



Glenoaks Elementary School

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.

Glenoaks Elementary School

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

2015 East Glenoaks Blvd.
Glendale, CA 91206
Principal: Dr. Cynthia McCarty
Phone: (818) 242-3747

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

Glenoaks Elementary School

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

» Principal's Message

Glenoaks Elementary School provides a combination of a rich academic and positive social and emotional environment for all students. The diverse student body is reflective of the city of Glendale. Glenoaks is truly a neighborhood school with many of our families having been students in their elementary career! There are many traditions at Glenoaks that have been passed down by grandparents, aunts, uncles and parents.

Our Academic Performance Index (API) continues to be well over the 800 goal established by the state of California. California Standards Tests (CST) scores indicate that over 60 percent of our students are proficient in English/ Language Arts and are performing with nearly 70 percent proficiency in mathematics. Interestingly, that means that we still have much work to do as we strive for our goal of 100 percent proficiency.

Dr. Cynthia McCarty, PRINCIPAL

Grade range and calendar

K–6

TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index

856

County Average: 767
State Average: 776

Student enrollment

606

County Average: 615
State Average: 523

Teachers

28

County Average: 31
State Average: 26

Students per teacher

22

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. Strong PTA and school foundation support is evident in many of our schools' supplemental activities. 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

Safety is a top priority of campus life. We look to the physical well-being of our students, as well as their emotional and social well-being. We support a licensed CARE counselor through our supplemental budgets one day per week. This person works with the emotional needs of individuals and small groups of students in the educational setting.

Glenoaks is a closed campus. The campus is completely fenced and gates are locked each morning after the arrival of the students. The main office is the only entrance to the campus. All visitors must sign in and take a visitor's badge before gaining admission to the campus during the school day. Paid staff supervises the students from the time of their arrival until their departure. Teachers supervise during morning recess, while noon duty assistants supervise the students during lunch time and after school. Students are not allowed on campus until 7:45 a.m., and unless they are engaged in an afterschool activity or program they must be picked up 15 minutes after dismissal.

We practice scheduled monthly drills. Students understand expectations for behavior as they go through the appropriate practice steps.

Students are encouraged to inform staff of major issues that occur on the playground. This information is dealt with immediately by the staff. Our students are generally very happy to be part of the diverse Glenoaks community. Student conflicts are rare and are generally minor.

Buildings

During the 2004–2006 school years the facilities on campus were updated and modernized. The main building housing the administrative offices, several classrooms, the computer lab, and staff work areas, was built in 1930. The annex building housing four classrooms was completed during the 1940's. The auditorium and cafeteria areas were finished in the 1950's. During the 1960's the two-story building, containing 10 classrooms, was completed. Since the 1980's, we have added 12 additional bungalows.

There are four major playground areas on the campus. The "Tan Mat" area has two play structures that were finished in 2006. The Middle Terrace, which is primarily used by students in grades one through four was resurfaced in the summer of 2007. Consequently, the Foundation also funded the expansion of the grassy area on the Middle Terrace at the same time.

The Upper Terrace is used primarily by students in grades five and six and a play yard in front of the kindergarten classrooms has a play structure which was completed in 2006. This area is used exclusively by kindergarten students.

During the 2007–2008 school year, the Foundation sponsored our eco-friendly project of planting a number of trees on campus to increase the amount of shade on the playgrounds. These trees have a caregiver assigned to watch over their development throughout the school year and during summer months. Glenoaks volunteers work closely with the Tree People to ensure the best care in maintaining an eco-friendly environment for our students.

Parent Involvement

We encourage parent involvement in all elements of the school program. Parents volunteer in the classroom, library, and computer lab. Parents often assist the teacher in the planning of extra- and co-curricular activities such as field trips. Each classroom has at least one room captain who is the liaison between the parents and the teacher planning the student activities.

The PTA and Glenoaks Elementary School Foundation are active in fund-raising activities and actively support the school. PTA provides the students with monetary assistance for field trips, assemblies, library, and classroom supplies. They have meetings bimonthly in the evening. These meetings are generally on a theme such as health or the greening of the campus or on other topics of importance. They also plan and organize our Howdy Night in October and the Global Festival in the spring. Other PTA-sponsored events include Guess Who's Coming to Read in February and a family reading night in March. Laura Rubenstein is our current PTA President.

The Foundation has supported the technology, art, and health of the students here at Glenoaks. They have purchased the computers in our lab and many for the classrooms. They have also funded the staff support personnel who are called LITE Techs. Last year they purchased the Arts Attack art program. This year they are focusing on greening the campus by providing a larger grass area on the Middle Terrace and by planting approximately 20 shade trees on the campus later in the year. Their main fund-raising events are a gala dinner dance in the spring and a jogathon in April. They also support an ongoing eScrip program. The Foundation generously purchased 23 laptops to be used in our 5th and 6th grade classrooms. Lee Yamashiro is our current Foundation President.

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.

Glenoaks’s API was 856 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 25 points compared to last year’s API. All students took the test. You can find three years of detailed API results in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

API RANKINGS: Based on our 2006–2007 test results, we started the 2007–2008 school year with an API base score of 831. 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 8 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 5 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 | Yes |
| API score | 856 |
| Growth attained from prior year | +25 |
| 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.

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 | ● | ● | ● | ● |

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.

SOURCE: AYP release of November 2008, CDE.


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 | | | 66% | 98% | SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 19 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California. |
| AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY | | | 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 | | | 58% | 209 | GENDER: About 15 percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced. |
| Girls | | | 73% | 229 | |
| English proficient | | | 74% | 331 | 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 | | | 40% | 107 | |
| Low income | | | 46% | 96 | INCOME: About 26 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students. |
| Not low income | | | 72% | 340 | |
| Learning disabled | NO DATA AVAILABLE | | N/A | 39 | 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% | 399 | |
| Asian American | | | 83% | 48 | ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report. |
| Hispanic/Latino | | | 60% | 80 | |
| White/Other | | | 66% | 263 | |

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 | | | 71% | 97% | SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 15 percent more 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 | | | 68% | 208 | GENDER: About five percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced. |
| Girls | | | 73% | 229 | |
| English proficient | | | 79% | 329 | 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 | | | 45% | 108 | |
| Low income | | | 54% | 96 | INCOME: About 22 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students. |
| Not low income | | | 76% | 339 | |
| Learning disabled | NO DATA AVAILABLE | | N/A | 38 | 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 | | | 73% | 399 | |
| Asian American | | | 92% | 48 | ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report. |
| Hispanic/Latino | | | 57% | 79 | |
| White/Other | | | 71% | 263 | |

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



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 | | | 69% | 98% | SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 22 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 | | | 65% | 43 | GENDER: About eight percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced. |
| Girls | | | 73% | 46 | |
| English proficient | | | 80% | 64 | ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was too small to be statistically significant. |
| English Learners | DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE | | N/S | 25 | |
| Low income | DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE | | N/S | 16 | INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from low-income families was too small to be statistically significant. |
| Not low income | | | 74% | 72 | |
| Learning disabled | NO DATA AVAILABLE | | N/A | 8 | 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 | | | 69% | 81 | |
| Hispanic/Latino | DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE | | N/S | 14 | 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. |
| White/Other | | | 71% | 59 | |

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) | 16% | 12% | 15% |
| Students scoring at or above average | Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile) | 49% | 33% | 39% |
| LANGUAGE | | | | |
| High-scoring students | Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile) | 26% | 17% | 19% |
| Students scoring at or above average | Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile) | 62% | 43% | 47% |
| MATH | | | | |
| High-scoring students | Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile) | 42% | 28% | 30% |
| Students scoring at or above average | Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile) | 75% | 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 Glenoaks, 49 percent of students scored at or above average in reading (compared to 39 percent statewide); 62 percent scored at or above average in language (compared to 47 percent statewide); and 75 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 Glenoaks, 16 percent of students scored at the top in reading (compared to 15 percent statewide); 26 percent scored at the top in language (compared to 19 percent statewide); and 42 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 Glenoaks, 77 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 | 77% | 63% | 68% |
| English Learners | 23% | 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 139 students classified as English Learners. At Glenoaks, the language these students most often speak at home is Armenian. 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 | 20% | 89% | 85% |
| Vietnamese | 0% | 1% | 3% |
| Cantonese | 1% | 2% | 1% |
| Hmong | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Filipino/Tagalog | 6% | 1% | 1% |
| Korean | 9% | 2% | 1% |
| Khmer/Cambodian | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| All other | 64% | 5% | 8% |

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

Ethnicity

Most students at Glenoaks identify themselves as White/European American/Other. In fact, there are about four times as many White/European American/Other students as Asian/Pacific Islander students, the second-largest ethnic group at Glenoaks. 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 | 18% | 10% | 11% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 14% | 64% | 50% |
| White/European American/Other | 67% | 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 Glenoaks, 21 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 | 21% | 63% | 55% |
| Parents with some college | 78% | 47% | 54% |
| Parents with college degree | 59% | 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 78 percent of the students at Glenoaks have attended college, and 59 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 68 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 Glenoaks varies across grade levels from a low of 19 students to a high of 36. Our average class size schoolwide is 24 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 | 20 | 20 | 19 |
| Second grade | 19 | 20 | 19 |
| Third grade | 19 | 20 | 20 |
| Fourth grade | 35 | 28 | 28 |
| Fifth grade | 36 | 28 | 29 |
| Sixth grade | 35 | 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 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| 2006–2007 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| 2005–2006 | 1 | 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 ten 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.

Computers

We have 142 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 | 11% | 9% | 11% |
| Teachers holding an MA degree or higher | Percentage of teachers with a master's degree or higher from a graduate school | 36% | 39% | 34% |
| Teachers holding a BA degree alone | Percentage of teachers whose highest degree is a bachelor's degree from a four-year college | 64% | 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 11 percent of our teachers have fewer than three years of teaching experience, which is about the same average for new teachers in other elementary schools in California. Our teachers have, on average, 15 years of experience. About 64 percent of our teachers hold only a bachelor's degree from a four-year college or university. About 36 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 | 96% | 97% | 97% |
| Trainee credential holders | Percentage of staff holding an internship credential | 4% | 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.

About 96 percent of the faculty at Glenoaks hold a full credential. This number is close to the average for all elementary schools in the state. About four percent of the faculty at Glenoaks 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 96 percent of the faculty at Glenoaks 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 | 4% | N/A | 0% |
| Teachers lacking a full credential | Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential | 4% | 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. About four percent of our teachers were 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 | 0.0 |
| Psychologists | 0.0 |
| Social workers | 0.0 |
| Nurses | 0.0 |
| Speech/language/hearing specialists | 0.0 |
| Resource specialists | 0.0 |

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_19-64568-6013692e/16375

» 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 | 28 | 28 | 23 |
| 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 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 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 | McMillan 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 | DESCRIPTION |
|---|-------------|--|
| 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 Tuesday, April 15, 2008. There were no other inspectors used in the completion of this form. The Facilities Inspection Tool was completed on Thursday, April 17, 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 582 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) | \$4,092.00 | \$4,201.00 | 3% | \$5,300 | -23% |
| Restricted funds (\$/student) | \$249.00 | \$764.00 | 67% | \$2,817 | -91% |
| Total (\$/student) | \$4,341.00 | \$4,965.00 | 13% | \$8,117 | -47% |

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 26 FTE teachers working in our school.

| CATEGORY | OUR SCHOOL | DISTRICT AVERAGE | SCHOOL VARIANCE | STATE AVERAGE | SCHOOL VARIANCE |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Salary | \$59,098.00 | \$64,195.00 | 8% | \$62,157 | -5% |
| Benefits | \$18,160.00 | \$19,258.00 | 6% | \$17,426 | 4% |
| Total | \$77,258.00 | \$83,453.00 | 7% | \$79,583 | -3% |

» 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 | 606 |
| African American | 1% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0% |
| Asian | 11% |
| Filipino | 7% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 14% |
| Pacific Islander | 0% |
| White (not Hispanic) | 56% |
| Multiple or no response | 11% |
| Socioeconomically disadvantaged | 22% |
| English Learners | 24% |
| 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 | 76 |
| Grade 1 | 85 |
| Grade 2 | 91 |
| Grade 3 | 72 |
| Grade 4 | 107 |
| Grade 5 | 92 |
| Grade 6 | 83 |
| 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 | 20 | 18 | 19 |
| Grade 1 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Grade 2 | 20 | 19 | 19 |
| Grade 3 | 20 | 19 | 19 |
| Grade 4 | 29 | 30 | 35 |
| Grade 5 | 33 | 33 | 36 |
| Grade 6 | 28 | 34 | 35 |
| Grade 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Grade 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Combined K–3 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Combined 3–4 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Combined 4–8 | N/A | 35 | 35 |
| 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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Grade 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Grade 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Combined K–3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined 3–4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined 4–8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 30 | 28 | 27 | 1,215 |
| Without Full Credential | 1 | 1 | 1 | 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 | 40% | 23% | 26% |
| Girls in Fitness Zone | 81% | 30% | 32% |
| Fifth graders in Fitness Zone | 61% | 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 | 61% | 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 | 60% | 60% | 65% | 56% | 58% | 59% | 42% | 43% | 46% |
| Mathematics | 68% | 63% | 70% | 57% | 57% | 58% | 40% | 40% | 43% |
| Science | 60% | 63% | 69% | 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 | 83% | 90% | N/A |
| Filipino | 56% | 75% | N/A |
| Hispanic or Latino | 60% | 57% | 57% |
| Pacific Islander | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| White (not Hispanic) | 66% | 71% | 71% |
| Boys | 58% | 68% | 65% |
| Girls | 72% | 73% | 73% |
| Economically disadvantaged | 46% | 54% | 50% |
| English Learners | 39% | 45% | 42% |
| Students with disabilities | 40% | 53% | 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 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Similar-schools rank | 7 | 6 | 5 |

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 | +3 | -12 | +25 | 856 |
| 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 | +14 | -16 | +30 | 810 |
| Pacific Islander | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| White (non Hispanic) | +5 | -10 | +23 | 860 |
| Economically disadvantaged | +25 | -43 | +23 | 779 |
| English Learners | +2 | -15 | +20 | 820 |
| 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.