

# Eleanor J. Toll Middle School

School Accountability Report Card, 2009–2010  
Glendale Unified School District



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



Published by  
**SCHOOL WISE PRESS**

# Eleanor J. Toll Middle School

School Accountability Report Card, 2009–2010  
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 2009–2010 school year, not the current school year. In most cases, this is the most recent data available. We present our school's results next to those of the average middle school in the county and state to provide the most meaningful and fair comparisons. To find additional facts about our school online, please use the [DataQuest](#) tool offered by the California Department of Education.

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\\_2010\\_en.html](http://www.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links_2010_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

700 Glenwood Rd.  
Glendale, CA 91202  
Principal: Dr. Paula Nelson  
Phone: (818) 244-8414

## How to Contact Our District

223 North Jackson St.  
Glendale, CA 91206  
Phone: (818) 241-3111  
<http://gusd.net/>



## » 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](http://www.schoolwisepress.com)

©2010 Publishing 20/20

# Eleanor J. Toll Middle School

School Accountability Report Card, 2009–2010  
Glendale Unified School District



## » Principal's Message

Toll Middle School is a high performing school located in the northern section of the city of Glendale and serves students in grades six through eight on a traditional calendar system. Through a rigorous, standards-based instructional program, the teachers, administrators, and support staff place an emphasis on academic achievement for all students while guiding them through the social and emotional complexities of adolescence. In addition to our strong academic program, students at Toll Middle School are nurtured by a school climate that holds high expectations for promoting respect, cooperation, courtesy, and acceptance of others. Cultural diversity is fostered through student involvement in various campus enhancements, including the recent painting of a multi-cultural mural in the common lunch area and lunchtime teambuilding activities are coordinated through our associated student body to promote unity.

The underlying belief of the school's mission is that students who develop a sense of personal responsibility will mature both academically and emotionally. We encourage students to participate in the school's varied additional academic and extracurricular activities that promote positive attitudes and encourage involvement and a sense of belonging. To build self-esteem and recognize student achievement, we present various awards to students at assemblies and special presentations throughout the school year.

Toll is organized into teams ("cores") of English, social studies, science and math teachers who share a group of students. This structure provides a personalized environment where students and teachers can get to know each other well. Each core promotes deep parent involvement in both academic and social activities, and the school's PTSA supports the team through field trips, supplies, and volunteerism on a regular basis. Technology is incorporated into the classroom through the use of SMART boards, document cameras and student computers.

Dr. Paula Nelson, PRINCIPAL

### Grade range and calendar

**6–8**

TRADITIONAL

### Academic Performance Index

**814**

County Average: N/A  
State Average: 768

### Student enrollment

**1,268**

County Average: N/A  
State Average: N/A

### Teachers

**54**

County Average: N/A  
State Average: N/A

### Students per teacher

**23**

County Average: N/A  
State Average: N/A

### PLEASE NOTE:

Comparative data (county average and state averages) in some sections of this report are unavailable due to problems the Department of Education had with data collection last year.

## **School Expenditures**

A combination of state and federal funding is used to cover all aspects of our instructional program. Strong PTSA 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 of students and staff is a primary concern of Toll Middle School. Administrators, teachers, and security personnel monitor students before school, after school, and during passing periods, breaks, and lunch. All visitors to the campus must report to the front office, sign in, and obtain a visitor's pass that must be displayed at all times. If there is a question about the purpose of the visit, the attendance office contacts the administration. Parents also provide daily supervision through the Parents on Patrol program. All areas of the school are equipped with an Internet-based video surveillance system consisting of 31 strategically placed cameras. The administration uses this system to monitor the campus at all times and to investigate incidents that occur on campus.

The School Site Safety Plan is evaluated and revised each spring by members of the School Safety Committee. All revisions are shared with staff members, students, and families through documents mailed to homes during the summer. The plan is also reviewed during monthly emergency drills. Key elements of the plan include child abuse reporting procedures, teacher notification of dangerous pupils procedures, disaster response procedures, procedures for safe ingress and egress from school, sexual harassment policy, and dress code policy. The school is always in compliance with the laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to hazardous materials and state earthquake standards. Fire, lockdown, and earthquake drills are conducted on a regular basis throughout the school year.

## **Buildings**

Toll Middle School, originally constructed in 1926, is currently situated on 9.31 acres and is comprised of 54 classrooms, a library, three stationary computer labs, several mobile computer lab carts, an auditorium, a cafeteria, covered lunch shelters, a multipurpose room, administrative offices, a gymnasium and athletic fields. The final phases of Measure K modernizations were completed in the fall of 2005. At that time, the school's technological capabilities, infrastructure, and handicap accessibility were all thoroughly upgraded. The school also has several landscaped areas for student and parent enjoyment.

## **Parent Involvement**

Parent involvement is quite robust at Toll Middle School, with a variety of opportunities for students' parents to volunteer and become involved with in the academic and social life of their children at school. The PTSA is our primary parent group, but parents also serve on many other committees that contribute to decisions made at the school. Each interdisciplinary team, consisting of an English, science, social studies, and math teacher, has a group of dedicated parent volunteers who help students in the classroom, during field trips, and with extra-curricular activities. Parents also chaperone dances, hold fund-raisers, write, design, and assemble the monthly community newsletter, host staff appreciation events, and supervise the campus at lunchtime through the Parents on Patrol organization. All parents are welcome to become involved with the life of the school. For more information, please contact the school at (818) 244-8414.

**MEASURES OF PROGRESS**

**Academic Performance Index**

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

Toll’s API was 814 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 12 points compared with last year’s API. All students took the test. You can find three years of detailed API results in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

**API RANKINGS:** Based on our 2008–2009 test results, we started the 2009–2010 school year with a base API of 802. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared with all middle schools in California, our school ranked 7 out of 10.

**SIMILAR SCHOOL RANKINGS:** We also received a second ranking that compared us with the 100 schools with the most similar students, teachers, and class sizes. Compared with these schools, our school ranked 9 out of 10. The CDE recalculates this factor every year. To read more about the specific elements included in this calculation, refer to the [CDE Web site](#).

**API GROWTH TARGETS:** Each year the CDE sets specific API “growth targets” for every school. It assigns one growth target for the entire school, and it sets additional targets for ethnic groups, English Learners, special education students, or socioeconomic subgroups of students that make up a significant portion of the student body. Schools are required to meet all of their growth targets. If they do, they may be eligible to apply for awards through the California School Recognition Program and the Title I Achieving Schools Program.


We did not meet some or all of our assigned growth targets during the 2009–2010 school year. Just for reference, 50 percent of middle schools statewide met their growth targets.

CALIFORNIA <b>API</b> ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
<b>Met schoolwide growth target</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met growth target for prior school year</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>API score</b>	<b>814</b>
<b>Growth attained from prior year</b>	<b>+12</b>
<b>Met subgroup* growth targets</b>	<b>No</b>

SOURCE: API based on spring 2010 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of December 2010.

\*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 2010**



SOURCE: API based on spring 2010 test cycle. State average represents middle schools only.  
NOTE: Only groups of students that represent at least 15 percent of total enrollment are calculated and displayed as student subgroups.

### Adequate Yearly Progress

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

We met 16 out of 21 criteria for yearly progress. Because we fell short in five areas, we did not make 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, middle schools must meet three criteria. First, a certain percentage of students must score at or above Proficient levels on the California Standards Tests (CST): 56.8 percent on the English/language arts test and 58 percent on the math test. All ethnic, English Learners, special education, and socioeconomic subgroups of students also must meet these goals. Second, the schools must achieve an API of at least 680 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 <b>AYP</b> ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS	
<b>Met AYP</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Met schoolwide participation rate</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met schoolwide test score goals</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met subgroup* participation rate</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met subgroup* test score goals</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Met schoolwide API for AYP</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Program Improvement school in 2010</b>	<b>Yes</b>

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of December 2010. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students’ test results in the 2009–2010 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 56.8% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST?	DID 58% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST?
<b>SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS</b>	●	●	●	●
<b>SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS</b>				
Low income	●	●	●	●
Students learning English	●	●	●	●
<b>STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY</b>				
Hispanic/Latino	●	●	●	●
White/Other	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of October 2010, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2009–2010 school year. The green dots represent goals we met; red dots indicate goals we missed. Just one red dot means that we failed to meet AYP.

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

**Program Improvement, a Federal Intervention Program**

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

**IMPROVEMENT:** Toll was placed on the list of schools needing improvement (also known as Program Improvement, or PI) for the first time in 2010. In California, 150 middle schools were in stage 1 of PI as of December 2010.

**THE STAGES OF PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:** Program Improvement 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	
<b>PI</b>	
PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	
<b>In PI since</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Stage of PI</b>	<b>1 of 5</b>
<b>Change in 2010</b>	<b>Entered PI</b>

SOURCE: PI status is based on the Accountability Progress Report of February 2010. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2009–2010 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 ■
2009	Not in PI	Toll met 24 of the 25 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress established by the federal law known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB).	
2010	1	We met 16 of the 21 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress, causing the school to enter the first stage of Program Improvement.	

SOURCE: PI status is based on the Accountability Progress Report of October 2010. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2009–2010 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**

**PARENTS:** Because Toll is in stage (year) 1 of PI, parents of students have just one option. They can enroll their children in different schools in the district. To see the list of these schools, parents can contact either the principal or the district office staff.

**SCHOOL:** The school’s staff is revising its improvement plan. The staff is also using as much as ten percent of the school’s Title I (federal) funds for coaching teachers.

**DISTRICT:** The district is establishing a peer review group to evaluate the school’s annual improvement plan.


## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

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

### California Standards Tests

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

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



SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2010 test cycle. State average represents middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.



## Frequently Asked Questions About Standardized Tests

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

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

**HOW HARD ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS?** Experts consider California's standards to be among the most clear and rigorous in the country. Just 55 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 61 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
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			57%	97%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About four percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
<b>AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			49%	96%	
<b>AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			53%	95%	

### Subgroup Test Scores

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


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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>Boys</b>			52%	639	<b>GENDER:</b> About 11 percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
<b>Girls</b>			63%	587	
<b>English proficient</b>			70%	910	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> 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.
<b>English Learners</b>			20%	316	
<b>Low income</b>			49%	747	<b>INCOME:</b> About 21 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
<b>Not low income</b>			70%	479	
<b>Learning disabled</b>			21%	49	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> 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.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			58%	1,177	
<b>Asian American</b>			80%	89	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> 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.
<b>Filipino</b>			78%	72	
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>			57%	212	
<b>White/Other</b>			53%	819	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2010 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.  
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.  
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

You can read the California standards for **English/language arts** on the CDE's Web site.



### Math (Excluding Algebra)

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			51%	78%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About three percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
<b>AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			44%	75%	
<b>AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			48%	74%	

### 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
<b>Boys</b>			49%	522	<b>GENDER:</b> About three percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
<b>Girls</b>			52%	469	
<b>English proficient</b>			61%	692	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> 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.
<b>English Learners</b>			27%	299	
<b>Low income</b>			44%	623	<b>INCOME:</b> About 18 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
<b>Not low income</b>			62%	368	
<b>Learning disabled</b>			15%	59	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> 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.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			53%	932	
<b>Asian American</b>			80%	49	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> 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.
<b>Filipino</b>			67%	57	
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>			44%	195	
<b>White/Other</b>			50%	659	


SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2010 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.  
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.  
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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

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

Three-Year Trend: Math



### Algebra I

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			87%	21%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About 40 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California. About 11 percent fewer students took algebra than did students in the average middle school in the state.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			44%	32%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			47%	32%	

### 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			87%	98	<b>GENDER:</b> About the same percentage of boys and girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			88%	112	
English proficient			86%	192	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> 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	18	
Low income			88%	113	<b>INCOME:</b> About the same percentage of students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced as our other students.
Not low income			87%	97	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	N/A	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> 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			87%	210	
Asian American			97%	36	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> 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	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	20	
White/Other			85%	142	


SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2010 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.  
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.  
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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

About 21 percent of our seventh and eighth grade students took the algebra CST, compared with 32 percent of all middle school students statewide. You can review the **math** standards on the CDE’s Web site.

Three-Year Trend: Algebra I



### History/Social Science

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			63%	99%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About 16 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			44%	99%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			47%	98%	

### Subgroup Test Scores

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			65%	271	<b>GENDER:</b> About three percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			62%	236	
English proficient			77%	370	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> 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			26%	137	
Low income			57%	325	<b>INCOME:</b> About 18 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			75%	182	
Learning disabled			29%	34	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> 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			66%	473	
Asian American			83%	30	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Filipino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	23	
Hispanic/Latino			57%	92	
White/Other			62%	351	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2010 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.


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

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

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

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

### Three-Year Trend: History/Social Science



**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
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			67%	97%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About ten percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
<b>AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			54%	96%	
<b>AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			57%	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
<b>Boys</b>			69%	263	<b>GENDER:</b> About four percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
<b>Girls</b>			65%	234	
<b>English proficient</b>			78%	363	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> 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.
<b>English Learners</b>			38%	134	
<b>Low income</b>			62%	317	<b>INCOME:</b> About 14 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
<b>Not low income</b>			76%	180	
<b>Learning disabled</b>	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	24	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was too small to be statistically significant.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			69%	473	
<b>Asian American</b>			87%	30	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> 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.
<b>Filipino</b>	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	23	
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>			60%	85	
<b>White/Other</b>			66%	349	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2010 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.  
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.  
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

Although we teach science at all grade levels, only our eighth graders took the California Standards Test in this subject. You can read the **science standards** on the CDE’s Web site.

**Three-Year Trend: Science**



**STUDENTS**

**Ethnicity**

Most students at Toll identify themselves as White/European American/Other. In fact, there are about three times as many White/European American/Other students as Hispanic/Latino students, the second-largest ethnic group at Toll. 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
<b>African American</b>	2%	9%	7%
<b>Asian American/ Pacific Islander</b>	13%	11%	11%
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>	19%	63%	49%
<b>White/European American/ Other</b>	66%	17%	33%

SOURCE: CBEDS census of October 2009. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

**Family Income and Education**

The **free or reduced-price meal** subsidy goes to students whose families earned less than \$40,793 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2009-2010 school year. At Toll, 59 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 56 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
<b>Low-income indicator</b>	59%	N/A	56%
<b>Parents with some college</b>	50%	48%	56%
<b>Parents with college degree</b>	34%	28%	32%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2009–2010 school year. Parents’ education level is collected in the spring at the start of testing. Rarely do all students answer these questions.

The parents of 50 percent of the students at Toll have attended college and 34 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 85 percent of our students provided this information.

**CLIMATE FOR LEARNING**

**Average Class Sizes**

The table at the right shows average class sizes for core courses. For more information on our average class sizes, please contact the school directly.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZES OF CORE COURSES	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
<b>English</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>History</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Math</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Science</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: This information provided by the school district.



**LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF**

**Indicators of Teachers Who May Be Underprepared**

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
<b>Core courses taught by a teacher not meeting NCLB standards</b>	Percentage of core courses not taught by a “highly qualified” teacher according to federal standards in NCLB	3%	N/A	0%
<b>Out-of-field teaching</b>	Percentage of algebra and science courses taught by a teacher who lacks the appropriate credential for the course	2%	N/A	N/A
<b>Fully credentialed teachers</b>	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	100%	N/A	N/A
<b>Teachers lacking a full credential</b>	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	0%	N/A	N/A

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

PLEASE NOTE: Comparative data (county average and state averages) from some of the data reported in the SARC is unavailable due to problems the California Department of Education had with data collection last year.

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

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

**CREDENTIAL STATUS OF TEACHERS:** Teachers who lack full credentials are working under the terms of an emergency permit, an internship credential, or a waiver. They should be working toward their credential, and they are allowed to teach in the meantime only if the school board approves.

**Districtwide Distribution of Teachers Who Are Not “Highly Qualified”**

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

When more than 40 percent of the students in a school are receiving subsidized lunches, that school is considered by the California Department of Education to be a school with higher concentrations of low-income students. About 70 percent of the state’s schools are in this category. When less than 25 percent of the students in a school are receiving subsidized lunches, that school is

DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT
<b>Districtwide</b>	Percentage of core courses not taught by “highly qualified” teachers (HQT)	7%
<b>Schools with more than 40% of students from lower-income homes</b>	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	13%
<b>Schools with less than 25% of students from lower-income homes</b>	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	5%

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

considered by the CDE to be a school with lower concentrations of low-income students. About 19 percent of the state’s schools are in this category.

The average percentage of courses in our district not taught by a “highly qualified” teacher is six percent, compared with one percent statewide. For schools with the highest percentage of low-income students, this factor is 13 percent, compared with zero percent statewide. For schools with the lowest percentage of low-income students, this factor is five percent, compared with zero percent statewide.

**Specialized Resource Staff**

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

**ACADEMIC GUIDANCE COUNSELORS:** More information about [counseling and student support](#) is available on the CDE Web site.

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

SOURCE: Data provided by the school district.

**TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY:** All data is the most current available as of December 2010. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2009–2010 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 2009 census); Language Census (March 2010); California Standards Tests (spring 2010 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (November 2010 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (October 2010).

**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.

rev20100216\_19-64568-6057723m/17254

## » Adequacy of Key Resources

Here you'll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2010–2011. Please note that these facts are based on evaluations our staff conducted in accordance with the Williams legislation.

This section also contains information about 2009–2010 staff development days, and, for high schools, percentages of seniors who met our district's graduation requirements.



**TEACHERS**

Teacher Vacancies

KEY FACTOR	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011
<b>TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR</b>			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	293	321	234
Number of classes which lacked a permanently assigned teacher within the first 20 days of school	0	0	1
<b>TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR</b>			
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	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011
<b>Teacher Misassignments</b>	Total number of classes taught by teachers without a legally recognized certificate or credential	0	0	3
<b>Teacher Misassignments in Classes that Include English Learners</b>	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	8	6	2
<b>Other Employee Misassignments</b>	Total number of service area placements of employees without the required credentials	0	0	1

**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
<b>2009–2010</b>	3.00
<b>2008–2009</b>	3.00
<b>2007–2008</b>	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 call for.

This information was collected on 06/18/2010.

**NOTES:** All of our textbooks are the most recently approved by the State Board of Ed or our Local Governing Agency.

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"/>	<b>English</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Math</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Science</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Social Science</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Foreign Languages</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Health</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Visual/Performing Arts</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

## Textbooks in Use

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

SUBJECT AND TITLE	PUBLISHER	YEAR ADOPTED
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS		
The Language of Literature	McDougal Littell	2003
MATH		
Math, Course 2	McDougal Littell	2008
Algebra Readiness	McDougal Littell	2008
SCIENCE		
California Earth Science	Prentice Hall	2007
California Life Science	Prentice Hall	2007
California Physical Science	Prentice Hall	2007
SOCIAL SCIENCE		
World History : Ancient Civilizations	McDougal Littell	2006
World History: Medieval & Early Modern Times	McDougal Littell	2006
Creating America: Beginnings through WW I	McDougal Littell	2006

**FACILITIES**

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

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

**INSPECTORS AND ADVISORS:** This report was completed on 12/14/2010 by Richard Carroll. The most recent facilities inspection occurred on 01/11/2009.

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

AREA	RATING	REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Good</b>	No apparent problems
<b>A. Systems</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Gas</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Mechanical/HVAC</b>		No apparent problems
<b>3. Sewer</b>		No apparent problems
<b>B. Interior Surfaces</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Interior Surfaces</b>		No apparent problems
<b>C. Cleanliness</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Overall cleanliness</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Pest/Vermin</b>		No apparent problems
<b>D. Electrical Components</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Electrical Components</b>		No apparent problems
<b>E. Restrooms/Fountains</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Restrooms</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Drinking Fountains</b>		No apparent problems
<b>F. Safety</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Fire Safety</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Hazardous Materials</b>		No apparent problems



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

## SCHOOL FINANCES, 2008–2009

We are required to report financial data from the 2008–2009 school year by the California Dept. of Education. More recent financial data is available on request from the district office.

### Spending per Student

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we first report our overall spending per student. We base our calculations on our average daily attendance (ADA) for the 2008–2009 school year.

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

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

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

TYPE OF FUNDS	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE
<b>Unrestricted funds (\$/student)</b>	\$4,360	\$4,373	-0.30%	\$5,653	-22.87%
<b>Restricted funds (\$/student)</b>	\$1,101	\$1,323	-16.78%	\$3,083	-64.29%
<b>Total (\$/student)</b>	\$5,461	\$5,695	-4.11%	\$8,736	-37.49%

### Compensation for Staff with Teaching Credentials

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we report our compensation per full-time equivalent (FTE) certificated staff.\* A teacher/administrator/pupil services person who works full-time counts as 1.0 FTE. Those who work only half-time count as 0.5 FTE.

CERTIFICATED STAFF*	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE
<b>Salary (\$/certificated staff)</b>	\$73,966	\$72,194	2.45%	\$72,020	2.70%
<b>Benefits (\$/certificated staff)</b>	\$21,923	\$21,162	3.60%	\$15,548	41.00%
<b>Total (\$/certificated staff)</b>	\$95,889	\$93,357	2.71%	\$87,568	9.50%

\* A certificated staff person is a school employee who is required by the state to hold teaching credentials, including full-time, part-time, substitute, or temporary teachers and most administrators.

## » Data Almanac

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



**STUDENTS AND TEACHERS**

**Student Enrollment by Ethnicity and Other Characteristics**

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

GROUP	ENROLLMENT
Number of students	1,268
Black/African American	2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	7%
Filipino	6%
Hispanic or Latino	19%
Pacific Islander	0%
White (not Hispanic)	65%
Two or more races	0%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	60%
English Learners	27%
Students with disabilities	7%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CBEDS, October 2009. Data about students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged, English Learners, or learning disabled come from the School Accountability Report Card unit of the California Department of Education.

**Student Enrollment by Grade Level**

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

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS
Kindergarten	0
Grade 1	0
Grade 2	0
Grade 3	0
Grade 4	0
Grade 5	1
Grade 6	249
Grade 7	504
Grade 8	514
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2009.

**Average Class Size by Core Course**

The average class size by core courses.

SUBJECT	2007–2008	2008–2009	2009–2010
English	29	29	89
History	28	30	66
Math	28	30	85
Science	29	30	84

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2009. Data for 2009–2010 provided by the school district.

**Average Class Size by Core Course, Detail**

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

SUBJECT	2007–2008			2008–2009			2009–2010		
	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+
English	7	25	13	9	27	16	8	4	3
History	7	18	16	7	26	19	10	6	3
Math	5	25	11	5	26	16	8	4	4
Science	5	19	15	6	19	20	10	4	1

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2009. Data for 2009–2010 provided by the school district.

### Physical Fitness

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

GRADE LEVEL	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING HEALTHY FITNESS ZONES		
	FOUR OF SIX STANDARDS	FIVE OF SIX STANDARDS	SIX OF SIX STANDARDS
Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7	27%	20%	20%
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Physical fitness test data is produced annually as schools test their students on the six Fitnessgram Standards. This information was the most recent available, for the 2008–2009 school year. Data is reported by Educational Data Systems.

### Suspensions and Expulsions

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

During the 2009–2010 school year, we had 242 suspension incidents. We had three incidents of expulsion. To make it easy to compare our suspensions and expulsions to those of other schools, we represent these events as a ratio (incidents per 100 students) in this report. Please note that multiple incidents may involve the same student.

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
<b>Suspensions per 100 students</b>			
2009–2010	19	18	20
2008–2009	23	23	19
2007–2008	36	28	20
<b>Expulsions per 100 students</b>			
2009–2010	0	0	0
2008–2009	0	0	0
2007–2008	1	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 middle schools only.

### Teacher Credentials

The number of teachers assigned to the school with a full credential and without a full credential, for both our school and the district. We also present three years' of data about the number of teachers who lacked the appropriate subject-area authorization for one or more classes they taught.

TEACHERS	SCHOOL			DISTRICT
	2007–2008	2008–2009	2009–2010	2009–2010
<b>With Full Credential</b>	47	53	53	1,121
<b>Without Full Credential</b>	0	1	0	16
<b>Teaching out of field</b>	6	9	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.

**STUDENT PERFORMANCE**

**California Standardized Testing and Reporting Program**

The California Standards Tests (CST) show how well students are doing in learning what the state content standards require. The CST include English/language arts and mathematics in grades six through eight; science in grade eight; and history/social science in grade eight. Student scores are reported as performance levels. We also include results from the California Modified Assessment and California Alternative Performance Assessment (CAPA).

**STAR Test Results for All Students: Three-Year Comparison**

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

SUBJECT	SCHOOL PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			DISTRICT PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			STATE PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010
English/ language arts	53%	54%	56%	59%	63%	66%	46%	50%	52%
History/social science	48%	55%	63%	52%	57%	60%	36%	41%	44%
Mathematics	59%	58%	58%	58%	60%	63%	43%	46%	48%
Science	63%	58%	67%	62%	64%	68%	46%	50%	54%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2010 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

**STAR Test Results by Student Subgroup: Most Recent Year**

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

STUDENT SUBGROUP	STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			
	ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS 2009–2010	HISTORY/ SOCIAL SCIENCE 2009–2010	MATHEMATICS 2009–2010	SCIENCE 2009–2010
African American	52%	N/A	38%	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	78%	83%	85%	87%
Filipino	78%	91%	72%	91%
Hispanic or Latino	55%	57%	47%	60%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	53%	62%	58%	66%
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Boys	51%	65%	57%	69%
Girls	62%	62%	59%	65%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	48%	57%	52%	62%
English Learners	21%	26%	33%	38%
Students with disabilities	34%	29%	24%	33%
Receives migrant education services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2010 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

**California Academic Performance Index (API)**

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

**API Ranks: Three-Year Comparison**

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

API RANK	2007–2008	2008–2009	2009–2010
Statewide rank	7	7	7
Similar-schools rank	8	9	9

SOURCE: The API Base Report from December 2010.

**API Changes by Subgroup: Three-Year Comparison**

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

SUBGROUP	ACTUAL API CHANGE			API
	2007–2008	2008–2009	2009–2010	2009–2010
All students at the school	+18	+10	+12	814
Black/African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	-2	+19	+24	769
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	+26	-1	+12	810
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	+26	-2	+19	780
English Learners	+50	+14	-65	724
Students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in December 2010.



### API Scores by Subgroup

This table includes Academic Performance Index results for our school, our district, and the state.

SUBGROUP	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	STATE
All students	814	842	767
Black/African American	N/A	788	686
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	728
Asian	N/A	935	890
Filipino	N/A	877	851
Hispanic or Latino	769	771	715
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	753
White (non Hispanic)	810	844	838
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	780	785	712
English Learners	724	761	692
Students with disabilities	N/A	646	580
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	807

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in December 2010.

### Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Intervention Programs

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

- (a) a 95-percent participation rate on the state’s tests
- (b) a CDE-mandated percentage of students scoring Proficient or higher on the state’s English/language arts and mathematics tests
- (c) an API of at least 680 or growth of at least one point

#### AYP for the District

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

AYP CRITERIA	DISTRICT
Overall	No
Graduation rate	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 December 2010.

#### 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	4
Percentage of schools currently in PI	13%

SOURCE: The Program Improvement Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in December 2010.

**DISTRICT EXPENDITURES**

According to the CDE’s SARC Data Definitions, “State certification/release dates for fiscal data occur in middle to late spring, precluding the inclusion of 2009–10 data in most cases. Therefore, 2008–09 data are used for report cards prepared during 2010–11.”

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
<b>FISCAL YEAR 2008–2009</b>			
Total expenses	\$217,571,164	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$8,471	\$8,823	\$8,736
<b>FISCAL YEAR 2007–2008</b>			
Total expenses	\$225,716,392	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$8,270	\$8,680	\$8,594

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

**District Salaries, 2008–2009**

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2008–2009 school year. This table compares our average salaries with those in districts like ours, based on both enrollment and the grade level of our students. In addition, we report the percentage of our district’s total budget dedicated to teachers’ and administrators’ salaries. The costs of health insurance, pensions, and other indirect compensation are not included.

SALARY INFORMATION	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Beginning teacher’s salary	\$42,451	\$42,377
Midrange teacher’s salary	\$65,170	\$67,667
Highest-paid teacher’s salary	\$88,157	\$87,102
Average principal’s salary (middle school)	\$118,692	\$113,713
Superintendent’s salary	\$273,188	\$223,323
Percentage of budget for teachers’ salaries	42%	40%
Percentage of budget for administrators’ salaries	5%	6%

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