%	48%	49%
Mathematics	30%	38%	35%	51%	57%	58%	48%	50%	51%
Science	52%	61%	54%	44%	53%	54%	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 SUBGROUP	STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			
	ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS 2011–2012	HISTORY/ SOCIAL SCIENCE 2011–2012	MATHEMATICS 2011–2012	SCIENCE 2011–2012
African American	0%	0%	0%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%	0%	0%	0%
Asian	73%	50%	68%	64%
Filipino	38%	0%	52%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	41%	27%	31%	52%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0%	0%	0%	0%
White (not Hispanic)	65%	0%	43%	0%
Two or more races	0%	0%	0%	0%
Boys	40%	33%	34%	59%
Girls	48%	23%	36%	47%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	44%	29%	35%	54%
English Learners	13%	3%	10%	15%
Students with disabilities	33%	8%	25%	0%
Receives migrant education services	42%	0%	33%	0%

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 middle schools in the state, while a statewide rank of 10 means that the school has an API in the highest 10 percent of all middle schools in the state. The similar-schools API rank reflects how a school compares with 100 statistically matched schools that have similar teachers and students.

API RANK	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
Statewide rank	3	3	4
Similar-schools rank	5	4	6

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	+10	+32	-13	725
Black/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	+31	+6	872
Filipino	N/A	+37	-18	733
Hispanic or Latino	+14	+32	-11	710
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	N/A	+86	-17	826
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	-1	+52	-13	725
English Learners	+14	+24	-13	665
Students with disabilities	N/A	+41	-33	563

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	583	725	9,067	785	4,664,264	788
Black/African American	7	N/A	169	733	313,201	710
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	N/A	19	789	31,606	742
Asian	37	872	1,071	889	404,670	905
Filipino	28	733	526	874	124,824	869
Hispanic or Latino	485	710	6,952	761	2,425,230	740
Pacific Islander	3	N/A	91	843	26,563	775
White (non Hispanic)	21	826	215	856	1,221,860	853
Two or more races	0	N/A	22	857	88,428	849
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	583	725	9,017	786	2,779,680	737
English Learners	314	665	5,904	759	1,530,297	716
Students with disabilities	85	563	1,267	634	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	No
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	3 of 3
The year the district entered PI	2004
Number of schools currently in PI	5
Percentage of schools currently in PI	19%

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	\$108,121,522	\$8,497,573,732	\$46,278,595,991
Expenses per student	\$8,850	\$7,789	\$8,323
FISCAL YEAR 2009–2010			
Total expenses	\$108,252,851	\$8,704,399,331	\$47,205,560,698
Expenses per student	\$8,736	\$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	\$46,567	\$41,246
Midrange teacher's salary	\$72,497	\$67,400
Highest-paid teacher's salary	\$84,619	\$85,481
Average principal's salary (middle school)	\$112,730	\$111,540
Superintendent's salary	\$198,000	\$180,572
Percentage of budget for teachers' salaries	43%	42%
Percentage of budget for administrators' salaries	7%	5%

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

