

Mark Keppel Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2010–2011

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

Mark Keppel Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2010–2011
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 2010–2011 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.

Please note that words that appear in a smaller, bold typeface are links in the online version of this report to more information. You can find a list of those linked words and their Web page URLs at:

http://www.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links_2011_en.html

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

If you have any questions related to this report, or would like to request a hardcopy version, please contact our school office.

How to Contact Our School

730 Glenwood Rd.
Glendale, CA 91202
Principal: Dr. Mary Mason
Phone: (818) 244-2113

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 2011–2012](#)
[Data Almanac](#)



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

©2011 Publishing 20/20

Mark Keppel Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2010–2011
Glendale Unified School District



» Principal's Message

I am proud of Mark Keppel school and our dedicated teaching and support staff. From the moment you enter our front doors and are greeted by our helpful front office staff, we are here to serve you.

We have high expectations for student learning, and students rise to meet our challenge! We are committed to excellence, as evidenced by how we have seen our test scores rise this year. Keppel has a wonderful school environment, and we are fortunate to have a fantastic group of parents who support us daily. In 2010, our school became an elementary magnet school with a focus in the visual and performing arts!

Mark Keppel Visual & Performing Arts Magnet is a very special place. The students who attend Mark Keppel Magnet receive a strong academic program provided by dedicated, professional teachers who care about their students, not only academically, but also personally.

Mark Keppel Visual & Performing Arts Magnet offers outstanding technological, instrumental, choral, arts, and library programs. I encourage parents to become active participants in the PTA and the foundation, Make Keppel Special (MKS), to volunteer in the classroom, and to join the School Site Council (SSC).

The Foreign Language Academies of Glendale (FLAG) program at Keppel is a 50/50 model Korean dual immersion program designed to develop biliteracy skills in all participating students, beginning in Kindergarten and extending through fifth grade. Parents from across Glendale Unified School District interested in Keppel Specialized programs should contact the school prior to enrolling their Kindergarten students.

The state of California recognized the wonderful learning environment here at Mark Keppel Elementary School by naming us a California Distinguished School in May 2002 and a Title I Achieving School in 2005 and 2011.

My door is always open to all students, parents, and teachers. I am here to serve the Mark Keppel Visual & Performing Arts Magnet community for the Glendale Unified School District. I do this with an open mind and a sincere devotion to the education of our students. Please come and visit to see for yourself what a wonderful learning environment we have at Mark Keppel!

Dr. Mary Mason, PRINCIPAL

Grade range and calendar

K-5

TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index

866

County Average: 802
State Average: 807

Student enrollment

882

County Average: 608
State Average: 534

Teachers

36

Students per teacher

25

School Expenditures

At Mark Keppel, we believe in using any additional dollars we receive in direct support for student learning in the classroom. We have hired certificated intervention teachers to provide this direct support to students during the school day. Our school's focus is reading comprehension. We utilize small group instruction during our language arts block each day to support each student's individual learning needs. Our intervention teachers provide direct support to students who need to make more than one's years growth in reading to close the achievement gap for these children.

Safety

All exterior gates are locked after morning drop off. Mark Keppel is a secured campus during the school day. Visitors must check in at the front office by signing in our visitor's book and getting a visitor's badge. We have front security doors just inside our main office from which everyone is buzzed in.

Our safety plan is revised each year with staff, parents, and local law enforcement representatives. Monthly faculty meetings cover safety issues and an OSHA meeting is conducted each year.

A schoolwide discipline assembly is held during the first two weeks of school to remind students of all our safety rules, and teachers review evacuation procedures with their classes each year. Posters are up in each classroom that outline the evacuation path as well as procedures for all emergency situations. These procedures are reviewed and revised yearly. We also conduct a PTA meeting outlining the safety procedures at our school to parents. Our schoolwide monthly drills are planned and calendared each year.

We coordinate our drills with Toll Middle School and Hoover High School, which are our neighbor schools.

Buildings

Cleanliness and safety are main priorities at Keppel! Originally built in 1930, main building was completely modernized through a three-year Measure K project from 2002–2006. All classrooms and restrooms were completely refurbished. The school has all new plumbing, tile, air conditioning and heating units, and flooring, as well as lowered ceilings and tackable wall surfaces in all of our classrooms.

Our PTA and School Foundation have invested thousands of dollars in school murals to beautify our campus. They have also planted trees and flowers all around the school grounds.

In 2006, a school "unity garden" was created along Virginia Avenue, and each grade level has their own raised bed for special planting projects. We continually receive compliments from visitors on how beautiful our campus looks. We are very proud of our school!

Parent Involvement

At Keppel, we have a fabulous team of parent volunteers that are a huge part of what makes our school so special. We have two primary groups that support our school: our PTA and our Make Keppel Special (MKS) committee. Our PTA holds monthly meetings on topics of interest. MKS is our school foundation, which primarily raises money for interventions in reading and math at Keppel.

Parents who are interested in volunteering may contact our school principal for additional information. Our teachers welcome parent volunteers in classrooms to help with special projects, accompany students on field trips, assist with classroom groups, and more. We encourage parents to talk directly to their child's teacher if they wish to volunteer.

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.

Keppel’s API was 866 (out of 1000). This is a decline of 4 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 2009–2010 test results, we started the 2010–2011 school year with a base API of 870. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared with all elementary schools in California, our school ranked 8 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 8 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 2010–2011 school year. Just for reference, 64 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	866
Growth attained from prior year	-4
Met subgroup* growth targets	Yes

SOURCE: API based on spring 2011 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of November 2011.

*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 2011



SOURCE: API based on spring 2011 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 13 out of 17 criteria for yearly progress. Because we fell short in four areas, we did not make 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), the California Modified Assessment (CMA), and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA): 67.6 percent on the English/language arts test and 68.5 percent on the math test. All ethnic, English Learners, special education, and socioeconomic subgroups of students also must meet these goals. Second, the schools must achieve an API of at least 710 or increase the API by one point from the prior year. Third, 95 percent of the student body must take the required standardized tests.

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

FEDERAL AYP ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS	
Met AYP	No
Met schoolwide participation rate	Yes
Met schoolwide test score goals	Yes
Met subgroup* participation rate	Yes
Met subgroup* test score goals	No
Met schoolwide API for AYP	Yes
Program Improvement school in 2011	No

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of November 2011. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students’ test results in the 2010–2011 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, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 67.6% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 68.5% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?
SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS	●	●	●	●
SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS				
Low income	●	●	●	●
Students learning English	●	●	●	●
STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY				
White/Other	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of November 2011, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2010–2011 school year. The green dots represent goals we met; red dots indicate goals we missed. Just one red dot means that we failed to meet AYP.

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


STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Here you'll find a three-year summary of our students' scores on the California Standards Tests (CST) in selected subjects. We compare our students' test scores with the results for students in the average 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 2011 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.

HOW HARD ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS? Experts consider California's standards to be among the most clear and rigorous in the country. Just 56 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 62 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			68%	96%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 12 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			54%	95%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			56%	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
Boys			64%	274	GENDER: About eight percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			72%	281	
English proficient			81%	320	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			52%	233	
Low income			57%	260	INCOME: About 21 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			78%	293	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	19	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%	536	
Asian American			90%	81	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Filipino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	27	
Hispanic/Latino			62%	65	
White/Other			62%	366	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2011 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			74%	97%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 12 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			60%	89%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			62%	90%	

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			73%	278	GENDER: About three percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			76%	283	
English proficient			82%	322	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: English Learners scored lower on the CST than students who are proficient in English. Because we give this test in English, English Learners tend to be at a disadvantage.
English Learners			63%	237	
Low income			62%	263	INCOME: About 23 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			85%	296	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	25	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			76%	536	
Asian American			96%	82	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Filipino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	27	
Hispanic/Latino			58%	67	
White/Other			72%	369	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2011 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.



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			67%	95%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About ten 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			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
Boys			67%	75	GENDER: The same percentage of boys and girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			67%	72	
English proficient			85%	99	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			29%	48	
Low income			52%	73	INCOME: About 29 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			81%	74	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	5	LEARNING DISABILITIES: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled			66%	142	
Asian American	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	18	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	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	24	
White/Other			63%	96	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2011 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.



STUDENTS

Students’ English Language Skills

At Keppel, 56 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared with 77 percent of elementary school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	56%	87%	77%
English Learners	44%	13%	23%

SOURCE: Language Census for school year 2010–2011. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

Languages Spoken at Home by English Learners, 2010–2011

Please note that this table describes the home languages of just the 386 students classified as English Learners. At Keppel, 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	9%	81%	82%
Vietnamese	0%	2%	3%
Cantonese	0%	3%	2%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	2%	1%	2%
Korean	20%	2%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	1%	0%
All other	69%	10%	9%

SOURCE: Language Census for school year 2010–2011. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

Ethnicity

Most students at Keppel identify themselves as White. In fact, there are about three times as many White students as Asian/Pacific Islander students, the second-largest ethnic group at Keppel. The state of California allows citizens to choose more than one ethnic identity, or to select “two or more races” or “decline to state.” As a consequence, the sum of all responses rarely equals 100 percent.

ETHNICITY	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
African American	2%	9%	6%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	24%	10%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	11%	64%	53%
White	61%	14%	26%

SOURCE: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), October 2010. 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 \$40,793 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2010–2011 school year. At Keppel, 43 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 60 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	43%	69%	60%
Parents with some college	72%	49%	56%
Parents with college degree	59%	28%	32%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2010–2011 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 72 percent of the students at Keppel 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 57 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 Keppel varies across grade levels from a low of 22 students to a high of 37. Our average class size schoolwide is 26 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY GRADE	OUR SCHOOL
Kindergarten	23
First grade	23
Second grade	22
Third grade	23
Fourth grade	33
Fifth grade	37

SOURCE: California Department of Education, SARC Research File. State and county averages represent elementary schools only.

LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

Indicators of Teachers Who May Be Underprepared

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Core courses taught by a teacher not meeting NCLB standards	Percentage of core courses not taught by a “highly qualified” teacher according to federal standards in NCLB	3%	N/A	0%
Fully credentialed teachers	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	97%	N/A	N/A
Teachers lacking a full credential	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	3%	N/A	N/A

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

PLEASE NOTE: Comparative data (county average and state averages) for some of the data reported in the SARC is unavailable.

“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 three percent of our teachers were working without full credentials.

Districtwide Distribution of Teachers Who Are Not “Highly Qualified”

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

When more than 40 percent of the students in a school are receiving subsidized lunches, that school is considered by the California Department of Education to be a school with higher concentrations of low-income students. About 70 percent of the state’s schools are in this category. When less than 25 percent of the students in a school are receiving subsidized lunches, that school is considered by the CDE to be a school with lower concentrations of low-income students. About 19 percent of the state’s schools are in this category.

DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT
Districtwide	Percentage of core courses not taught by “highly qualified” teachers (HQT)	6%
Schools with more than 40% of students from lower-income homes	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	7%
Schools with less than 25% of students from lower-income homes	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	5%

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

Specialized Resource Staff

The table to the right lists the number of full-time equivalent qualified support personnel who provide counseling and other pupil support services in our school. These specialists often work part time at our school and some may work at more than one school in our district. For more details on [statewide ratios of counselors, psychologists, or other pupil services](#) staff to students, see the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site. [Library facts](#) and frequently asked questions are also available there.

STAFF POSITION	STAFF (FTE)
Academic counselors	0.0
Behavioral/career counselors	0.0
Librarians and media staff	0.0
Psychologists	0.0
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 November 2011. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2010–2011 school year after the publication date of this report. We rely on the following sources of information from the California Department of Education: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) (October 2010); Language Census (March 2011); California Standards Tests (spring 2011 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (November 2011 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (November 2011).

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.

rev20120112_19-64568-6013726e/16377

» Adequacy of Key Resources 2011–2012

Here you'll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2011–2012. Please note that these facts are based on evaluations our staff conducted in accordance with the Williams legislation.

This section also contains information about 2010–2011 staff development days, and, for high schools, percentages of seniors who met our district's graduation requirements.



TEACHERS

Teacher Vacancies

KEY FACTOR	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	36	36	36
Number of classes that 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	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
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	2	1	0
Other Employee Misassignments	Total number of service area placements of employees without the required credentials	0	0	0

NOTES:

Staff Development

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

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
2010–2011	3.00
2009–2010	3.00
2008–2009	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.

All of our textbooks except for those in the following subject areas are the most recently approved by the State Board of Education or our Local Governing Agency:

This information was collected on 11/10/2010.

NOTES:

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"/>	

Textbooks in Use

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

SUBJECT AND TITLE	PUBLISHER	YEAR ADOPTED
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS		
Reading: California	Houghton Mifflin	2003
The Language of Literature	McDougal Littell	2003
MATH		
Everyday Mathematics	MacMillan McGraw-Hill	1997
SCIENCE		
California Science	MacMillan McGraw-Hill	2007
California Earth Science	PrenticeHall	2007
SOCIAL SCIENCE		
Reflections: California Series	Harcourt	2006
California Vistas	McMillan McGraw-Hill	2006
World History: Ancient Civilizations	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 03/11/2011 by Edward Zung. The most recent facilities inspection occurred on 12/22/2010.

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

AREA	RATING	REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED
Overall Rating	Good	No apparent problems
A. Systems	Good	
1. Gas		No apparent problems
2. Mechanical/HVAC		No apparent problems
3. Sewer		No apparent problems
B. Interior Surfaces	Good	
1. Interior Surfaces		Damaged ceiling tiles
C. Cleanliness	Good	
1. Overall cleanliness		No apparent problems
2. Pest/Vermin		No apparent problems
D. Electrical Components	Good	
1. Electrical Components		No apparent problems
E. Rest Rooms/Fountains	Good	
1. Rest Rooms		No apparent problems
2. Drinking Fountains		Button is sticking
F. Safety	Good	
1. Fire Safety		No apparent problems
2. Hazardous Materials		No apparent problems

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

SCHOOL FINANCES, 2009–2010

We are required by the California Dept. of Education to report financial data from the 2009–2010 school year. More recent financial data is available on request from the district office.

Spending per Student

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

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

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

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

TYPE OF FUNDS	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE
Unrestricted funds (\$/student)	\$4,105	\$4,059	1%	\$5,513	-26%
Restricted funds (\$/student)	\$1,908	\$1,684	13%	\$2,939	-35%
Total (\$/student)	\$6,013	\$5,744	5%	\$8,452	-29%

Compensation for Staff with Teaching Credentials

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

CERTIFICATED STAFF*	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE
Salary (\$/certificated staff)	\$74,956	\$73,624	2%	\$71,246	5%
Benefits (\$/certificated staff)	\$22,489	\$22,954	-2%	\$16,062	40%
Total (\$/certificated staff)	\$97,445	\$96,578	1%	\$87,308	12%

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

» Data Almanac

This Data Almanac provides additional information about students, teachers, student performance, accountability, and district expenditures.



STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

Student Enrollment by Ethnicity and Other Characteristics

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

GROUP	ENROLLMENT
Number of students	882
Black/African American	2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	18%
Filipino	6%
Hispanic or Latino	11%
Pacific Islander	0%
White (not Hispanic)	61%
Two or more races	2%
Ethnicity not reported	0%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	41%
English Learners	51%
Students with disabilities	5%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CALPADS, October 2010. 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	142
Grade 1	158
Grade 2	149
Grade 3	142
Grade 4	132
Grade 5	159
Grade 6	0
Grade 7	0
Grade 8	0
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2010.

Average Class Size by Grade Level

GRADE LEVEL	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011
Kindergarten	20	21	23
Grade 1	18	20	23
Grade 2	20	21	22
Grade 3	20	20	23
Grade 4	34	36	33
Grade 5	35	34	37
Grade 6	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined K–3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 3–4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 4–8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2010. Information for 2009-2010 provided by the school district.

Average Class Size by Grade Level, Detail

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

GRADE LEVEL	2008–2009			2009–2010			2010–2011		
	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+
Kindergarten	7	0	0	4	3	0	2	4	0
Grade 1	8	0	0	3	4	0	2	5	0
Grade 2	6	0	0	3	4	0	1	6	0
Grade 3	7	0	0	6	0	0	0	6	0
Grade 4	0	1	3	0	0	4	0	1	3
Grade 5	0	0	4	0	1	3	0	0	4
Grade 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined K–3	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 3–4	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 4–8	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2010. Information for 2009-2010 provided by the school district.

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
	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011	2010–2011
With Full Credential	41	41	N/A	N/A
Without Full Credential	0	0	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Information provided by 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	23%	23%	50%
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Physical fitness test data is produced annually as schools test their students on the six Fitnessgram Standards. This information is from the 2010–2011 school year.

Suspensions and Expulsions

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

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Suspensions per 100 students			
2010–2011	0	3	N/A
2009–2010	1	4	6
2008–2009	1	5	6
Expulsions per 100 students			
2010–2011	0	0	N/A
2009–2010	0	0	0
2008–2009	0	0	0

SOURCE: Data is from the Consolidated Application published by the California Department of Education. The numbers above are a ratio of suspension or expulsion events, per 100 students enrolled. District and state averages represent elementary schools only.

During the 2010–2011 school year, we had no 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.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

California Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

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. 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		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
English/ language arts	63%	65%	68%	63%	66%	68%	49%	52%	54%
Mathematics	74%	70%	73%	60%	63%	64%	46%	48%	50%
Science	54%	77%	67%	65%	68%	72%	50%	54%	57%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2011 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 GROUP	STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	ENGLISH/ LANGUAGE ARTS 2010–2011	MATHEMATICS 2010–2011	SCIENCE 2010–2011
African American	77%	77%	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	89%	95%	89%
Filipino	76%	76%	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	67%	57%	62%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	62%	71%	62%
Two or more Races	N/A	N/A	N/A
Boys	63%	71%	67%
Girls	72%	75%	67%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	56%	62%	52%
English Learners	51%	62%	29%
Students with disabilities	58%	42%	0%
Receives migrant education services	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2011 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 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 with 100 statistically matched schools that have similar teachers and students.

API RANK	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011
Statewide rank	8	8	8
Similar-schools rank	6	7	8

SOURCE: The API Base Report from December 2011.

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
	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011	2010–2011
All students at the school	+27	+19	-4	866
Black/African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	860
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	+16	975
Filipino	N/A	N/A	+4	889
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	N/A	+18	828
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	+24	+22	-11	849
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	+26	+45	-16	812
English Learners	+7	+19	-1	827
Students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	+7	706

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in December 2011.

API Scores by Subgroup

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

SUBGROUP	SCHOOL		DISTRICT		STATE	
	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API
All students	546	866	19,281	851	4,683,676	778
Black/African American	13	860	255	801	317,856	696
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	N/A	39	817	33,774	733
Asian	73	975	2,427	944	398,869	898
Filipino	28	889	1,298	893	123,245	859
Hispanic or Latino	64	828	4,284	778	2,406,749	729
Pacific Islander	0	N/A	20	913	26,953	764
White (non Hispanic)	365	849	10,852	854	1,258,831	845
Two or more races	3	N/A	98	900	76,766	836
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	254	812	8,953	798	2,731,843	726
English Learners	267	827	7,814	771	1,521,844	707
Students with disabilities	42	706	1,862	661	521,815	595

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in December 2011.

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 710 or growth of at least one point
- (d) the graduation rate for the graduating class must be higher than 90 percent (or satisfy alternate improvement criteria).

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 2011.

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	1 of 3
The year the district entered PI	2011
Number of schools currently in PI	11
Percentage of schools currently in PI	34%

SOURCE: The Program Improvement Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in December 2011.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES

According to the CDE, “State certification/release dates for fiscal data occur in middle to late spring, precluding the inclusion of 2010–11 data in most cases. Therefore, 2009–10 data are used for report cards prepared during 2011–12.”

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 2009–2010			
Total expenses	\$212,092,576	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$8,325	\$8,543	\$8,452
FISCAL YEAR 2008–2009			
Total expenses	\$217,571,164	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$8,471	\$8,823	\$8,736

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

District Salaries, 2009–2010

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2009–2010 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	\$42,017
Midrange teacher’s salary	\$65,170	\$67,294
Highest-paid teacher’s salary	\$88,157	\$86,776
Average principal’s salary (elementary school)	\$107,023	\$108,534
Superintendent’s salary	\$286,847	\$226,417
Percentage of budget for teachers’ salaries	41%	38%
Percentage of budget for administrators’ salaries	5%	5%

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

