# VALLEY VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL School Accountability Report Card

# **Reported Using Data from the 2011–12 School Year**

# Published During 2012–13

Every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC), by February 1 of each year. The SARC contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school.

- For more information about SARC requirements, see the California Department of Education (CDE) SARC Web page at <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/</a>.
- For additional information about the school, parents and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.

# I. Data and Access

## Ed-Data Partnership Web Site

Ed-Data is a partnership of the CDE, EdSource, and the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) that provides extensive financial, demographic, and performance information about California's public kindergarten through grade twelve school districts and schools.

# DataQuest

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE DataQuest Web page at <u>http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/</u> that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district, the county, and the state. Specifically, DataQuest is a dynamic system that provides reports for accountability (e.g., state Academic Performance Index [API], federal Adequate Yearly Progress [AYP]), test data, enrollment, high school graduates, dropouts, course enrollments, staffing, and data regarding English learners.

## **Internet Access**

Internet access is available at public libraries and other locations that are publicly accessible (e.g., the California State Library). Access to the Internet at libraries and public locations is generally provided on a first-come, first-served basis. Other use restrictions may include the hours of operation, the length of time that a workstation may be used (depending on availability), the types of software programs available on a workstation, and the ability to print documents.

# **II. About This School**

#### Contact Information (School Year 2012–13)

	School	District		
School Name	Valley View Elementary	District Name	Glendale Unified	
Street	4900 Maryland Ave.	Phone Number	(818) 241-3111	
City, State, Zip	La Crescenta, CA, 91214	Web Site	www.gusd.net	
Phone Number	(818) 241-3111	Superintendent	Dr. Richard Sheehan	
Principal	Dr. Adriana Pestonji, Principal	E-mail Address	dsheehan@gusd.net	
E-mail Address	apestonji@gusd.net	CDS Code	19645686013825	

### School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2011–12)

In partnership with the school district, dedicated staff, involved parents, and the community, provide a safe environment, challenging instructional programs, promote excellence and the best of technology. Every student will develop the skills, knowledge, attitudes and behaviors necessary to reach full potential, be independent thinkers and learners, demonstrate responsibility towards each other, and become welleducated, productive citizens.

### **Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2011–12)**

We are proud to have a very active parent population, and encourage parent involvement in all areas of our school program. Parents log in thousands of hours per year volunteering. We have numerous parents volunteering in our classrooms every day, assisting with small groups, helping teachers, and chaperoning field trips. There are opportunities for parents to participate in the School Site council (SSC) to provide their input. We also have opportunities to join our PTA, and our Education Foundation (our fund-raising parent group). There are many ways that parents can assist through joining these organizations, and helping in special events throughout the school year. We have a Korean Parents Club, due to our large Korean population, who help support our PTA.

Grade Level	Number of Students	Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	49	Grade 8	0
Grade 1	62	Ungraded Elementary	0
Grade 2	65	Grade 9	0
Grade 3	68	Grade 10	0
Grade 4	61	Grade 11	0
Grade 5	45	Grade 12	0
Grade 6	68	Ungraded Secondary	0
Grade 7	0	Total Enrollment	418

#### Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2011–12)

Student Enrollment by Student Group (School Year 2011-12)

Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	1.0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.5%
Asian	28.9%
Filipino	3.3%
Hispanic or Latino	13.6%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.0%
White	50.2%
Two or More Races	2.4%
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	18.2%
English Learners	23.9%
Students with Disabilities	7.4%

Grade	Avg. Class		–10 Nu i Classe		Avg. Class		10–11 Number of Classes* Avg. of Cla Class		–12 Nu Classe			
Level	Size	1- 20	21- 32	33+	Size	1- 20	21- 32	33+	Size	1- 20	21- 32	33+
К	19	3	0	0	22.3	2	1	0	24.5	0	2	0
1	19	2	1	0	23.5	0	2	0	19.5	2	2	0
2	19	3	0	0	24.0	0	2	0	23.0	0	2	0
3	23	0	2	0	24.0	0	3	0	23.7	0	3	0
4	31	0	2	0	33.0	0	0	1	35.5	0	0	2
5	35	0	0	2	36.0	0	0	2	35.0	0	0	1
6	36	0	0	2	36.0	0	0	2	34.0	0	0	2
Other												

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)

\* Number of classes indicates how many classes fall into each size category (a range of total students per classroom).

# **III. School Climate**

### School Safety Plan (School Year 2011–12)

Safety on our campus is a priority. Our campus entrances are limited to the front office during school hours. All visitors must sign in, wear a visitor's badge, and sign out as they are leaving. Our Safety Plan was revised in November 2011. The key elements of our Safety Plan focus on one of our target areas: reducing the frequency of harassment and bullying. We use the Second Step Violence Prevention Program at all grade levels.

We have noon duty assistants who have been trained in conflict resolution to assist in problem solving on the playground. These assistants provide special rewards at our monthly assemblies to acknowledge students who act responsibly. This component of our Safety Plan is shared with students during assemblies and in classroom and instruction.

During faculty meetings and at our School Site council (SSC) meetings, we review the Safety Plan and provide suggestions to ensure that the safety of our students is our priority. The school grounds undergo a monthly safety inspection of all equipment and playground areas, performed by our custodian and principal. We have a Facility Regional Maintenance Supervisor who assists on safety walks as well. Our goal is to provide before and after school safety in the drop-off lane to ensure a safe entrance and exit from cars. WE participate regularly in disaster preparedness training, evacuation procedures, and lockdown procedures in case of unsafe happening sin the neighborhood. All staff members are assigned a specific job in campus incident command. WE are prepared with food and water in the event of a natural disaster, or an occurrence where we would have to be on campus for several days.

Rate*	School 2009–10	School 2010–11	School 2011–12	District 2009–10	District 2010–11	District 2011–12
Suspensions	0	0	1	24	6	6
Expulsions	0	0	0	0	0	0

#### Suspensions and Expulsions

\* The rate of suspensions and expulsions is calculated by dividing the total number of incidents by the total enrollment.

# **IV. School Facilities**

#### School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (School Year 2012–13)

Our building was completely remodeled in 1998. The renovation included updating technology, infrastructure, new furnishings, playground resurfacing, and new white boards. We don't have any major maintenance problems and are not in need of improvements, but we do have small, ongoing fixes here and there. Our school grounds are very clean. We take pride in the cleanliness of our campus, and students take pride in maintaining the cleanliness, including in the rest rooms.

System Inspected	Repair Status				Repair Needed and Action Taken or
System Inspected	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor	Planned
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer		Х			
Interior: Interior Surfaces		Х			
<b>Cleanliness:</b> Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation		Х			
Electrical: Electrical	-	Х			
<b>Restrooms/Fountains:</b> Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains		Х			
<b>Safety:</b> Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials		Х			
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs		Х			
<b>External:</b> Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences		Х			
Overall Rating		Х			

### School Facility Good Repair Status (School Year 2012-13) as of: 1/25/13

Note: Cells shaded in black do not require data.

# V. Teachers

#### **Teacher Credentials**

Teachers	School 2009–10	School 2010–11	School 2011–12	District 2011–12
With Full Credential	20	17	18	1,110
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	1
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence (with full credential)	0	0	0	44

### **Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions**

Indicator	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments*	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

Note: "Misassignments" refers to the number of positions filled by teachers who lack legal authorization to teach that grade level, subject area, student group, etc.

\* Total Teacher Misassignments includes the number of Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners.

## Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (School Year 2011–12)

The Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), also known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), requires that core academic subjects be taught by Highly Qualified Teachers, defined as having at least a bachelor's degree, an appropriate California teaching credential, and demonstrated core academic subject area competence. For more information, see the CDE *Improving Teacher and Principal Quality* Web page at: <u>http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/tq/</u>

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
This School	100.00%	0.00%
All Schools in District	99.45%	0.55%
High-Poverty Schools in District	99.77%	0.23%
Low-Poverty Schools in District	98.69%	1.31%

Note: High-poverty schools are defined as those schools with student eligibility of approximately 40 percent or more in the free and reduced price meals program. Low-poverty schools are those with student eligibility of approximately 25 percent or less in the free and reduced price meals program.

# **VI. Support Staff**

#### Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2011–12)

Title	Number of FTE* Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor		
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)		
Library Media Teacher (librarian)		

Library Media Services Staff (paraprofessional)	.75
Psychologist	1
Social Worker	
Nurse	1
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	.5
Resource Specialist (non-teaching)	
Other	
Nata O alla alcada dia bla alcada yant yang jua data	

Note: Cells shaded in black do not require data.

\* One Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) equals one staff member working full-time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full-time.

# **VII. Curriculum and Instructional Materials**

### Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2012–13)

This section describes whether the textbooks and instructional materials used at the school are from the most recent adoption; whether there are sufficient textbooks and instruction materials for each student; and information about the school's use of any supplemental curriculum or non-adopted textbooks or instructional materials.

Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and instructional materials/year of adoption	From most recent adoption?	Percent students lacking own assigned copy
Reading/Language Arts	Houghton Mifflin – Reading – California/2012 McDougall Littell-The Language of Literature/2003	Yes	0%
Mathematics	MacMillian McGraw-Hill-Everyday Mathematics/1997	Yes	0%
Science	MacMillian McGraw-Hill-California Science/2007 Prentice Hall – California Earth Science/2007	Yes	0%
History-Social Science	Harcourt – Reflections:California Series/2006 McMillian McGraw-Hill – California Vistas/2006 McDougal Littell-Worl History:Ancient Civilizations/2006	Yes	0%

#### Year and month in which data were collected: December 2012

# **VIII. School Finances**

Level	Total Expenditures Per Pupil	Expenditures Per Pupil (Supplemental / Restricted)	Expenditures Per Pupil (Basic / Unrestricted)	Average Teacher Salary
School Site	\$6,114	\$1,778	\$4,336	\$78,827
District			\$4,101	\$70,145
Percent Difference – School Site and District			6%	12%
State			\$5,455	\$68,835
Percent Difference – School Site and State			-21%	15%

#### Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2010–11)

Note: Cells shaded in black do not require data.

**Supplemental/Restricted** expenditures come from money whose use is controlled by law or by a donor. Money that is designated for specific purposes by the district or governing board is not considered restricted. **Basic/unrestricted** expenditures are from money whose use, except for general guidelines, is not controlled by law or by a donor.

For detailed information on school expenditures for all districts in California, see the *CDE Current Expense of Education & Per-pupil Spending* Web page at <u>http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/ec/</u>. For information on teacher salaries for all districts in California, see the CDE *Certificated Salaries & Benefits* Web page at <u>http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/</u>. To look up expenditures and salaries for a specific school district, see the Ed-Data Web site at: <u>http://www.eddata.org</u>.

## Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2011–12)

A combination of state and federal funding is used to cover all aspects of our instructional program. We are proud of our Computer Lab where all students learn the elements of visual literacy facilitated by a technology assistant. Strong PTA and school foundation support is evident in many of our schools' supplemental activities. All Glendale Unified schools benefit from the support of the Glendale Educational Foundation, which offers enhanced programs in visual and performing arts, science and technology, and health and fitness.

Category	Category District Amount	
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$42,451	\$41,455
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$65,170	\$66,043
Highest Teacher Salary	\$88,157	\$85,397
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	\$106,154	\$106,714
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$118,692	\$111,101
Average Principal Salary (High)	\$128,189	\$121,754

#### Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2010–11)

Superintendent Salary	\$259,000	\$223,357
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	41.00%	39.00%
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	5.00%	5.00%

Note: For detailed information on salaries, see the CDE Certificated Salaries & Benefits Web page at <u>http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/</u>.

# **IX. Student Performance**

## Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

The Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program consists of several key components, including:

- California Standards Tests (CSTs), which include English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics in grades two through eleven; science in grades five, eight, and nine through eleven; and history-social science in grades eight, and nine through eleven.
- California Modified Assessment (CMA), an alternate assessment that is based on modified achievement standards in ELA for grades three through eleven; mathematics for grades three through seven, Algebra I, and Geometry; and science in grades five and eight, and Life Science in grade ten. The CMA is designed to assess those students whose disabilities preclude them from achieving grade-level proficiency on an assessment of the California content standards with or without accommodations.
- California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA), includes ELA and mathematics in grades two through eleven, and science for grades five, eight, and ten. The CAPA is given to those students with significant cognitive disabilities whose disabilities prevent them from taking either the CSTs with accommodations or modifications or the CMA with accommodations.

The assessments under the STAR Program show how well students are doing in relation to the state content standards. On each of these assessments, student scores are reported as performance levels.

For detailed information regarding the STAR Program results for each grade and performance level, including the percent of students not tested, see the CDE STAR Results Web site at <u>http://star.cde.ca.gov</u>.

	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
Subject		School			District			State	
	2009– 10	2010– 11	2011– 12	2009– 10	2010– 11	2011– 12	2009– 10	2010– 11	2011– 12
English- Language Arts	82%	83%	84%	66%	68%	71%	52%	54%	56%
Mathematics	84%	88%	83%	63%	64%	67%	48%	50%	51%
Science	82%	82%	89%	68%	72%	73%	54%	57%	60%
History-Social Science	0%	0%	0%	60%	63%	61%	44%	48%	49%

#### Standardized Testing and Reporting Results for All Students – Three-Year Comparison

Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced					
Group	English- Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	History- Social Science		
All Students in the LEA	71%	67%	73%	61%		
All Students at the School	84%	83%	89%	0%		
Male	84%	82%	91%	0%		
Female	84%	84%	87%	0%		
Black or African American	0%	0%	0%	0%		
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%	0%	0%	0%		
Asian	91%	89%	88%	0%		
Filipino	0%	0%	0%	0%		
Hispanic or Latino	71%	66%	0%	0%		
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander						
White	82%	85%	92%	0%		
Two or More Races	0%	0%	0%	0%		
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	79%	72%	0%	0%		
English Learners	64%	66%	0%	0%		
Students with Disabilities	43%	26%	0%	0%		
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services						

### Standardized Testing and Reporting Results by Student Group – Most Recent Year

Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

## California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2011–12)

The California Physical Fitness Test (PFT) is administered to students in grades five, seven, and nine only. This table displays by grade level the percent of students meeting the fitness standards for the most recent testing period. For detailed information regarding this test, and comparisons of a school's test results to the district and state, see the CDE *PFT* Web page at <u>http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/pf/</u>.

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards					
Gidue Level	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards			
5	10.90%	32.60%	43.50%			
7	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
9	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			

Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

# X. Accountability

#### **Academic Performance Index**

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of state academic performance and progress of schools in California. API scores range from 200 to 1,000, with a statewide target of 800. For detailed information about the API, see the CDE *API Web page at* <u>http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/</u>.

#### Academic Performance Index Ranks – Three-Year Comparison

This table displays the school's statewide and similar schools' API ranks. The **statewide API rank** ranges from 1 to 10. A statewide rank of 1 means that the school has an API score in the lowest ten percent of all schools in the state, while a statewide rank of 10 means that the school has an API score in the highest ten percent of all schools in the state.

The *similar schools API rank* reflects how a school compares to 100 statistically matched "similar schools." A similar schools rank of 1 means that the school's academic performance is comparable to the lowest performing ten schools of the 100 similar schools, while a similar schools rank of 10 means that the school's academic performance is better than at least 90 of the 100 similar schools.

API Rank	2009	2010	2011
Statewide	10	10	10
Similar Schools	7	3	4

## Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group – Three-Year Comparison

Group	Actual API Change 2009–10	Actual API Change 2010–11	Actual API Change 2011–12
All Students at the School	-1	8	-4
Black or African American			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian	2	-1	4
Filipino			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander			
White	5	17	2
Two or More Races			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged			
English Learners	-15	10	-20
Students with Disabilities			

Note: "N/D" means that no data were available to the CDE or LEA to report. "B" means the school did not have a valid API Base and there is no Growth or target information. "C" means the school had significant demographic changes and there is no Growth or target information.

### Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group – 2012 Growth API Comparison

	2012 Growth API						
Group	Number of Students	School	Number of Students	LEA	Number of Students	State	
All Students at the School	294	925	19,456	858	4,664,264	788	
Black or African American	3		238	836	313,201	710	
American Indian or Alaska Native	2		41	840	31,606	742	
Asian	99	956	2,376	946	404,670	905	
Filipino	8		1,308	895	124,824	869	
Hispanic or Latino	33	875	4,395	790	2,425,230	740	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0		21	888	26,563	775	
White	145	920	10,834	862	1,221,860	853	
Two or More Races	4		204	921	88,428	849	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	56	883	9,348	808	2,779,680	737	
English Learners	71	905	7,710	783	1,530,297	716	
Students with Disabilities	23	667	1,684	658	530,935	607	

This table displays, by student group, the number of students included in the API and the 2012 Growth API at the school, LEA, and state level.

#### Adequate Yearly Progress

The federal ESEA requires that all schools and districts meet the following Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) criteria:

- Participation rate on the state's standards-based assessments in ELA and mathematics
- Percent proficient on the state's standards-based assessments in ELA and mathematics
- API as an additional indicator
- Graduation rate (for secondary schools)

For detailed information about AYP, including participation rates and percent proficient results by student group, see the CDE AYP Web page at <u>http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/</u>.

### Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2011–12)

AYP Criteria	School	District
Made AYP Overall	Yes	No
Met Participation Rate - English-Language Arts	Yes	Yes
Met Participation Rate - Mathematics	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient - English-Language Arts	Yes	No
Met Percent Proficient - Mathematics	Yes	No
Met API Criteria	Yes	Yes
Met Graduation Rate	N/A	No

### Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2012–13)

Schools and 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 (ELA or mathematics) or on the same indicator (API or graduation rate). After entering PI, schools and districts advance to the next level of intervention with each additional year that they do not make AYP. For detailed information about PI identification, see the CDE *PI Status Determinations Web* page: <u>http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/tidetermine.asp</u>.

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status		In PI
First Year of Program Improvement		2011-2012
Year in Program Improvement		Year 2
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement		12
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement		37.5%

Note: Cells shaded in black do not require data.

# XI. Instructional Planning and Scheduling

#### **Professional Development**

This section provides information on the annual number of school days dedicated to staff development for the most recent three-year period.

3 school days are dedicated for staff development.