



La Crescenta Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2006–2007
Glendale Unified School District

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

La Crescenta Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2006–2007
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 2006–2007 school year, not the current school year. In most cases, this is the most recent data available. We present our school's results next to those of the average elementary school in the county and state to provide the most meaningful and fair comparisons. To find additional facts about our school online, please use the [DataQuest](#) tool offered by the California Department of Education.

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

http://www.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links_2007_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

4343 La Crescenta Ave.
La Crescenta, CA 91214
Principal: Kim Bishop
Phone: (818) 249-3187

How to Contact Our District

223 North Jackson St.
Glendale, CA 91206
Phone: (818) 241-3111 ext. 218
<http://www.gusd.net>



» Contents

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

- 1 Principal's Message**
- 3 Measures of Progress**
- 5 Student Achievement**
- 12 Students**
- 13 Climate for Learning**
- 15 Leadership, Teachers, and Staff**
- 19 Curriculum and Textbooks**
- 20 Resources**
- 21 District Expenditures**
- 22 School Expenditures**



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

©2007 Publishing 20/20

La Crescenta Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2006–2007
Glendale Unified School District

» Principal's Message

In 2006 our school entered an exciting school improvement program called Focus on Results. Teachers have worked together as a team to focus on reading comprehension through extensive staff development, visitations to other schools to gather good ideas, analysis of student performance results, and grade-level collaboration among teachers.

Kim Bishop, PRINCIPAL

Grade range and calendar

K-6

TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index

898

County Average: 751
State Average: 763

Student enrollment

527

County Average: 637
State Average: 531

Teachers

24

County Average: 32
State Average: 26

Students per teacher

22

County Average: 20
State Average: 20

Students per computer

11

County Average: 4
State Average: 5

Major Achievements

- Students who are not meeting grade-level expectations have been provided high-quality, small-group tutoring with two outstanding part-time teachers. In addition, they have been able to access Unique Reader, an online computerized tutorial program targeted directly to their needs. Standardized test scores have risen dramatically as a result of analyzing student needs using Data Director software and aligning instruction with state standards.
- All classes have benefited from focused reading comprehension strategy instruction. Students across grade levels are able to explain how to make connections, infer, synthesize, determine importance, visualize, and question in order to be fully engaged in and create meaning from their reading of fiction and nonfiction text.
- Partnerships with Kidspace Museum, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and the GCC Science Department have enriched science instruction through classroom visitations, guest lecturers, and field trips that brought together scientists and students.

Focus for Improvement

- Continue to target reading comprehension in order to increase the proficiency of all students on the California Standards Tests in English/language arts.
- Continue to focus extra attention on the unique learning needs of males and of English learners to bridge the performance gap between these subgroups of students and their classmates.

MEASURES OF PROGRESS

Academic Performance Index

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

CALIFORNIA API ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
Met schoolwide growth target	Yes
Met growth target for prior school year	Yes
API score	898
Growth attained from prior year	+23
Met subgroup* growth targets	Yes
Underperforming school	No

La Crescenta’s API was 898 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 23 points compared to last year’s API. All students took the test. You can find three years of detailed API results in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

API RANKINGS: Based on our 2005–2006 test results, we started the 2006–2007 school year with an API base score of 875. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared to all elementary schools in California, our school ranked 9 out of 10.

SOURCE: API based on spring 2007 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of March 2008.


*Ethnic 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.

SIMILAR SCHOOL RANKINGS: We also received a second ranking that compared us to the 100 schools with the most similar students, teachers, and class sizes. Compared to these schools, our school ranked 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 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 2006–2007 school year. Just for reference, 51 percent of elementary schools statewide met their growth targets.

API, Spring 2007



SOURCE: API based on spring 2007 test cycle. State average represents elementary schools only.
NOTE: Only groups of students that represent at least 15 percent of total enrollment are calculated and displayed as student subgroups.

Adequate Yearly Progress

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

We met all 21 criteria for yearly progress. As a result, we succeeded at making AYP.

To meet AYP, elementary and 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): 24.4 percent on the English/language arts test and 26.5 percent on the math test. All ethnic and socioeconomic subgroups of students also must meet these goals. Second, the schools must achieve an API of at least 590 or increase the API by one point from the prior year. Third, 95 percent of the student body must take the required standardized tests.

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

FEDERAL AYP ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS	
Met AYP	Yes
Met schoolwide participation rate	Yes
Met schoolwide test score goals	Yes
Met subgroup* participation rate	Yes
Met subgroup* test score goals	Yes
Met schoolwide API for AYP	Yes
Program Improvement School in 2007	No

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of March 2008. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students’ test results in the 2006–2007 school year or earlier.

*Ethnic 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 24.4% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST?	DID 26.5% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST?
SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS	●	●	●	●
SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS				
Low income	●	●	●	●
Students learning English	●	●	●	●
STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY				
Asian American	●	●	●	●
White/Other	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of March 2008, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2006–2007 school year. The green dots represent goals we met; red dots indicate goals we missed. Just one red dot means that we failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress.

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


STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

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

California Standards Tests

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

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



SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2007 test cycle. State average represents elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.

Frequently Asked Questions About Standardized Tests

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

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

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

HOW HARD ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS? Experts consider California’s standards to be among the most clear and rigorous in the country. Just 45 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 53 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 CSTs. 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 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			72%	99%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 27 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			42%	99%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			45%	99%	

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%	211	GENDER: About 17 percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			81%	192	
English proficient			79%	313	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			47%	90	
Low income			55%	76	INCOME: About 21 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			76%	327	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	30	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%	373	
Asian American			80%	148	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			56%	59	
White/Other			70%	175	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2007 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			82%	99%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 29 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			52%	95%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			53%	96%	

Subgroup Test Scores

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


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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			77%	211	GENDER: About ten percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			87%	191	
English proficient			84%	312	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			73%	90	
Low income			67%	76	INCOME: About 18 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			85%	326	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	30	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			85%	372	
Asian American			95%	148	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			62%	59	
White/Other			77%	174	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2007 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			80%	97%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 43 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			34%	99%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			37%	99%	

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			77%	39	GENDER: About six percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			83%	35	
English proficient			88%	59	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English learners tested was too small to be statistically significant.
English learners	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	15	
Low income	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	12	INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from low-income families was too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income			84%	62	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	7	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			84%	67	
Asian American			87%	30	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
White/Other			78%	32	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2007 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.



California Achievement Test (CAT/6)

The CAT/6 differs from the CST in three ways. First, in the spring of 2007, only students in grades three and seven took this test. Second, the CAT/6 is taken by students in other states, which enables us to see how our students are doing compared to other students in the nation. Third, the CAT/6 is scored by comparing students to each other on a scale from 1 to 99, much like being graded “on the curve.” In contrast, the CST scores students against five defined criteria.

SUBJECT	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
READING				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	25%	12%	15%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	59%	33%	39%
LANGUAGE				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	46%	17%	19%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	78%	42%	46%
MATH				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	67%	28%	30%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	84%	53%	56%


SOURCE: The scores for the CAT/6 are from the spring 2007 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Therefore, our test score results may vary from other CDE test score reports when missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results.
N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.

STUDENTS SCORING ABOVE AVERAGE: This view of test scores shows the percentage of our students who scored in the top half of students nationally (at the 50th percentile and higher). At La Crescenta, 59 percent of students scored at or above average in reading (compared to 39 percent statewide); 78 percent scored at or above average in language (compared to 46 percent statewide); and 84 percent scored at or above average in math (compared to 56 percent statewide). The subject with the most students scoring at or above average was math.

HIGH-SCORING STUDENTS: This view of test scores shows the percentage of our students who scored in the top fourth of students nationally (above the 75th percentile). At La Crescenta, 25 percent of students scored at the top in reading (compared to 15 percent statewide); 46 percent scored at the top in language (compared to 19 percent statewide); and 67 percent scored at the top in math (compared to 30 percent statewide). The subject with the most students scoring at the top was math.

Our CAT/6 Results Compared

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



SOURCE: Spring 2007 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

Other Measures of Student Achievement

We use many means to assess student progress, including homework completion, quizzes, tests and final exams, research papers, essays, multimedia projects, oral exams or presentations, and teacher observation. We also analyze Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) test results to give a complete picture of student achievement and the quality of instruction.

STUDENTS

Students’ English Language Skills

At La Crescenta, 81 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared to 68 percent of elementary school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English proficient students	81%	62%	68%
English learners	19%	38%	32%

SOURCE: Language Census for school year 2006–2007. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

Languages Spoken at Home by English Learners

Please note that this table describes the home languages of just the 102 students classified as English learners. At La Crescenta, the language these students most often speak at home is Korean. 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	18%	89%	85%
Vietnamese	0%	1%	2%
Cantonese	0%	2%	1%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	3%	1%	1%
Korean	48%	1%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	0%	0%
All other	31%	6%	9%

SOURCE: Language Census for school year 2006–2007. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

Ethnicity

Most students at La Crescenta identify themselves as White/European American/Other or Asian/Pacific Islander. The state of California allows citizens to choose more than one ethnic identity, or to select “multiethnic” or “decline to state.” As a consequence, the sum of all responses rarely equals 100 percent.

ETHNICITY	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
African American	1%	9%	7%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	37%	10%	11%
Latino/Hispanic	15%	64%	50%
White/European American/Other	48%	17%	32%

SOURCE: CBEDS census of October 2006. 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 \$37,000 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2006–2007 school year. At La Crescenta, 17 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared to 56 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	17%	67%	56%
Parents with some college	74%	47%	54%
Parents with college degree	56%	26%	30%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2006–2007 school year. Parents’ education level is collected in the spring at the start of testing. Rarely do all students answer these questions. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

The parents of 74 percent of the students at La Crescenta have attended college, and 56 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 73 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 grades.

The average class size at La Crescenta varies across grade levels from a low of 19 students to a high of 36. Our average class size schoolwide is 25 students. The average class size for elementary schools in the state is 23 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY GRADE	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Kindergarten	20	20	20
First grade	19	19	19
Second grade	20	19	19
Third grade	20	19	20
Fourth grade	33	28	29
Fifth grade	36	28	29
Sixth grade	36	30	29

SOURCE: CBED5 census, October 2006. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

Safety

A comprehensive safety plan, updated annually by our safety committee, spells out roles and procedures for fire, earthquake, intruder, and other emergencies. Staff, parents, and students are trained on the updated plan each fall. An emergency bin includes search and rescue supplies, disaster equipment, and enough food and water for several days. Our custodian conducts a monthly inspection of all facilities and grounds and prepares work orders for timely repair and maintenance. The campus is secured during school hours and all visitors sign in through the main office upon presentation of identification.

Discipline

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

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Suspensions per 100 students			
2006–2007	1	6	5
2005–2006	1	4	5
2004–2005	0	4	5
Expulsions per 100 students			
2006–2007	0	0	2
2005–2006	0	0	0
2004–2005	0	0	0

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

During the 2006–2007 school year, we had four 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.

Homework

Homework occupies an important place in the educational program if effectively administered. Homework reinforces classroom instruction, supports high expectations, motivates students toward self-direction, and strengthens the relationship of school and home in the learning process. Homework is an important part of every student’s instructional program. Accordingly, teachers assign homework regularly based on classroom instruction, and students are held accountable for completing it.

Schedule

Primary students in grades one through three attend school most days from 8:20 a.m. until 2:30 p.m. Upper grade students attend from 8:10 a.m. until 2:30 p.m. Kindergarten students attend from 8 a.m. until 12:15 p.m. Every Wednesday students in grades one through six are dismissed at 1:30 p.m. Afterschool childcare is available until 5:45 p.m.

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 at right shows the percentage of students at our school who scored within the “healthy fitness zone” on all six tests. Our results are compared to other students’ results in the county and state. More information about [physical fitness testing and standards](#) is available on the CDE Web site.

CATEGORY	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Boys in Fitness Zone	59%	22%	25%
Girls in Fitness Zone	85%	28%	30%
Fifth graders in Fitness Zone	71%	25%	27%
Seventh graders in Fitness Zone	N/A	27%	29%
Ninth graders in Fitness Zone	N/A	29%	23%
All students in Fitness Zone	71%	25%	27%

SOURCE: 2006–2007 physical fitness test data is produced annually as schools test their students on the six Fitnessgram Standards. Data is reported by Educational Data Systems. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

Leadership

This was our principal’s second year at the school site after serving for ten years as a principal at other school sites and teaching for 17 years. Decision-making bodies of teachers include the Instructional Leadership Team, which oversees school improvement areas with a focus on reading comprehension, and the Logistics Team, which coordinates all other leadership decisions. The School Site Council, comprised of the principal, parents, and teachers, serves as an umbrella group for decisions related to the use of state and federal resources. The English Language Acquisition Committee, made up of the principal, teacher specialist, and parents of English learners, monitors the English Language Development program.

Teacher Experience and Education

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Teaching experience	Average years of teaching experience	17	13	13
Newer teachers	Percentage of teachers with one or two years of teaching experience	0%	9%	11%
Teachers holding an MA degree or higher	Percentage of teachers with a master’s degree or higher from a graduate school	67%	38%	33%
Teachers holding a BA degree alone	Percentage of teachers whose highest degree is a bachelor’s degree from a four-year college	33%	62%	67%

SOURCE: Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF), October 2006, completed by teachers during the CBEDS census. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

None of our teachers has less than three years of teaching experience, which is below the average for new teachers in other elementary schools in California. Our teachers have, on average, 17 years of experience. About 33 percent of our teachers hold only a bachelor’s degree from a four-year college or university. About 67 percent have completed a master’s degree or higher.

Credentials Held by Our Teachers

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Fully credentialed teachers	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	100%	97%	97%
Trainee credential holders	Percentage of staff holding an internship credential	0%	3%	2%
Emergency permit holders	Percentage of staff holding an emergency permit	0%	5%	3%
Teachers with waivers	Lowest level of accreditation, used by districts when they have no other option	0%	0%	0%

SOURCE: PAIF, October 2006. This is completed by teachers during the CBEDS census. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. A teacher may have earned more than one credential. For this reason, it is likely that the sum of all credentials will exceed 100 percent.

All of the faculty at La Crescenta hold a full credential. This number is close to the average for all elementary schools in the state. None of the faculty at La Crescenta holds a trainee credential, which is reserved for those teachers who are in the process of completing their teacher training. In comparison, two percent of elementary school teachers throughout the state hold trainee credentials. None of our faculty holds an emergency permit. Very few elementary school teachers hold this authorization statewide (just three percent). About 92 percent of the faculty at La Crescenta hold the elementary (multiple-subject) credential. This number is above the average for elementary schools in California, which is 91 percent. You can find three years of data about teachers’ credentials in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

Indicators of Teachers Who May Be Underprepared

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

SOURCE: Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF) of October 2006. Data on NCLB standards is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file.

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

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

More facts about our teachers, called for by the recent Williams legislation of 2004, are available on our Accountability Web page, which is accessible from our district Web site. What you will find are specific facts about **misassigned teachers** and **teacher vacancies** in the 2007–2008 school year.

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 standard. We show how these teachers are distributed among schools according to the percentage of low-income students enrolled.

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

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

DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN STATE
Districtwide	Percentage of core courses not taught by “highly qualified” teachers (HQT)	N/A	5%
Schools with the most low-income students	First quartile of schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	N/A	5%
Schools with the fewest low-income students	Fourth quartile of schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	N/A	3%

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

Staff Development

The school’s instructional focus is on reading comprehension to address achievement gaps in this area. Staff development is provided through weekly banking time when students are released an hour early, and include professional development on reading comprehension strategies and grade-level implementation. We have also focused on reading comprehension during pupil-free days.

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
2006–2007	3.0
2005–2006	3.0
2004–2005	3.0

Specialized Resource Staff

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

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

SOURCE: CBEDS census, October 2006.

Specialized Programs and Staff

Enrichment classes such as science for GATE students, chess, Math Magic, Armenian class, and Robotics are offered after school. We offer extended-day childcare on campus. We provide at-risk students supplementary tutoring, computerized instruction tailored to their needs, and counseling as needed.

GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION (GATE): High-achieving and gifted students in kindergarten through grade six receive differentiated (customized) instruction in flexible guided reading groups using leveled (developmentally appropriate) reading materials. Specialized computer software such as the STAR Reading Assessment Program and Accelerated Reader allow high-achieving students to read ahead of their grade level. Kindergarten through sixth grade teachers participate in professional development provided by GATE consultants for differentiated instruction, higher level questioning, and tiered lesson planning. Formal identification of gifted students for the GATE program begins in grade four and consists of teacher recommendations and individual performance on state tests. We provide differentiated instruction, cooperative learning, and cluster groupings in self-contained classrooms during the school day.

GATE students also participate in extracurricular activities provided by the school and district, including GATE Breakfasts, the California Math League Contest, Invention Convention, Math Field Day, and other enrichment activities planned by individual school sites. At our school, GATE opportunities included afterschool science enrichment, lunchtime math club, and a Robotics team.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM: Our school program includes an upper grade Special Day Class, a Resource Specialist Program for all grades, Designated Instructional Services such as speech, occupational therapy, and adapted PE, as well as accommodations and modifications to enable students with special needs to access the curriculum in the general education program.

ENGLISH LEARNER PROGRAM: The focus is developing English reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills. All teachers hold a Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) credential and have been trained to deliver English Language Acquisition Instruction and to use Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English for content areas using adopted materials and supplementary resources.

CURRICULUM AND TEXTBOOKS

For more than six years, panels of scholars have decided what California students should learn and be able to do. Their decisions are known as the California Content Standards, and they apply to all public schools in the state. The textbooks we use and the tests we give are based on these content standards, and we expect our teachers to be firmly focused on them. Policy experts, researchers, and educators consider our state's standards to be among the most rigorous and challenging in the nation. You can find the [content standards](#) for each subject at each grade level on the Web site of the California Department of Education (CDE).

Reading and Writing

By third grade, we expect our students to be able to read and write. By fourth grade, we're teaching students to read full-length books and to use a dictionary and encyclopedia when they write. By fifth grade, students should be able to write poems, plays, true-life adventures, and personal journals. You can read the California standards for [English/language arts](#) on the CDE's Web site.

Math

Because the math standards have become more rigorous, our goal now is to prepare our elementary school graduates to start middle school ready to master algebra in the eighth grade. You can read the [math standards](#) on the CDE's Web site.

Science

Students learn the science standards starting in first grade. The curriculum covers physical, earth, and life sciences. The scientific method of experimentation and investigation is woven through all of our science courses. Read more about the [science standards](#) on the CDE's Web site.

Social Science

Students learn about citizenship starting in first grade. In second grade, we explore the lives of people who affect our students' everyday lives and learn about extraordinary people from history. The theme in third grade is continuity and change. California is the subject of our studies in fourth grade, and American history is our focus in fifth grade. Our students also learn about geography. They learn to research topics on their own, develop their own point of view, and interpret history. To read more about the [social studies standards](#), see the CDE's Web site.

Textbooks

We choose our textbooks from lists that have already been approved by state education officials. For a list of some of the textbooks we use at our school, see the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

We have also reported additional facts about our textbooks called for by the Williams legislation of 2004. This online report shows whether we had a textbook for each student in each core course during the 2007–2008 school year, and whether those [textbooks](#) covered the California Content Standards.

RESOURCES

Buildings

Our school was constructed in the 1920s and renovated in 2004 through Measure K modernization funds. It is situated on 2.97 acres and is comprised of 26 classrooms, a library, cafeteria, lunch shelter, administrative offices, grassy fields, blacktop playground, and a kindergarten play yard. During the 2005–2006 school year, a mural was painted in the auditorium, new curtains were purchased, and landscaping was installed. During the 2006–2007 school year the stage was redone.

More facts about the [condition of our school buildings](#) are available in an online supplement to this report called for by the Williams legislation of 2004. What you will find is an assessment of more than a dozen aspects of our buildings: their structural integrity, electrical systems, heating and ventilation systems, and more. The important purpose of this assessment is to determine if our buildings and grounds are safe and in good repair. If anything needs to be repaired, this assessment identifies it and targets a date by which we commit to make those repairs. The guidelines for this assessment were written by the [Office of Public School Construction \(OPSC\)](#), and were brought about by the legislation known as Williams. If you'd like to see the six-page [survey form](#) used for the assessment, you will find it on the Web site of the OPSC.

Library

The library/computer media center includes a well-stocked library of current publications and access to a bank of Internet-connected computers. A SMART board allows for teacher modeling of the computer work. A library assistant provides assistance to classes and clerical support 19 hours per week. The library is open for research during designated blocks during the day. After school it is used for computerized tutorial instruction using the Let's Go Learn program for at-risk readers.

Computers

We have 48 computers available for student use, which means that, on average, there is one computer for every 11 students. There are 24 classrooms connected to the Internet.

RESOURCES	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Students per computer	11	4	5
Internet-connected classrooms	24	33	30

SOURCE: CBEDS census of October 2006. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

Classroom and computer lab computers are used to reinforce instructional concepts, word process documents, and to access the Internet and online tutorial reading support. All classes have at least two computers and have Internet access.

Parent Involvement

Parent involvement includes classroom volunteers, a parent docent Meet the Masters art appreciation program, chaperoned field trips, and several leadership organizations for parents such as PTA, Foundation, School Site Council, and English Language Acquisition Committee.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	OUR DISTRICT	SIMILAR DISTRICTS	ALL DISTRICTS
FISCAL YEAR 2005–2006			
Total expenses	\$206,005,343	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$7,330	\$7,583	\$7,521
FISCAL YEAR 2004–2005			
Total expenses	\$203,558,533	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$7,038	\$7,172	\$7,127

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

Our district spent an average of \$7,330 per student in the 2005–2006 school year, compared to an average of \$7,583 per student spent by similar (unified school district) districts in the state. Our total operating expenses for the 2005–2006 year were \$206,005,343. Facts about the 2006–2007 fiscal year were not available at the time we published this report. Additional details about our expenditures can be found on the [Ed-Data Partnership's Web site](#).

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](#).

District Salaries, 2005–2006

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2005–2006 school year. More current information was not available at the time we published this annual report. This table compares our average salaries to those in districts like ours, based on both enrollment and the grade level of our students. In addition, we report the percentage of our district's total budget dedicated to teachers' and administrators' salaries. The costs of health insurance, pensions, and other indirect compensation are not included.

SALARY INFORMATION	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Beginning teacher's salary	\$39,599	\$38,937
Midrange teacher's salary	\$60,792	\$61,080
Highest-paid teacher's salary	\$78,447	\$76,443
Average principal's salary (elementary school)	\$107,120	\$99,694
Superintendent's salary	\$222,210	\$195,054
Percentage of budget for teachers' salaries	41%	40%
Percentage of budget for administrators' salaries	5%	5%

SOURCE: This financial data is from the Statewide Average Salaries and Expenditure Percentages report, 2005–2006, the Fiscal Services Division, CDE.

SCHOOL EXPENDITURES

A combination of state and federal funding is used to cover all aspects of our instructional program. Strong PTA and school foundation support is evident in many of Glendale Unified 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.

A new law passed in 2005 required schools to report school-specific expenditures for the first time. In prior years, schools reported only the districtwide average for these expenditures. This year we have provided a comparative analysis of our [school's expenditures](#), along with the [average salaries of our teachers](#). You can view this information from the preceding links or on our Accountability Web page, which is accessible through our district's Web site.

TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY: All data is the most current available as of March 2008. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2006–2007 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 2006 census); Language Census (March 2007); California Achievement Test and California Standards Tests (spring 2007 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (October 2007 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (October 2007).

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.

rev20080409_19-64568-6013734e/16378

» Data Almanac

This Data Almanac provides more detailed information than the School Accountability Report Card or data that covers a period of more than one year. It presents the facts and statistics in tables without narrative text. We hope it provides information that will be useful to your school community.



STUDENT 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	527
African American	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	33%
Filipino	3%
Hispanic or Latino	15%
Pacific Islander	1%
White (not Hispanic)	46%
Multiple or no response	2%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	18%
English learners	22%
Students with disabilities	8%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CBEDS, October 2006. Data about students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged, English learners, and 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	60
Grade 1	68
Grade 2	66
Grade 3	80
Grade 4	68
Grade 5	75
Grade 6	110
Grade 7	0
Grade 8	0
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2006.

Average Class Size by Grade Level

GRADE LEVEL	2004–2005	2005–2006	2006–2007
Kindergarten	19	20	20
Grade 1	20	20	19
Grade 2	20	20	20
Grade 3	20	20	20
Grade 4	32	35	33
Grade 5	30	33	36
Grade 6	37	34	36
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined K–3	20	N/A	18
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: CBEDS, October 2006.

Average Class Size by Grade Level, Detail

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

GRADE LEVEL	2004–2005			2005–2006			2006–2007		
	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+
Kindergarten	3	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0
Grade 1	3	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0
Grade 2	2	0	0	4	0	0	3	0	0
Grade 3	3	0	0	3	0	0	4	0	0
Grade 4	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Grade 5	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
Grade 6	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	3
Combined K–3	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Combined 3–4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2006.

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
	2004–2005	2005–2006	2006–2007	2006–2007
With Full Credential	22	22	24	1,239
Without Full Credential	1	1	0	28

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2006, Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF) section.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

California Standards Tests (CST)

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

CST Results for All Students: Three-Year Comparison

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

SUBJECT	SCHOOL PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			DISTRICT PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			STATE PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007
English/ Language Arts	61%	68%	72%	54%	56%	58%	40%	42%	43%
Mathematics	79%	78%	82%	55%	57%	57%	38%	40%	40%
Science	58%	68%	80%	39%	50%	52%	27%	35%	38%

SOURCE: California Standards Tests (CST) results, spring 2007 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

CST Results by Student Group: Most Recent Year

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

STUDENT GROUP	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	ENGLISH/ LANGUAGE ARTS 2006–2007	MATHEMATICS 2006–2007	SCIENCE 2006–2007
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	80%	95%	87%
Filipino	64%	82%	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	56%	61%	N/A
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	70%	77%	78%
Boys	64%	77%	77%
Girls	81%	87%	83%
Economically disadvantaged	55%	67%	58%
English Learners	47%	73%	47%
Students with disabilities	20%	37%	N/A
Students receiving migrant education services	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: California Standards Tests (CST) results, spring 2007 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

California Achievement Test, Sixth Edition (CAT/6)

The California Achievement Test, Sixth Edition (CAT/6), a national, norm-referenced test, shows how well students are doing compared to students nationally in reading, language, spelling, and mathematics. It is taken only by third and seventh graders. We report only reading and math below. The results are reported as the percentage of students scoring at or above the national average (the 50th percentile).

CAT/6 Test Results for Third Grade Students: Three-Year Comparison

The percentage of students scoring at or above the national average in reading and mathematics for the most current three-year period.

SUBJECT	SCHOOL PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			DISTRICT PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			STATE PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007
Reading	39%	43%	59%	49%	52%	53%	41%	42%	42%
Mathematics	81%	73%	84%	67%	70%	69%	52%	53%	53%

SOURCE: The California Achievement Test, Sixth Edition, spring 2007 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

CAT/6 Test Results for Third Grade Students by Group: Most Recent Year

The percentage of students, by group, scoring at or above the national average (the 50th percentile) in reading and mathematics for the most recent testing period.

STUDENT GROUP	PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	
	READING 2006–2007	MATHEMATICS 2006–2007
African American	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A
Asian	64%	84%
Filipino	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	57%	71%
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	58%	91%
Boys	62%	85%
Girls	56%	82%
Economically disadvantaged	38%	69%
English learners	33%	67%
Students with disabilities	N/A	N/A
Students receiving migrant education services	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: The California Achievement Test, Sixth Edition, spring 2007 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

ACCOUNTABILITY

California Academic Performance Index (API)

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

API Ranks: Three-Year Comparison

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

API RANK	2004–2005	2005–2006	2006–2007
Statewide rank	9	9	9
Similar-schools rank	6	6	8

SOURCE: The API Base Report from July 2007.

API Changes by Student Group: Three-Year Comparison

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

STUDENT GROUP	ACTUAL API CHANGE			API SCORE
	2004–2005	2005–2006	2006–2007	2006–2007
All students at the school	+3	+13	+23	898
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	+6	+11	+31	950
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	-7	+11	+23	881
Economically disadvantaged	N/A	+1	+47	840
English learners	N/A	+1	+35	883
Students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Intervention Programs

The federal law known as No Child Left Behind requires that all schools and districts meet all three of the following criteria in order to attain Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP): (a) a 95-percent participation rate on the state’s tests; (b) a CDE-mandated percentage of students scoring Proficient or higher on the state’s English/language arts and mathematics tests; and (c) an API of at least 590 or growth of at least one point.

AYP for the District

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

AYP CRITERIA	DISTRICT
Overall	Yes
Graduation rate	Yes
Participation rate in English/language arts	Yes
Participation rate in mathematics	Yes
Percent Proficient in English/language arts	Yes
Percent Proficient in mathematics	Yes
Met Academic Performance Index (API)	Yes

SOURCE: The AYP Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in March 2008.

Intervention Program: District Program Improvement (PI)

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

INDICATOR	DISTRICT
PI stage	Not in PI
The year the district entered PI	N/A
Number of schools currently in PI	2
Percentage of schools currently in PI	6%

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

TEXTBOOKS

Textbook Adoption List (TABLE O)

TITLE	SUBJECT	DATE OF PUBLICATION	ADOPTION DATE
Reading - California	English - Language Arts	2003	2003
The Language of Literature	English/Reading	2002	2003
California Vistas	History/Social Studies	2007	2006
Reflections: California Series	History/Social Studies	2007	2006
World History: Ancient Civilizations, CA Edition	History/Social Studies	2006	2006
Everyday Mathematics	Mathematics	1997-2001	1997
"California Earth Science"			
Focus on Earth Science	Science	2008	2007
California Science	Science	2008	2007

SOURCE: Textbook data is supplied by the district.