



Thomas Edison Elementary

School Accountability Report Card, 2007–2008

Glendale Unified School District

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

Thomas Edison Elementary

School Accountability Report Card, 2007–2008
Glendale Unified School District

This School Accountability Report Card (SARC) provides information that can be used to evaluate and compare schools. State and federal laws require all schools to publish a SARC each year.

The information in this report represents the 2007–2008 school year, not the current school year. In most cases, this is the most recent data available. We present our school's results next to those of the average elementary school in the county and state to provide the most meaningful and fair comparisons. To find additional facts about our school online, please use the [DataQuest](#) tool offered by the California Department of Education.

If you are reading a printed version of this report, note that words that appear in a smaller, bold typeface are links in the online version of this report to even more information. You can find a master list of those linked words, and the Web page addresses they are connected to, at:

http://www.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links_2008_en.html

Reports about other schools are available on the [California Department of Education Web site](#). Internet access is available in local libraries.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact the school office.

How to Contact Our School

435 South Pacific Ave.
Glendale, CA 91204
Principal: Dr. Kelly King
Phone: (818) 241-1807

How to Contact Our District

223 North Jackson St.
Glendale, CA 91206
Phone: (818) 241-3111
<http://www.glendale.k12.ca.us>



» Contents

ONLINE USERS: CLICK ON A TITLE TO JUMP TO THAT SECTION

Principal's Message
Measures of Progress
Student Achievement
Students
Climate for Learning
Leadership, Teachers, and Staff
Adequacy of Key Resources
Data Almanac



Published by
SCHOOL WISE PRESS
385 Ashton Ave., Ste. 200
San Francisco, CA 94112
Phone: (415) 337-7971
www.schoolwisepress.com

©2008 Publishing 20/20

Thomas Edison Elementary

School Accountability Report Card, 2007–2008
Glendale Unified School District

» Principal's Message

Dear Parents and Family Members,

Welcome to Edison and the 2008-2009 school year! It is our goal that every child meets the rigorous state standards in English language-arts, mathematics, social studies, science and physical education. At times it may seem that our teachers' and staff members' expectations are extremely high. This is true. We know that what happens in elementary school has an impact on each child's ability to pass the High School Exit Exam. In order to earn a high school diploma, students must demonstrate proficiency in reading, writing and mathematics. Our students are very capable of meeting this goal.

In 2007-2008 Edison students, families, teachers, and staff made great academic progress in reading/language arts and mathematics. We met all of our Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) goals and increased our school's Academic Performance Index (API) by 30 points. Due to our progress Edison exited Program Improvement status and is well on its way to becoming a high achieving California school. Our Spanish Dual-Language Immersion program continues to grow and is a model for other Glendale schools. We share our facility with the City of Glendale and enjoy access to a public library, computer lab, parent center, health center, and large playground and sporting fields. Please come and visit our amazing school!

Dr. Kelly King, PRINCIPAL

Grade range and calendar

K-6

TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index

764

County Average: 767

State Average: 776

Student enrollment

703

County Average: 615

State Average: 523

Teachers

35

County Average: 31

State Average: 26

Students per teacher

20

County Average: 20

State Average: 20

Students per computer

4

County Average: 4

State Average: 4

School Expenditures

A combination of state and federal funding is used to cover all aspects of our instructional program and intervention programs. All Glendale Unified schools benefit from the support of the Glendale Educational Foundation, which offers enhanced programs in visual and performing arts, science and technology, and health and fitness.

Safety

We last revised our safety plan in September 2008. The plan, which we update once a year, covers the safety procedures we follow in emergency situations. It includes safety procedures for earthquakes, fires, evacuations, lockdown drills, and intruders. We distribute the safety plan to teachers, staff, and parents on the School Site Council. The police department approves the plan each year. Communicating with parents during emergencies is of utmost importance. To contact parents during a crisis, our school uses two-way radios, cell phones, and phone and email trees.

Before school, teachers, instructional assistants, and crossing guards are on hand to monitor grounds and surrounding areas for safety. During recess, teachers, instructional assistants, and staff assistants supervise the playground. Teachers and crossing guards observe the campus after school. Student safety is closely monitored during morning drop-off and afterschool pickup times. For more information on our school's procedures for dropping off and picking up students, please contact your child's teacher.

We take discipline seriously at Edison. For consistent or serious misconduct, we will suspend students for one or more days. Students in grades four through six may be asked to attend Saturday school. We provide students and their parents with a copy of the rules we expect students to follow.

Buildings

Our state of the art campus was built in 2003. It is entirely handicapped accessible and features a city library, a full-sized gymnasium, computer lab, and a cafeteria. Other than general maintenance done in 2007–2008, we have no renovations planned for our buildings in the near future. We have no modular or portable buildings on our campus. District custodial staff cleans the school and city gardeners tend to the landscaping.

Parent Involvement

Parents volunteer in the classroom, on field trips, in the library, at theater and music performances, and on the School Site Council. One of our goals is to have 100 percent parent participation and volunteerism and we need your help to make this dream come true. There are many ways you can participate! It can be as simple as helping set up or clean up after an event or complete a project at home to help your child's teacher. It can be as involved as helping to coordinate that event or get community donations and sponsors. Here are more ways to be involved at Edison:

Family Center projects

Putting books away in the library.

Help supervise morning drop-off.

Help supervise afternoon dismissal.

Help supervise during lunch.

Classroom volunteers (helping in the classroom).

Helping teachers with special projects (at home or in the classroom).

Chaperoning field trips.

Tutoring students.

Reading to students.

Sharing your special talents.

Fundraisers (helping to organize)

Office projects

Special Events (planning, setting up, or cleaning up afterwards)

Academic Awards Ceremony

Mother/Daughter Event

Father/Son Event

End of Year Family Picnic

Back to School Night Dinner

Book Fair

Open House Pizza Sales

Food Sales at Halloween Carnival

Multicultural Week

Thomas Edison's Birthday

Dual Language Program – Festival of Lights

Dual Language Program – Fiesta

Teacher Appreciation/Staff Appreciation Events

Read Across America

Red Ribbon Week

For more information about volunteer opportunities contact Wendy Rios at (818) 241-3111, ext.1122, or at wrios@gusd.net. We have no parent association at our school but have an extremely active parent volunteer program and growing parent leadership.

Teachers hold conferences with parents once a year. Parents are required to attend these meetings. Back to School Night and Spring Open House provide parents with an opportunity to tour the school and classrooms with their children, meet teachers and staff, and find out what our students are learning. We strongly encourage parents to attend both of these events, and we encourage them to volunteer at our school or donate funds to support our programs.

We mail report cards home to parents three times a year. Parents may request translations of documents, newsletters, and meetings in any language at any time.

MEASURES OF PROGRESS

Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is California’s way of comparing schools based on student test scores. The index was created in 1999 to help parents and educators recognize schools that show progress and identify schools that need help. A school’s API determines whether it receives recognition or sanctions. It is also used to compare schools in a statewide ranking system. The California Department of Education (CDE) calculates a school’s API using student test results from the California Standards Tests, the California Achievement Test, and, for high schools, the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE). APIs range from 200 to 1000. The CDE expects all schools to eventually obtain APIs of at least 800. [Additional information on the API](#) can be found on the CDE Web site.

Thomas Edison Elementary’s API was 764 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 30 points compared to last year’s API. About 94 percent of our students took the test. You can find three years of detailed API results in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

API RANKINGS: Based on our 2006–2007 test results, we started the 2007–2008 school year with an API base score of 734. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared to all elementary schools in California, our school ranked 4 out of 10.

SIMILAR SCHOOL RANKINGS: We also received a second ranking that compared us to the 100 schools with the most similar students, teachers, and class sizes. Compared to these schools, our school ranked 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 met our assigned growth targets during the 2007–2008 school year. Just for reference, 59 percent of elementary schools statewide met their growth targets.

CALIFORNIA API ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
Met schoolwide growth target	Yes
Met growth target for prior school year	No
API score	764
Growth attained from prior year	+30
Met subgroup* growth targets	Yes
Underperforming school	No

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

*Ethnic groups, English Learners, special ed students, or socioeconomic groups of students that make up 15 percent or more of a school’s student body. These groups must meet AYP and API goals. R/P - Results pending due to challenge by school. N/A - Results not available.

API, Spring 2008



SOURCE: API based on spring 2008 test cycle. State average represents elementary schools only.
NOTE: Only groups of students that represent at least 15 percent of total enrollment are calculated and displayed as student subgroups.

Adequate Yearly Progress

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

We met all 21 criteria for yearly progress. As a result, we succeeded at making AYP. Our school is also on the federal watchlist known as Program Improvement (PI). See the next page for background on this matter and an explanation of the consequences.

To meet AYP, elementary schools must meet three criteria. First, a certain percentage of students must score at or above Proficient levels on the California Standards Tests (CST): 35.2 percent on the English/language arts test and 37 percent on the math test. All ethnic and socioeconomic subgroups of students also must meet these goals. Second, the schools must achieve an API of at least 620 or increase the API by one point from the prior year. Third, 95 percent of the student body must take the required standardized tests.

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

FEDERAL AYP ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS	
Met AYP	Yes
Met schoolwide participation rate	Yes
Met schoolwide test score goals	Yes
Met subgroup* participation rate	Yes
Met subgroup* test score goals	Yes
Met schoolwide API for AYP	Yes
Program Improvement school in 2008	No

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of November 2008. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students’ test results in the 2007–2008 school year or earlier.

*Ethnic groups, English Learners, special ed students, or socioeconomic groups of students that make up 15 percent or more of a school’s student body. These groups must meet AYP and API goals. R/P - Results pending due to challenge by school. N/A - Results not available.

Adequate Yearly Progress, Detail by Subgroup

● MET GOAL ● DID NOT MEET GOAL — NOT ENOUGH STUDENTS

	English/Language Arts		Math	
	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST?	DID 35.2% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST?	DID 37% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST?
SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS	●	●	●	●
SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS				
Low income	●	●	●	●
Students learning English	●	●	●	●
STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY				
Hispanic/Latino	●	●	●	●
White/Other	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of November 2008, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2007–2008 school year. The green dots represent goals we met; red dots indicate goals we missed. Just one red dot means that we failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress.

Note: Dashes indicate that too few students were in the category to draw meaningful conclusions. Federal law requires valid test scores from at least 50 students for statistical significance.

Program Improvement, a Federal Intervention Program

A BRIEF HISTORY OF OUR SCHOOL’S PLACEMENT IN PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:







IMPROVEMENT: Thomas Edison Elementary improved two years in a row, and is no longer in Program Improvement. Just 83 elementary schools exited Program Improvement as of November 2008.

THE STAGES OF PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT: Program Improvement (PI) is a five-stage process for monitoring, improving, and, if necessary, reorganizing any school that receives federal money under the Title I section of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Schools in PI get extra attention from their district office to help them improve.

FEDERAL INTERVENTION PROGRAM	
PI	
PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	
In PI since	2006
Stage of PI	Exited PI
Change in 2008	Improved and is now out of PI

SOURCE: PI status is based on the Accountability Progress Report of November 2008. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2007–2008 school year or earlier.

When a school misses even one of its goals for Adequate Yearly Progress, it is at risk of entering PI. If a school misses the same AYP goals two years in a row, it enters stage 1 of PI. Each subsequent year that a school misses any of its AYP goals, it goes one stage deeper into the process. Each stage results in increasingly severe consequences. The first stage gives parents the right to choose another school. In the second stage, students have the right to free tutoring in addition to the option to change schools. The last three stages can result in a change of staff and leadership, the conversion of the school to charter status, transferring the school to another district, or even the school’s closure.

YEAR	PI STAGE	SUMMARY OF EVENTS FOR THIS YEAR	AYP GOALS NOT MET  AYP GOALS MET 
2005	Not in PI	Thomas Edison Elementary met 20 of the 21 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress established by the federal law known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB).	
2006	1	We met 20 of the 21 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress, causing the school to enter the first stage of Program Improvement.	
2007	1	In 2007, the school met all of its criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress for the second year in row. This enabled the school to leave Program Improvement and return to normal status.	
2008	Not in PI	In 2008, the school met all of its criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress for the second year in row. This enabled the school to leave Program Improvement and return to normal status.	

SOURCE: PI status is based on the Accountability Progress Report of November 2008. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2007–2008 school year or earlier. Some schools were in Program Improvement prior to the passage of No Child Left Behind, when the definition of PI was significantly modified.

CONSEQUENCES

Thomas Edison Elementary has succeeded in attaining its Adequate Yearly Progress goals for two years in a row and is no longer in PI. Few schools have accomplished this feat. The district is no longer required to take corrective action; teachers don’t have to work longer hours to improve their teaching; and the school no longer needs to offer free tutoring or school choice.


STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Here you'll find a three-year summary of our students' scores on the California Standards Tests (CST) in selected subjects. We compare our students' test scores to the results for students in the average elementary school in California. On the following pages we provide more detail for each test, including the scores for different subgroups of students. In addition, we provide links to the California Content Standards on which these tests are based. If you'd like more information about the CST, please contact our principal or our teaching staff. To find [grade-level-specific scores](#), you can refer to the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Web site. Other tests in the [STAR program](#) can be found on the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site.

California Standards Tests

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

■ FAR BELOW BASIC ■ BELOW BASIC ■ BASIC ■ PROFICIENT ■ ADVANCED



SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2008 test cycle. State average represents elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.

Frequently Asked Questions About Standardized Tests

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

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

WHY ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS (CST) AND THE CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST (CAT/6) SCORED DIFFERENTLY? When students take the CST, they can score at any of the proficiency levels: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, or Far Below Basic. In theory all students in California could score at the top. The CAT/6 is a nationally normed test, which means that students are scored against each other nationally. This scoring method is similar to grading “on the curve.” CAT/6 scores are expressed as a ranking on a scale from 1 to 99.

HOW HARD ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS? Experts consider California’s standards to be among the most clear and rigorous in the country. Just 47 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 56 percent scored Proficient or Advanced in math. You can review the [California Content Standards](#) on the CDE Web site.

ARE ALL STUDENTS’ SCORES INCLUDED? No. Only students in grades two through eleven are required to take the CST. When fewer than 11 students in one grade or subgroup take a test, state officials remove their scores from the report. They omit them to protect students’ privacy, as called for by federal law.

CAN I REVIEW SAMPLE TEST QUESTIONS? Sample test questions for the CST are on the [CDE’s Web site](#). These are actual questions used in previous years.

WHERE CAN I FIND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION? The CDE has a wealth of resources on its Web site. The STAR Web site publishes detailed reports for schools and districts, and assistance packets for parents and teachers. This site includes explanations of [technical terms](#), scoring methods, and the [subjects](#) covered by the tests for each grade. You’ll also find a [guide](#) to navigating the STAR Web site as well as help for understanding how to [compare test scores](#).

English/Language Arts (Reading and Writing)

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			44%	100%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About three percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			44%	98%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			47%	97%	

Subgroup Test Scores

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


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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			40%	253	GENDER: About seven percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			47%	247	
English proficient			64%	258	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: English Learners scored lower on the CST than students who are proficient in English. Because we give this test in English, English Learners tend to be at a disadvantage.
English Learners			22%	242	
Low income			40%	400	INCOME: About 20 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			60%	100	
Learning disabled			10%	49	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			47%	451	
Filipino			77%	50	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Hispanic/Latino			33%	268	
White/Other			50%	159	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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



Math

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			53%	100%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About three percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			55%	94%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			56%	94%	

Subgroup Test Scores

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

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


GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			53%	252	GENDER: About the same percentage of boys and girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			52%	248	
English proficient			69%	260	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			35%	240	
Low income			50%	400	INCOME: About 16 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			66%	100	
Learning disabled			5%	50	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			57%	450	
Filipino			67%	50	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			42%	268	
White/Other			62%	159	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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

Three-Year Trend: Math



SOURCE: CDE STAR research file: 2006, 2007, and 2008.

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			53%	100%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About six percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			44%	97%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			47%	96%	

Subgroup Test Scores

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

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


GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			50%	49	GENDER: About six percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			56%	54	
English proficient			65%	62	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			35%	41	
Low income			51%	78	INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested who were not from low-income families was too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	25	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	5	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%	98	
Filipino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	16	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			50%	45	
White/Other			46%	37	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

The science standards test was administered only to fifth graders. Of course, students in all grade levels study science in these areas: physical science, life science, earth science, and investigation and experimentation. For background, you can review the [science standards](#) by going to the CDE's Web site.

Three-Year Trend: Science



California Achievement Test (CAT/6)

The CAT/6 differs from the CST in three ways. First, in the spring of 2008, only students in grades three and seven took this test. Second, the CAT/6 is taken by students in other states, which enables us to see how our students are doing compared to other students in the nation. Third, the CAT/6 is scored by comparing students to each other on a scale from 1 to 99, much like being graded “on the curve.” In contrast, the CST scores students against five defined criteria.

SUBJECT	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
READING				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	7%	12%	15%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	27%	33%	39%
LANGUAGE				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	17%	17%	19%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	42%	43%	47%
MATH				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	20%	28%	30%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	44%	53%	56%


SOURCE: The scores for the CAT/6 are from the spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Therefore, our test score results may vary from other CDE test score reports when missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results.
N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.

STUDENTS SCORING ABOVE AVERAGE: This view of test scores shows the percentage of our students who scored in the top half of students nationally (at the 50th percentile and higher). At Thomas Edison Elementary, 27 percent of students scored at or above average in reading (compared to 39 percent statewide); 42 percent scored at or above average in language (compared to 47 percent statewide); and 44 percent scored at or above average in math (compared to 56 percent statewide). The subject with the most students scoring at or above average was math.

HIGH-SCORING STUDENTS: This view of test scores shows the percentage of our students who scored in the top quarter of students nationally (above the 75th percentile). At Thomas Edison Elementary, seven percent of students scored at the top in reading (compared to 15 percent statewide); 17 percent scored at the top in language (compared to 19 percent statewide); and 20 percent scored at the top in math (compared to 30 percent statewide). The subject with the most students scoring at the top was math.

Our CAT/6 Results Compared

Students take this test only in grades three and seven. The values displayed to the right represent the percentage of our students who scored at or above average compared to their peers in the county and state.



SOURCE: Spring 2008 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

STUDENTS

Students’ English Language Skills

At Thomas Edison Elementary, 49 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared to 68 percent of elementary school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	49%	63%	68%
English Learners	51%	37%	32%

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

Languages Spoken at Home by English Learners

Please note that this table describes the home languages of just the 360 students classified as English Learners. At Thomas Edison Elementary, 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	64%	89%	85%
Vietnamese	1%	1%	3%
Cantonese	0%	2%	1%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	5%	1%	1%
Korean	1%	2%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	0%	0%
All other	29%	5%	8%

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

Ethnicity

Most students at Thomas Edison Elementary identify themselves as Hispanic/Latino. The state of California allows citizens to choose more than one ethnic identity, or to select “multiethnic” or “decline to state.” As a consequence, the sum of all responses rarely equals 100 percent.

ETHNICITY	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
African American	1%	9%	7%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	12%	10%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	53%	64%	50%
White/European American/Other	33%	17%	32%

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

Family Income and Education

The [free or reduced-price meal](#) subsidy goes to students whose families earned less than \$38,203 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2007–2008 school year. At Thomas Edison Elementary, 77 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared to 55 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	77%	63%	55%
Parents with some college	36%	47%	54%
Parents with college degree	24%	27%	30%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2007–2008 school year. Parents’ education level is collected in the spring at the start of testing. Rarely do all students answer these questions. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

The parents of 36 percent of the students at Thomas Edison Elementary have attended college, and 24 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 71 percent of our students provided this information.

CLIMATE FOR LEARNING

Average Class Sizes

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

The average class size at Thomas Edison Elementary varies across grade levels from a low of 19 students to a high of 36. Our average class size schoolwide is 23 students. The average class size for elementary schools in the state is 22 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY GRADE	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Kindergarten	19	20	20
First grade	19	20	19
Second grade	19	20	19
Third grade	19	20	20
Fourth grade	29	28	28
Fifth grade	35	28	29
Sixth grade	36	30	29

SOURCE: CBED5 census, October 2007. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

Discipline

At times we find it necessary to suspend students who break school rules. We report only suspensions in which students are sent home for a day or longer. We do not report in-school suspensions, in which students are removed from one or more classes during a single school day. Expulsion is the most serious consequence we can impose. Expelled students are removed from the school permanently and denied the opportunity to continue learning here.

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Suspensions per 100 students			
2007–2008	8	4	6
2006–2007	16	6	6
2005–2006	11	4	5
Expulsions per 100 students			
2007–2008	0	0	0
2006–2007	0	0	0
2005–2006	0	0	0

SOURCE: Data is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file. Data represents the number of incidents reported, not the number of students involved. District and state averages represent elementary schools only.

During the 2007–2008 school year, we had 54 suspension incidents. We had one expulsion incident. 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.

Computers

We have 197 computers available for student use, which means that, on average, there is one computer for every four students. There are 33 classrooms connected to the Internet.

RESOURCES	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Students per computer	4	4	4
Internet-connected classrooms	33	32	29

SOURCE: CBED5 census of October 2007. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

Teacher Experience and Education

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Teaching experience	Average years of teaching experience	15	13	13
Newer teachers	Percentage of teachers with one or two years of teaching experience	6%	9%	11%
Teachers holding an MA degree or higher	Percentage of teachers with a master's degree or higher from a graduate school	53%	39%	34%
Teachers holding a BA degree alone	Percentage of teachers whose highest degree is a bachelor's degree from a four-year college	47%	61%	66%

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

About six percent of our teachers have fewer than three years of teaching experience, which is below the average for new teachers in other elementary schools in California. Our teachers have, on average, 15 years of experience. About 47 percent of our teachers hold only a bachelor's degree from a four-year college or university. About 53 percent have completed a master's degree or higher.

Credentials Held by Our Teachers

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Fully credentialed teachers	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	100%	97%	97%
Trainee credential holders	Percentage of staff holding an internship credential	3%	2%	2%
Emergency permit holders	Percentage of staff holding an emergency permit	0%	3%	2%
Teachers with waivers	Lowest level of accreditation, used by districts when they have no other option	0%	0%	0%

SOURCE: PAIF, October 2007. This is completed by teachers during the CBEDS census. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. A teacher may have earned more than one credential. For this reason, it is likely that the sum of all credentials will exceed 100 percent.

All of the faculty at Thomas Edison Elementary hold a full credential. This number is close to the average for all elementary schools in the state. About three percent of the faculty at Thomas Edison Elementary hold a trainee credential, which is reserved for those teachers who are in the process of completing their teacher training. In comparison, two percent of elementary school teachers throughout the state hold trainee credentials. None of our faculty holds an emergency permit. Very few elementary school teachers hold this authorization statewide (just two percent). About 97 percent of the faculty at Thomas Edison Elementary hold the elementary (multiple-subject) credential. This number is above the average for elementary schools in California, which is 91 percent. You can find three years of data about teachers' credentials in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

Indicators of Teachers Who May Be Underprepared

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Core courses taught by a teacher not meeting NCLB standards	Percentage of core courses not taught by a “highly qualified” teacher according to federal standards in NCLB	0%	N/A	0%
Teachers lacking a full credential	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	0%	3%	3%

SOURCE: Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF) of October 2007. Data on NCLB standards is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file.

“HIGHLY QUALIFIED” TEACHERS: The federal law known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requires districts to report the number of teachers considered to be “highly qualified.” These “highly qualified” teachers must have a full credential, a bachelor’s degree, and, if they are teaching a core subject (such as reading, math, science, or social studies), they must also demonstrate expertise in that field. The table above shows the percentage of core courses taught by teachers who are considered to be less than “highly qualified.” There are exceptions, known as the **High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE)** rules, that allow some veteran teachers to meet the “highly qualified” test who wouldn’t otherwise do so.

CREDENTIAL STATUS OF TEACHERS: Teachers who lack full credentials are working under the terms of an emergency permit, an internship credential, or a waiver. They should be working toward their credential, and they are allowed to teach in the meantime only if the school board approves. None of our teachers was working without full credentials, compared to three percent of teachers in elementary schools statewide.

Districtwide Distribution of Teachers Who Are Not “Highly Qualified”

Here, we report the percentage of core courses in our district whose teachers are considered to be less than “highly qualified” by NCLB’s standards. We show how these teachers are distributed among schools according to the percentage of low-income students enrolled.

The CDE has divided schools in the state into four groups (quartiles), based on the percentage of families who qualify and apply for free or reduced-price

lunches. The one-fourth of schools with the most students receiving subsidized lunches are assigned to the first group. The one-fourth of schools with the fewest students receiving subsidized lunches are assigned to the fourth group. We compare the courses and teachers assigned to each of these groups of schools to see how they differ in “highly qualified” teacher assignments.

The average percentage of courses in our district not taught by a “highly qualified” teacher is six percent, compared to eight percent statewide. For schools with the highest percentage of low-income students, this factor is zero percent, compared to five percent statewide. For schools with the lowest percentage of low-income students, this factor is four percent, compared to 11 percent statewide.

DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN STATE
Districtwide	Percentage of core courses not taught by “highly qualified” teachers (HQT)	6%	8%
Schools with the most low-income students	First quartile of schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	0%	5%
Schools with the fewest low-income students	Fourth quartile of schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	4%	11%

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

Specialized Resource Staff

Our school may employ social workers, speech and hearing specialists, school psychologists, nurses, and technology specialists. These specialists often work part time at our school and some may work at more than one school in our district. Their schedules will change as our students’ needs change. For these reasons, the staffing counts you see here may differ from the staffing provided today in this school. For more details on [statewide ratios of counselors, psychologists, or other pupil services](#) staff to students, see the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site. [Library facts](#) and frequently asked questions are also available there.

STAFF POSITION	STAFF (FTE)
Counselors	0.0
Librarians	1.0
Psychologists	0.4
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.4
Speech/language/hearing specialists	0.6
Resource specialists	2.0

SOURCE: CBEDS census, October 2007.

TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY: All data is the most current available as of November 2008. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2007–2008 school year after the publication date of this report. We rely on the following sources of information from the California Department of Education: California Basic Education Data System (CBEDS) (October 2007 census); Language Census (March 2008); California Achievement Test and California Standards Tests (spring 2008 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (October 2008 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (November 2008).

DISCLAIMER: School Wise Press, the publisher of this accountability report, makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of this information but offers no guarantee, express or implied. While we do our utmost to ensure the information is complete, we must note that we are not responsible for any errors or omissions in the data. Nor are we responsible for any damages caused by the use of the information this report contains. Before you make decisions based on this information, we strongly recommend that you visit the school and ask the principal to provide the most up-to-date facts available.

rev20081211_19-64568-6013650e/16372

» Adequacy of Key Resources

Here you'll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2008–2009. Please note that these facts are based on evaluations our staff conducted in accordance with the Williams legislation.

This section also contains information about 2006–2007 staff development days, and, for high schools, percentages of seniors who met our district's graduation requirements.



TEACHERS

Teacher Vacancies

KEY FACTOR	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	34	35	29
Number of classes which lacked a permanently assigned teacher within the first 20 days of school	0	0	0
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Number of classes where the permanently assigned teacher left during the year	0	0	0
Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher	0	0	0

NOTES:

There are two general circumstances that can lead to the unfortunate case of a classroom without a full-time, permanently assigned teacher. Within the first 20 days of the start of school, we can be surprised by too many students showing up for school, or too few teachers showing up to teach. After school starts, however, teachers can also be surprised by sudden changes: family emergencies, injuries, accidents, etc. When that occurs, it is our school’s and our district’s responsibility to fill that teacher’s vacancy with a qualified, full-time and permanently assigned replacement. For that reason, we report teacher vacancies in two parts: at the start of school, and after the start of school.

Teacher Misassignments

A “misassigned” teacher is one who lacks the appropriate subject-area authorization for a class she is teaching. Under the terms of the Williams settlement, schools must inform the public of the number of their teachers who are misassigned. It is possible for a teacher who lacks the authorization for a subject to get special permission—in the form of an emergency permit, waiver, or internship authorization—from the school board or county office of education to teach the subject anyway. This permission prevents the teacher from being counted as misassigned.

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
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	1	0	0
Other Employee Misassignments	Total number of service area placements of employees without the required credentials	0	0	0

NOTES:

Staff Development

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

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
2007–2008	3.00
2006–2007	3.00
2005–2006	3.00

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 calls for. This information is far more meaningful when viewed along with the more detailed description of textbooks contained in our School Accountability Report Card (SARC). There you'll find the names of the textbooks used in our core classes, their dates of publication, the names of the firms that published them, and more.

TAUGHT AT OUR SCHOOL?	SUBJECT	ARE THERE TEXTBOOKS OR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN USE?		ARE THERE ENOUGH BOOKS FOR EACH STUDENT?	
		STANDARDS ALIGNED?	OFFICIALLY ADOPTED?	FOR USE IN CLASS?	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS HAVING BOOKS TO TAKE HOME?
<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"/>	

This information was collected on .

NOTES:

Textbooks in Use

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

SUBJECT AND TITLE	PUBLISHER	YEAR PUBLISHED
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS		
Reading- California	Houghton Mifflin	2003
The Language of Literature	McDougal Littell	2002
MATH		
Everyday Mathematics	MacMillan McGraw-Hill	2001
SCIENCE		
California Science	MacMillan McGraw-Hill	2008
California Earth Science	Prentice Hall	2008
SOCIAL SCIENCE		
Reflections: California Series	Harcourt	2007
California Vistas	McMillan McGraw-Hill	2007
World History: Ancient Civilizations	McDougal Littell	2006

FACILITIES

To determine the condition of our facilities, our district sent experts from our facilities team to do so. They used a survey, called the Facilities Inspection Tool, issued by the Office of Public School Construction.

Based on that survey, we've answered the questions you see on this report. Please note that the information reflects the condition of our buildings as of the date of the report. Since that time, those conditions may have changed.

AREA	RATING	REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED
Overall Rating	Good	Our school is in good repair, according to the criteria established by the Office of Public School Construction. Our deficiencies are minor ones resulting from common wear and tear, and there are few of them. We scored between 85 and 97 percent on the 15 categories of our evaluation.
1. Gas Leaks	Good	No apparent problems.
2. Mechanical Problems (Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning)	Good	No apparent problems.
3. Windows, Doors, Gates, Fences (Interior and Exterior)	Good	No apparent problems.
4. Interior Surfaces (Walls, Floors, and Ceilings)	Good	No apparent problems.
5. Hazardous Materials (Lead Paint, Asbestos, Mold, Flammables, etc.)	Good	No apparent problems.
6. Structural Damage (Cracks in Walls and Foundations, Sloping Ceilings, Posts or Beams Missing)	Good	No apparent problems.
7. Fire Safety (Sprinkler Systems, Alarms, Extinguishers)	Good	No apparent problems.
8. Electrical Systems and Lighting	Good	No apparent problems.
9. Pest or Vermin Infestation	Good	No apparent problems.
10. Drinking Fountains (Inside and Out)	Good	No apparent problems.
11. Bathrooms	Good	No apparent problems.
12. Sewer System	Good	No apparent problems.
13. Roofs	Good	No apparent problems.
14. Playground/School Grounds	Good	No apparent problems.
15. Overall Cleanliness	Good	No apparent problems.
Other Deficiencies	N/A	No apparent problems.

INSPECTORS AND ADVISORS: This report was completed on Friday, June 27, 2008 by C Jeffress (Administrative Secretary). The facilities inspection occurred on Wednesday, April 16, 2008. We employed the following staff or businesses in completing this report: The Facilities Inspection Tool was completed on Friday, April 18, 2008.

SCHOOL FINANCES, 2006–2007

We are required to report financial data from the 2006–2007 school year by the California Dept. of Education. More recent financial data is available on request from the district office.

Spending per Student

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we first report our overall spending per student. We base our calculations on our average daily attendance (ADA), which was 691 students.

We've broken down expenditures by the type of funds used to pay for them. Unrestricted funds can be used for any lawful purpose. Restricted funds, however, must be spent for specific purposes set out by legal requirements or the donor. Examples include funding for instructional materials, economic impact aid, and teacher and principal training funds.

Adjacent 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 VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE
Unrestricted funds (\$/student)	\$4,490.00	\$4,201.00	7%	\$5,300	-15%
Restricted funds (\$/student)	\$1,128.00	\$764.00	48%	\$2,817	-60%
Total (\$/student)	\$5,618.00	\$4,965.00	13%	\$8,117	-31%

Compensation per Teacher

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we report our compensation per full-time equivalent (FTE) teacher. A teacher who works full-time counts as 1.0 FTE teachers. A teacher who works only half-time counts as 0.5 FTE. We had 31 FTE teachers working in our school.

CATEGORY	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE
Salary	\$65,105.00	\$64,195.00	0%	\$62,157	5%
Benefits	\$19,800.00	\$19,258.00	0%	\$17,426	14%
Total	\$84,905.00	\$83,453.00	0%	\$79,583	7%

» Data Almanac

This Data Almanac provides more-detailed information than the School Accountability Report Card or data that covers a period of more than one year. It presents the facts and statistics in tables without narrative text.



STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

Student Enrollment by Ethnicity and Other Characteristics

The ethnicity of our students, estimates of their family income and education level, their English fluency, and their learning-related disabilities.

GROUP	ENROLLMENT
Number of students	703
African American	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	3%
Filipino	9%
Hispanic or Latino	53%
Pacific Islander	0%
White (not Hispanic)	32%
Multiple or no response	1%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	79%
English Learners	52%
Students with disabilities	11%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CBEDS, October 2007. Data about students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged, English Learners, or learning disabled come from the School Accountability Report Card unit of the California Department of Education.

Student Enrollment by Grade Level

Number of students enrolled in each grade level at our school.

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS
Kindergarten	97
Grade 1	106
Grade 2	93
Grade 3	97
Grade 4	97
Grade 5	100
Grade 6	113
Grade 7	0
Grade 8	0
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2007.

Average Class Size by Grade Level

GRADE LEVEL	2005–2006	2006–2007	2007–2008
Kindergarten	19	20	19
Grade 1	19	19	19
Grade 2	19	18	19
Grade 3	20	20	19
Grade 4	31	34	29
Grade 5	32	33	35
Grade 6	33	33	36
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined K–3	N/A	N/A	19
Combined 3–4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 4–8	33	31	33
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2007.

Average Class Size by Grade Level, Detail

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

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

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2007.

Teacher Credentials

The number of teachers assigned to the school with a full credential and without a full credential, for both our school and the district.

TEACHERS	SCHOOL			DISTRICT
	2005–2006	2006–2007	2007–2008	2007–2008
With Full Credential	35	35	36	1,215
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	29

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2007, Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF) section.

Physical Fitness

Students in grades five, seven, and nine take the California Fitness Test each year. This test measures students’ aerobic capacity, body composition, muscular strength, endurance, and flexibility using six different tests. The table below shows the percentage of students at our school who scored within the “healthy fitness zone” on all six tests. Our 2007–2008 results are compared to other students’ results in the county and state. More information about [physical fitness testing and standards](#) is available on the CDE Web site.

CATEGORY	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Boys in Fitness Zone	38%	23%	26%
Girls in Fitness Zone	37%	30%	32%
Fifth graders in Fitness Zone	37%	26%	29%
Seventh graders in Fitness Zone	N/A	28%	30%
Ninth graders in Fitness Zone	N/A	36%	27%
All students in Fitness Zone	37%	27%	29%

SOURCE: Physical fitness test data is produced annually as schools test their students on the six Fitnessgram Standards. Data is reported by Educational Data Systems. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

California Standards Tests (CST)

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

CST Results for All Students: Three-Year Comparison

The percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards) for the most current three-year period.

SUBJECT	SCHOOL PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			DISTRICT PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			STATE PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
English/ language arts	31%	35%	44%	56%	58%	59%	42%	43%	46%
Mathematics	47%	49%	53%	57%	57%	58%	40%	40%	43%
Science	26%	25%	53%	50%	52%	62%	35%	38%	46%

SOURCE: California Standards Tests (CST) results, spring 2008 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

CST Results by Student Group: Most Recent Year

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

STUDENT GROUP	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	ENGLISH/ LANGUAGE ARTS 2007–2008	MATHEMATICS 2007–2008	SCIENCE 2007–2008
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	77%	92%	N/A
Filipino	72%	72%	69%
Hispanic or Latino	33%	42%	50%
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	50%	62%	46%
Boys	39%	53%	50%
Girls	47%	52%	56%
Economically disadvantaged	40%	50%	51%
English Learners	22%	35%	35%
Students with disabilities	9%	12%	N/A
Students receiving migrant education services	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: California Standards Tests (CST) results, spring 2008 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

ACCOUNTABILITY

California Academic Performance Index (API)

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of the academic performance and progress of schools in California. API scores range from 200 to 1000, with a statewide target of 800. Detailed information about the API can be found on the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/>.

API Ranks: Three-Year Comparison

The state assigns statewide and similar-schools API ranks for all schools. The API ranks range from 1 to 10. A statewide rank of 1 means that the school has an API in the lowest 10 percent of all elementary schools in the state, while a statewide rank of 10 means that the school has an API in the highest 10 percent of all elementary schools in the state. The similar-schools API rank reflects how a school compares to 100 statistically matched schools with similar teachers and students.

API RANK	2005–2006	2006–2007	2007–2008
Statewide rank	4	4	4
Similar-schools rank	4	6	6

SOURCE: The API Base Report from August 2008.

API Changes by Student Group: Three-Year Comparison

API changes for all students and student groups: the actual API changes in points added or lost for the past three years, and the most recent API. Note: "N/A" means that the student group is not numerically significant.

STUDENT GROUP	ACTUAL API CHANGE			API SCORE
	2005–2006	2006–2007	2007–2008	2007–2008
All students at the school	+18	+4	+30	764
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	+23	+6	+29	702
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	+10	+2	+39	818
Economically disadvantaged	+23	+6	+31	742
English Learners	+26	-1	+25	744
Students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in October 2008.

Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Intervention Programs

The federal law known as No Child Left Behind requires that all schools and districts meet all three of the following criteria in order to attain Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):

- (a) a 95-percent participation rate on the state’s tests;
- (b) a CDE-mandated percentage of students scoring Proficient or higher on the state’s English/language arts and mathematics tests; and
- (c) an API of at least 590 or growth of at least one point.

AYP for the District

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

AYP CRITERIA	DISTRICT
Overall	No
Graduation rate	Yes
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 November 2008.

Intervention Program: District Program Improvement (PI)

Districts receiving federal Title I funding enter Program Improvement (PI) if they do not make AYP for two consecutive years in the same content area (English/language arts or mathematics) and for each grade span or on the same indicator (API or graduation rate). After entering PI, districts advance to the next level of intervention with each additional year that they do not make AYP.

INDICATOR	DISTRICT
PI stage	Not in PI
The year the district entered PI	N/A
Number of schools currently in PI	0
Percentage of schools currently in PI	0%

SOURCE: The Program Improvement Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in October 2008.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES

Total expenses include only the costs related to direct educational services to students. This figure does not include food services, land acquisition, new construction, and other expenditures unrelated to core educational purposes. The expenses-per-student figure is calculated by dividing total expenses by the district’s average daily attendance (ADA). More information is available on the [CDE’s Web site](#).

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	OUR DISTRICT	SIMILAR DISTRICTS	ALL DISTRICTS
FISCAL YEAR 2006–2007			
Total expenses	\$208,246,634	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$7,548	\$8,193	\$8,117
FISCAL YEAR 2005–2006			
Total expenses	\$206,005,343	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$7,330	\$7,583	\$7,521

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

District Salaries, 2006–2007

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2006–2007 school year. According to the CDE’s SARC Data Definitions, “State certification/release dates for fiscal data occur in middle to late spring, precluding the inclusion of 2007–08 data in most cases. Therefore, 2006–07 data are used for report cards prepared during 2008–09.” This table compares our average salaries to those in districts like ours, based on both enrollment and the grade level of our students. In addition, we report the percentage of our district’s total budget dedicated to teachers’ and administrators’ salaries. The costs of health insurance, pensions, and other indirect compensation are not included.

SALARY INFORMATION	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Beginning teacher’s salary	\$41,619	\$40,721
Midrange teacher’s salary	\$63,892	\$65,190
Highest-paid teacher’s salary	\$85,448	\$84,151
Average principal’s salary (elementary school)	\$104,581	\$104,476
Superintendent’s salary	\$222,210	\$210,769
Percentage of budget for teachers’ salaries	41%	40%
Percentage of budget for administrators’ salaries	5%	6%

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