



William L. Sheppard Middle School

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013

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

William L. Sheppard Middle School

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013
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 2012–2013 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://pub.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links_2013_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

480 Rough and Ready Road
San Jose, CA 95133
Principal: Imee Almazan
Phone: (408) 928-8800

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 2013–2014](#)
[Data Almanac](#)



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

©2013 Publishing 20/20

William L. Sheppard Middle School

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013
Alum Rock Union Elementary School District

» Principal's Message

On behalf of the staff and administration, I want to welcome our new and returning students and families to Sheppard Middle School. This year, our energies will be focused on increasing student academic achievement by providing an excellent standard based curriculum and ensuring that all of our students are proficient and advanced. We are also implementing Common Core State Standards practices so that our staff and students are ready for the official arrival of the Common Core in 2014–2015.

Our committed and dedicated staff works hard to make certain that every student reaches his or her full potential. Teachers attend professional development throughout the year. In addition, Sheppard would not be the school that it is without the tremendous support of teachers, parents, and community.

I encourage all parents and guardians to get involved in their students' education by volunteering at the school, attending school events throughout the year such as parent cafes, parent-teacher conferences, and other community meetings.

In the classroom and beyond, the students and adults who comprise the Sheppard Middle School community make it an exceptional place in which to learn and teach. I invite you to visit our school, explore our website, or call us at (408) 928-8800 to learn more about our school and the spirit and pride of the Sheppard Trojans!

Imee Almazan, PRINCIPAL

Grade range and calendar

6–8

TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index

746

County Average: 825

State Average: 792

Student enrollment

738

County Average: 713

State Average: 626

School Expenditures

Sheppard Middle School provides the following categorical funded services to enable under-performing students to meet academic standards:

Implementation of intervention programs during school and after school focus on the needs of at-risk and underperforming students.

Intervention classes are scheduled for at-risk students scoring below proficiency levels in language arts and math during the advisory period.

Economic Impact Aid and Title III funds are used to fund school needs such as, but not limited to, professional development, assessments, technology, necessary school materials to enhance teaching and learning in the classroom, and off campus educational experiences for students.

Safety

Sheppard Middle 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 determined by the students, staff, and parents. The School 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.

The Sheppard School Safety Committee updates the plan before it is presented to the Alum Rock Union Elementary School District Board of Trustees for annual approval. The revised plan was last approved in February 2013. The School 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, conflict management policy, Internet safety policy, and an intervention policy.

The Safety Plan is revised and approved annually. In addition, there is before and after school supervision as well as coverage during brunch and lunch time. A school resource officer is on campus Monday through Friday. All visitors must report to the main office upon arrival in order to maintain the safety of our campus.

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.

Sheppard school was built in 1962. 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 the school's buildings. Needed repairs and maintenance projects are completed in a timely manner.

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 crews ensures that grass and landscaped areas are well maintained, and that the school's buildings, grounds and play areas are safe for use.

Although Sheppard's main school campus was constructed in 1962, portable buildings have been added to accommodate the growing school population and diverse program needs. During the 2007–2008 school year, local Measure G funds and state-matching funds were used to renovate existing facilities. Major projects for the past years included painting, heating, flooring, striping, roofing and renovation of boys and girls locker rooms and the boys and girls restrooms in the south end of the campus.

In June of 2012, through the collaborative work between the district and city of San Jose, Sheppard was the first school in the Alum Rock Union School District to have an all-weather track, football, and soccer field that the school and community have been actively using to promote health, exercise, and school and community events.

Parent Involvement

William L. Sheppard Middle School values and includes all stakeholders in all facets of the educational process. To encourage parent participation, Sheppard maintains a system of open communication and employs a variety of techniques to increase stakeholder communication. Not only is the School Accountability Report Card available on the district's website, but also pertinent school information, including results of the school evaluation process, school data, and school programs are posted on our school's website.

Because parent and community participation is essential to student achievement, Sheppard Middle School provides a number of parent and community involvement opportunities such as, but not limited to, Back-to-School Nights, parent teacher conferences, and math/literacy nights. Parent Cafes are held twice a month. The school has an active School Site Council that meets once a month. In addition, school beautification days allow staff, parents and students to come together to improve Sheppard facilities through cleaning and landscaping projects.

Parents are informed of school activities through an automated phone system called Parent Link and parents have access to the Home Access Center (HAC) online which informs them of their child's grades, absences and behavior. Parents can obtain their username and password by contacting the school secretary at 408-928-8800.

Parents who wish to volunteer at Sheppard Middle School are encouraged to contact our main office at 408-928-8800.

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.

CALIFORNIA API ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
Met schoolwide growth target	No
Met growth target for prior school year	Yes
API score	746
Growth attained from prior year	-27
Met subgroup* growth targets	No

Sheppard’s API was 746 (out of 1000). This is a decline of 27 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.

SOURCE: API based on spring 2013 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of December 2013.

API RANKINGS: Based on our 2011–2012 test results, we started the 2012–2013 school year with a base API of 773. 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.


*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.

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 2012–2013 school year. Just for reference, 39 percent of middle schools statewide met their growth targets.

API, Spring 2013



SOURCE: API based on spring 2013 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 ten out of 21 criteria for yearly progress. Because we fell short in 11 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): 89.2 percent on the English/language arts test and 89.5 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 770 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 2013	No

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of September 2013. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students’ test results in the 2012–2013 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 89.2% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 89.5% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?
SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS	●	●	●	●
SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS				
Low income	●	●	●	●
Students learning English	●	●	●	●
STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY				
Asian American	●	●	●	●
Hispanic/Latino	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of September 2013, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2012–2013 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 2013 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

HAVE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS KEPT UP WITH THE CHANGES IN WHAT WE TEACH? In two subjects, the answer is “yes,” and in two more the answer is “no.” The Common Core transition is the reason for this. The test questions in math and English/language arts in 2012–13 were likely to be less well aligned with the official standards for California curriculum than they were three years ago. But the test questions in social studies and science were just as well aligned in 2012–13 as they were in the past.

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 57 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			50%	89%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About seven percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			68%	94%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			57%	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			46%	345	GENDER: About nine percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			55%	308	
English proficient			61%	520	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			6%	125	
Low income			50%	653	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	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	18	LEARNING DISABILITIES: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled			51%	635	
Asian American			66%	196	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			63%	73	
Hispanic/Latino			39%	350	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 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			34%	79%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 17 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%	66%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			51%	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%	309	GENDER: The same percentage of boys and girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			34%	266	
English proficient			42%	434	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			10%	133	
Low income			34%	575	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			7%	43	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			36%	532	
Asian American			55%	148	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			47%	55	
Hispanic/Latino			24%	338	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 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			68%	20%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 16 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California. About 13 percent fewer students took algebra than did students in the average middle school in the state.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			64%	39%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			52%	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			63%	51	GENDER: About 11 percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			74%	50	
English proficient			68%	95	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	6	
Low income			68%	101	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	N/A	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			68%	101	
Asian American			81%	53	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	18	
Hispanic/Latino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	28	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 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 20 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			34%	98%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 19 percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			63%	99%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			53%	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			31%	136	GENDER: About six percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			37%	116	
English proficient			43%	190	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%	62	
Low income			34%	252	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	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	27	LEARNING DISABILITIES: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled			37%	225	
Asian American			56%	80	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	28	
Hispanic/Latino			15%	131	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 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			45%	88%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 19 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%	93%	
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			41%	120	GENDER: About eight percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			49%	108	
English proficient			53%	179	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			14%	49	
Low income			45%	228	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			45%	225	
Asian American			65%	77	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	28	
Hispanic/Latino			25%	112	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 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 Sheppard, 77 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared with 84 percent of middle school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	77%	82%	84%
English Learners	23%	18%	16%

SOURCE: Language census for the 2012–2013 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 168 students classified as English Learners. At Sheppard, 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	69%	74%	86%
Vietnamese	15%	9%	2%
Cantonese	1%	1%	1%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	10%	3%	1%
Korean	0%	1%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	2%	0%	0%
All other	3%	12%	8%

SOURCE: Language census for the 2012–2013 school year. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

Ethnicity

Most students at Sheppard identify themselves as Hispanic/Latino. 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	3%	3%	7%
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	38%	31%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	57%	40%	51%
White	1%	23%	28%

SOURCE: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), October 2012. 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 \$42,643 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2012–2013 school year. At Sheppard, 80 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 58 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	80%	39%	58%
Parents with some college	37%	67%	58%
Parents with college degree	18%	49%	33%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2012–2013 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 Sheppard have attended college and 18 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 93 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 Sheppard varies from a low of 12 students to a high of 29. Our average class size schoolwide is 21 students. The average class size for middle schools in the state is 25 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZES OF CORE COURSES	OUR SCHOOL	OUR DISTRICT
English	12	12
History	29	26
Math	23	22
Science	29	25

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	0%	N/A	N/A
Fully credentialed teachers	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	97%	N/A	N/A
Teachers lacking a full credential	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	3%	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 2013.

“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 three 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. 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.

DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT
Districtwide	Percentage of core courses not taught by “highly qualified” teachers (HQT)	2%
Schools with more than 40% of students from lower-income homes	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	2%
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 738 students. More information about [counseling and student support](#) is available on the CDE Web site.

STAFF POSITION	STAFF (FTE)
Academic counselors	1.0
Behavioral/career counselors	0.5
Librarians and media staff	0.0
Psychologists	0.5
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.0
Speech/language/hearing specialists	0.5
Resource specialists	2.3

SOURCE: Data provided by the school district.

TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY: All data is the most current available as of December 2013. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2012–2013 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 2012); Language Census (March 2013); California Standards Tests (spring 2013 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (September 2013 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (September 2013).


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.

rev20140107_43-69369-6046338m/23832

» Adequacy of Key Resources 2013–2014

Here you'll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2013–2014. Please note that these facts are based on evaluations our staff conducted in accordance with the Williams legislation.

This section also contains information about 2012–2013 staff development days, and, for high schools, percentages of seniors who met our district's graduation requirements.



TEACHERS

Teacher Vacancies

KEY FACTOR	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	29	155	152
Number of classes that lacked a permanently assigned teacher within the first 20 days of school	0	5	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	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
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 we set aside for the past three years for their continuing education and professional development.

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
2012–2013	0.00
2011–2012	0.00
2010–2011	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 9/12/13.

NOTES:

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Math	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Science	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Social Science	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 11/13/13 by Ed Romero. The most recent facilities inspection occurred on 10/15 – 11/13/13.

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		No apparent problems
3. Sewer		No apparent problems
B. Interior Surfaces	Good	
1. Interior Surfaces		No apparent problems
C. Cleanliness	Good	
1. Overall cleanliness		No apparent problems
2. Pest/Vermin		No apparent problems
D. Electrical Components	Good	
1. Electrical Components		No apparent problems
E. Rest Rooms/Fountains	Good	
1. Rest Rooms		No apparent problems
2. Drinking Fountains		No apparent problems
F. Safety	Good	
1. Fire Safety		No apparent problems
2. Hazardous Materials		No apparent problems

AREA	RATING	REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED
G. Structural	Good	
1. Structural Damage		No apparent problems
2. Roofs/Gutters		No apparent problems
H. External	Good	
1. Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences		No apparent problems
2. Playgrounds/School Grounds		No apparent problems

SCHOOL FINANCES, 2011–2012

We are required by the California Dept. of Education to report financial data from the 2011–2012 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)	\$5,135	\$5,667	-9%	\$5,596	-8%
Restricted funds (\$/student)	\$2,670	\$2,908	-8%	\$2,786	-4%
Total (\$/student)	\$7,805	\$8,575	-9%	\$8,382	-7%

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)	\$71,603	\$67,908	5%	\$71,848	0%
Benefits (\$/certificated staff)	\$20,874	\$18,202	15%	\$16,999	23%
Total (\$/certificated staff)	\$92,477	\$86,110	7%	\$88,847	4%

* 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	738
Black/African American	3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	28%
Filipino	9%
Hispanic or Latino	57%
Pacific Islander	1%
White (not Hispanic)	1%
Two or more races	0%
Ethnicity not reported	0%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	100%
English Learners	54%
Students with disabilities	13%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CALPADS, October 2012. 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	243
Grade 7	237
Grade 8	258
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012.

Average Class Size by Core Course

The average class size by core courses.

SUBJECT	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
English	25	28	12
History	27	30	29
Math	25	25	23
Science	29	30	29

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012.

Average Class Size by Core Course, Detail

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

SUBJECT	2010–2011			2011–2012			2012–2013		
	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+
English	12	26	4	10	10	14	15	24	4
History	4	10	4	2	8	7	3	5	9
Math	6	9	6	6	10	4	8	11	3
Science	3	9	6	2	8	7	3	3	11

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012.

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	76%	57%	35%
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 2012–2013 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.

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Suspensions per 100 students			
2012–2013	13	12	N/A
2011–2012	17	20	N/A
2010–2011	12	23	16
Expulsions per 100 students			
2012–2013	0	0	N/A
2011–2012	0	0	N/A
2010–2011	0	0	0

SOURCE: Information for the two most recent years provided by the school district. Prior 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.

During the 2012–2013 school year, we had 96 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.

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
	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013	2012–2013
With Full Credential	33	30	28	491
Without Full Credential	1	2	1	22
Teaching out of field	N/A	0	0	0

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		
	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
English/ language arts	49%	57%	48%	48%	52%	50%	54%	56%	55%
History/social science	50%	47%	34%	46%	46%	41%	48%	49%	49%
Mathematics	39%	39%	39%	57%	58%	58%	49%	50%	50%
Science	56%	53%	45%	53%	54%	53%	57%	60%	59%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2013 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 2012–2013	HISTORY/ SOCIAL SCIENCE 2012–2013	MATHEMATICS 2012–2013	SCIENCE 2012–2013
African American	31%	N/A	13%	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	67%	58%	62%	67%
Filipino	64%	61%	49%	72%
Hispanic or Latino	38%	15%	26%	25%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	71%	N/A	64%	N/A
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Boys	44%	31%	38%	40%
Girls	53%	37%	39%	49%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	48%	34%	39%	45%
English Learners	10%	5%	13%	14%
Students with disabilities	30%	4%	21%	N/A
Receives migrant education services	43%	N/A	43%	N/A

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2013 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	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
Statewide rank	6	4	4
Similar-schools rank	7	4	6

SOURCE: The API Base Report from May 2013.

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
	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013	2012–2013
All students at the school	-31	+17	-27	746
Black/African American	+25	-18	-11	582
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	-30	+9	-18	853
Filipino	-3	+33	-34	845
Hispanic or Latino	-18	+24	-32	677
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	+49	+22	+81	860
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	-11	+17	-27	746
English Learners	-48	+31	-54	664
Students with disabilities	-34	+83	-82	547

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013. 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	681	746	8,927	785	4,655,989	790
Black/African American	16	582	148	744	296,463	708
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	N/A	19	768	30,394	743
Asian	193	853	1,086	885	406,527	906
Filipino	67	845	453	862	121,054	867
Hispanic or Latino	383	677	6,863	762	2,438,951	744
Pacific Islander	5	N/A	84	810	25,351	774
White (non Hispanic)	11	860	217	863	1,200,127	853
Two or more races	4	N/A	57	812	125,025	824
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	679	746	8,857	785	2,774,640	743
English Learners	355	664	5,682	756	1,482,316	721
Students with disabilities	88	547	1,142	629	527,476	615

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013. 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 770 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 September 2013.

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	10
Percentage of schools currently in PI	34%

SOURCE: The Program Improvement Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013.

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 2011–2012			
Total expenses	\$106,205,180	\$8,575,019,725	\$46,420,178,248
Expenses per student	\$8,850	\$7,846	\$8,382
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

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

District Salaries, 2011–2012

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2011–2012 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	\$41,451
Midrange teacher’s salary	\$72,497	\$67,655
Highest-paid teacher’s salary	\$84,619	\$85,989
Average principal’s salary (middle school)	\$112,730	\$111,643
Superintendent’s salary	\$196,000	\$182,548
Percentage of budget for teachers’ salaries	44%	42%
Percentage of budget for administrators’ salaries	6%	5%

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