



Rosemont Middle 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.

Rosemont Middle 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 middle school in the county and state to provide the most meaningful and fair comparisons. To find additional facts about our school online, please use the [DataQuest](#) tool offered by the California Department of Education.

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

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

4725 Rosemont Ave.
La Crescenta, CA 91214
Principal: Sally Buckley
Phone: (818) 248-4224

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**
- 14 Students**
- 15 Climate for Learning**
- 17 Leadership, Teachers, and Staff**
- 22 Curriculum and Textbooks**
- 23 Resources**
- 24 District Expenditures**
- 25 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

Rosemont Middle School

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

» Principal's Message

Rosemont Middle School is well known as a high-performing school and has established itself as a school that meets the needs of students academically and emotionally. In 2006–2007 we were recognized as a California Distinguished School for the sixth time. Students, parents, teachers, staff, and administration work together to ensure that the school exemplifies its motto: Honor, Excellence and Pride.

Sally Buckley, PRINCIPAL

Grade range and calendar

7-8

TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index

888

County Average: 715
State Average: 734

Student enrollment

1,349

County Average: 1,043
State Average: 672

Teachers

53

County Average: 45
State Average: 30

Students per teacher

26

County Average: 23
State Average: 22

Students per computer

5

County Average: 4
State Average: 4

Major Achievements

- During 2006–2007, Rosemont embarked on an exciting new three-year challenge to focus on writing in all classrooms. We adopted a new schoolwide goal to have all students show measurable growth in their ability to demonstrate content knowledge through writing as measured by writing prompts and statewide assessments. As a teaching staff, we collaborated on ways to best help our students improve their writing. We have observed students using their skills in a variety of ways throughout their instructional day. We have continued to expand our use of online writing through the Vantage program with great success.
- In addition to the regular courses aligned to the California Content Standards, a wide array of electives is available to students, including Spanish, instrumental and choral music, art and ceramics, computer literacy and word processing, wood shop, and home economics. Our students are often recognized in the community for their creative ability in art, music, drama, and writing.

Focus for Improvement

- During 2006–2007, Rosemont plans to expand our focus on writing. As a staff, we are implementing a professional development plan to learn how to use summarization and scoring guides to help students enhance their writing skill. Every student writes a short essay each quarter in every class, and teachers compare the results and discuss ways to improve the performance of each student.
- Our School Plan reflects the efforts of teachers who are working together to improve the learning of every student. We have also analyzed test results to identify students who need extra assistance and attention to ensure that all students continue to show improvement. Our counselors are meeting with each student and his family to discuss and plan for the future.

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	888
Growth attained from prior year	-3
Met subgroup* growth targets	Yes
Underperforming school	No

Rosemont’s API was 888 (out of 1000). This is a decline of 3 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 891. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared to all middle schools in California, our school ranked 10 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, 35 percent of middle schools statewide met their growth targets.

API, Spring 2007



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

Adequate Yearly Progress

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

We met 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 BY ETHNICITY				
Asian American	●	●	●	●
Hispanic/Latino	●	●	●	●
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 middle school in California. On the following pages we provide more detail for each test, including the scores for different subgroups of students. In addition, we provide links to the California Content Standards on which these tests are based. If you'd like more information about the CST, please contact our principal or our teaching staff. To find [grade-level-specific scores](#), you can refer to the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Web site. Other tests in the [STAR program](#) can be found on the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site.

California Standards Tests

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

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

TESTED SUBJECT	2006–2007		2005–2006		2004–2005	
	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher						
Average middle school Percent Proficient or higher						
MATH (excluding algebra)						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher						
Average middle school Percent Proficient or higher						
ALGEBRA						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher						
Average middle school Percent Proficient or higher						
HISTORY/SOCIAL SCIENCE						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher						
Average middle school Percent Proficient or higher						
SCIENCE						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher					NO DATA AVAILABLE N/A	
Average middle school Percent Proficient or higher					NO DATA AVAILABLE N/A	

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

Frequently Asked Questions About Standardized Tests

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

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

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			76%	100%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 33 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			38%	99%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			43%	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			71%	698	GENDER: About nine percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			80%	658	
English proficient			80%	1,239	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			28%	117	
Low income			61%	139	INCOME: About 16 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			77%	1,217	
Learning disabled			26%	87	LEARNING DISABILITIES: Students classified as learning disabled scored lower than students without learning disabilities. The CST is not designed to test the progress of students with moderate to severe learning differences.
Not learning disabled			79%	1,269	
Asian American			77%	427	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Filipino			77%	35	
Hispanic/Latino			66%	122	
White/Other			76%	749	


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

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

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

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

You can read the California standards for [English/language arts](#) on the CDE's Web site.



Math (Excluding Algebra)

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			73%	75%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 34 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			34%	80%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			39%	79%	

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			72%	536	GENDER: About the same percentage of boys and girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			73%	481	
English proficient			75%	913	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			58%	104	
Low income			61%	114	INCOME: About 13 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			74%	903	
Learning disabled			24%	86	LEARNING DISABILITIES: Students classified as learning disabled scored lower than students without learning disabilities. The CST is not designed to test the progress of students with moderate to severe learning differences.
Not learning disabled			77%	931	
Asian American			83%	261	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Filipino			70%	30	
Hispanic/Latino			58%	111	
White/Other			72%	596	

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


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

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

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

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

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



Algebra I

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			96%	21%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 57 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California. About seven percent fewer students took algebra than did students in the average middle school in the state.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			33%	28%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			39%	28%	

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			96%	138	GENDER: The same percentage of boys and girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			96%	151	
English proficient			97%	279	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English learners tested was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
English learners	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	10	
Low income	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	23	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			96%	266	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	N/A	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			96%	289	
Asian American			97%	134	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			95%	140	


SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2007 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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

About 21 percent of our students took the algebra CST, compared to 28 percent of all middle school students statewide. You can review the **algebra** standards on the CDE’s Web site.

Three-Year Trend: Algebra I



SOURCE: CDE STAR research file: 2005, 2006, and 2007.

History/Social Science

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			71%	99%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 36 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			30%	98%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			35%	98%	

Subgroup Test Scores

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


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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			72%	357	GENDER: About three percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			69%	330	
English proficient			73%	642	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: English learners scored lower on the CST than students who are proficient in English. Because we give this test in English, English learners tend to be at a disadvantage.
English learners			29%	45	
Low income			50%	66	INCOME: About 23 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			73%	621	
Learning disabled			30%	37	LEARNING DISABILITIES: Students classified as learning disabled scored lower than students without learning disabilities. The CST is not designed to test the progress of students with moderate to severe learning differences.
Not learning disabled			73%	650	
Asian American			77%	205	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Filipino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	16	
Hispanic/Latino			61%	54	
White/Other			69%	402	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2007 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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



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			75%	99%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 33 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			37%	98%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			42%	98%	

Subgroup Test Scores

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

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


GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			76%	357	GENDER: About two percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			74%	330	
English proficient			77%	642	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			49%	45	
Low income			64%	66	INCOME: About 12 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			76%	621	
Learning disabled			32%	37	LEARNING DISABILITIES: Students classified as learning disabled scored lower than students without learning disabilities. The CST is not designed to test the progress of students with moderate to severe learning differences.
Not learning disabled			77%	650	
Asian American			82%	205	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Filipino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	16	
Hispanic/Latino			57%	54	
White/Other			75%	402	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2007 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

This was the second year that science was included in the California Standards Tests our eighth grade students took. As a result, we have only two years of trend data to present. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

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

Two-Year Trend: Science



SOURCE: CDE STAR research file: 2005, 2006, and 2007.

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)	45%	16%	21%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	75%	40%	46%
LANGUAGE				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	54%	21%	26%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	77%	40%	46%
MATH				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	58%	22%	25%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	85%	46%	52%


SOURCE: The scores for the CAT/6 are from the spring 2007 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. 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 Rosemont, 75 percent of students scored at or above average in reading (compared to 46 percent statewide); 77 percent scored at or above average in language (compared to 46 percent statewide); and 85 percent scored at or above average in math (compared to 52 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 Rosemont, 45 percent of students scored at the top in reading (compared to 21 percent statewide); 54 percent scored at the top in language (compared to 26 percent statewide); and 58 percent scored at the top in math (compared to 25 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 middle 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 STAR (Standardized Testing and Reporting) test results to give a complete picture of student achievement and the quality of instruction.

STUDENTS

Students’ English Language Skills

At Rosemont, 92 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared to 79 percent of middle school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English proficient students	92%	75%	79%
English learners	8%	25%	21%

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

Languages Spoken at Home by English Learners

Please note that this table describes the home languages of just the 105 students classified as English learners. At Rosemont, 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	10%	90%	86%
Vietnamese	0%	1%	2%
Cantonese	0%	2%	1%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	0%	1%	1%
Korean	62%	1%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	0%	1%
All other	28%	5%	7%

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

Ethnicity

Most students at Rosemont identify themselves as White/European American/Other. 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%	11%	8%
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	32%	10%	11%
Latino/Hispanic	9%	62%	47%
White/European American/ Other	57%	18%	34%

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

Family Income and Education

The **free or reduced-price meal** subsidy goes to students whose families earned less than \$37,000 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2006–2007 school year. At Rosemont, nine percent of the students qualified for this program, compared to 51 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	9%	63%	51%
Parents with some college	83%	46%	54%
Parents with college degree	63%	25%	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 middle schools only.

The parents of 83 percent of the students at Rosemont have attended college, and 63 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 95 percent of our students provided this information.

CLIMATE FOR LEARNING

Average Class Sizes

The average class size at Rosemont varies from a low of 27 students to a high of 31. Our average class size schoolwide is 31 students. The average class size for middle schools in the state is 28 students. This table shows the average class sizes of our core courses compared to those of the county and state.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE OF CORE COURSES	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English	27	27	26
History	27	30	29
Math	31	29	28
Science	31	31	29

SOURCE: CBEDS census, October 2006. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

Safety

Staff and parent volunteers monitor the school grounds before and after school, at recesses, and during lunch time. Teachers regularly review the rules for safe, responsible behavior. We have a fully fenced, closed campus. Visitors must enter the school through the main door and sign in at the front desk in the office. They are given a visitor’s badge and required to wear it while on campus.

We revise our School Safety Plan annually; it was revised and approved by our School Site Council on November 14, 2006. The plan includes procedures for emergencies, exit routes, and inventories of emergency supplies. We make the plan available on our school Web site (www.rosemontweb.org) and in the school office. We share the plan with all staff during a schoolwide staff meeting. We practice fire drills each month and earthquake drills three times a year, plus we hold workshops for staff on emergency preparedness annually.

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	12	23	19
2005–2006	10	18	19
2004–2005	7	23	19
Expulsions per 100 students			
2006–2007	0	0	1
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 middle schools only.

During the 2006–2007 school year, we had 165 suspension incidents. We had one expulsion incident. 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

The school year begins the first week in September and ends the third week of June. It includes 180 days of instruction. Classes begin at 8 a.m. and end at 3 p.m., except on Thursdays, when school begins late to make time for teacher meetings.

We offer a breakfast program before school. We offer numerous afterschool activities, including tutoring help, clubs, and some sports. We have a daily child-care program that is fee based. Office hours are from 7:30 a.m. to 4 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	43%	25%	28%
Girls in Fitness Zone	60%	28%	33%
Fifth graders in Fitness Zone	N/A	25%	26%
Seventh graders in Fitness Zone	51%	27%	31%
Ninth graders in Fitness Zone	N/A	24%	23%
All students in Fitness Zone	51%	26%	30%

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 middle schools only.

LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

Leadership

Sally Buckley has served as principal of Rosemont for the past five years. She has 21 years of experience as a principal at both the elementary and middle school levels. Prior to becoming a principal, Mrs. Buckley taught in all grades, focusing on upper elementary and middle school students.

Parent volunteers, the administration, and staff compose the School Site Council, which makes many important budgetary decisions. Our English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC) includes parents of English learners, and we have an active Korean Parent Club and Armenian Parent Club. We have a large and very active PTA that encompasses more than three-quarters of our families. It works closely with the school to keep parents informed and to support school activities.

Our Instructional Leadership Team (ILT), made up of the principal and five teachers, gathers input about student performance, works closely with all classroom teachers to enhance instruction, and analyzes testing data to make curricular decisions and monitor the effectiveness of our programs. The Leadership Team, which comprises department chairpersons, administration, counselors, and classified staff, identifies and resolves a variety of schoolwide issues to keep the school running smoothly and consistently. The department chairpersons meet regularly to ensure effective communication throughout the school.

Teacher Experience and Education

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Teaching experience	Average years of teaching experience	13	11	12
Newer teachers	Percentage of teachers with one or two years of teaching experience	2%	16%	15%
Teachers holding an MA degree or higher	Percentage of teachers with a master's degree or higher from a graduate school	45%	38%	34%
Teachers holding a BA degree alone	Percentage of teachers whose highest degree is a bachelor's degree from a four-year college	55%	62%	66%

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

About two percent of our teachers have less than three years of teaching experience, which is below the average for new teachers in other middle schools in California. Our teachers have, on average, 13 years of experience. About 55 percent of our teachers hold only a bachelor's degree from a four-year college or university. About 45 percent have completed a master's degree or higher.

Credentials Held by Our Teachers

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Fully credentialed teachers	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	96%	90%	93%
Trainee credential holders	Percentage of staff holding an internship credential	2%	8%	5%
Emergency permit holders	Percentage of staff holding an emergency permit	2%	11%	5%
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 middle schools only. A teacher may have earned more than one credential. For this reason, it is likely that the sum of all credentials will exceed 100 percent.

About 96 percent of the faculty at Rosemont hold a full credential. This number is close to the average for all middle schools in the state. About two percent of the faculty at Rosemont hold a trainee credential, which is reserved for those teachers who are in the process of completing their teacher training. In comparison, five percent of middle school teachers throughout the state hold trainee credentials. About two percent of our faculty hold an emergency permit. Very few middle school teachers hold this authorization statewide (just five percent). All of the faculty at Rosemont hold the secondary (single-subject) credential. This number is above the average for middle schools in California, which is 84 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	12%	N/A	0%
Out-of-field teaching: courses	Percentage of core courses taught by a teacher who lacks the appropriate subject area authorization for the course	16%	37%	38%
Teachers lacking a full credential	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	4%	10%	7%

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.

TEACHING OUT OF FIELD: When a teacher lacks a subject area authorization for a course she is teaching, that course is counted as an **out-of-field** section. The students who take that course are also counted. For example, if an unexpected vacancy in a biology class occurs, and a teacher who normally teaches English literature (and who lacks a subject area authorization in science) fills in to teach for the rest of the year, that teacher would be teaching out of field. See the detail by core course area in the Out-of-Field Teaching table. About 16 percent of our core courses were taught by teachers who were teaching out of their field of expertise, compared to 38 percent of core courses taught by such middle school teachers statewide.

CREDENTIAL STATUS OF TEACHERS: Teachers who lack full credentials are working under the terms of an emergency permit, an internship credential, or a waiver. They should be working toward their credential, and they are allowed to teach in the meantime only if the school board approves. About four percent of our teachers were working without full credentials, compared to seven percent of teachers in middle schools statewide.

Out-of-Field Teaching, Detail by Selected Subject Areas

CORE COURSE	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English	Percentage of English courses taught by a teacher lacking the appropriate subject area authorization	15%	35%	40%
Math	Percentage of math courses taught by a teacher lacking the appropriate subject area authorization	14%	39%	37%
Science	Percentage of science courses taught by a teacher lacking the appropriate subject area authorization	32%	44%	40%
Social Science	Percentage of social science courses taught by a teacher lacking the appropriate subject area authorization	6%	39%	41%

SOURCE: PAIF, October 2006. This is completed by teachers during the CBEDS census. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

The table above shows the distribution of out-of-field teaching in each of the core subject areas.

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.

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

DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN STATE
Districtwide	Percentage of core courses not taught by “highly qualified” teachers (HQT)	7%	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	7%	3%

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

Staff Development

The 2006–2007 school year was an exciting one for professional development and teacher engagement. The teachers worked diligently to analyze test data, classroom assessments, and observations to determine a schoolwide focus on helping students demonstrate content knowledge through writing. The Instructional Leadership Team, consisting of five teachers and the principal, led all teachers through a strategic process that included selecting the focus, identifying effective teaching practices, realigning resources, involving students and parents, developing an internal measurement process, and then developing a targeted professional development plan.

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

Teachers worked during the summer to develop an implementation plan so all teachers could learn together and support each other. Every Thursday in the school year is a late start day to allow time for teacher collaboration. In addition, there are three student-free days throughout the school year that are used for professional development. In the 2006–2007 school year, these days gave teachers time to work together on site and with other schools, as well as to begin to use common curriculum-based assessments.

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	2.0
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.

ACADEMIC GUIDANCE COUNSELORS: Our school has two full-time equivalent academic counselors, which is equivalent to one counselor for every 675 students. Just for reference, California districts employed about one academic counselor for every 780 middle school students in the state. More information about [counseling and student support](#) is available on the CDE Web site.

Specialized Programs and Staff

Rosemont offers multiple opportunities to get additional academic support and enrichment opportunities. The teachers have a posted schedule for additional tutoring before or after school every day. Afterschool clubs, which are open to all students, include art and Armenian language classes, flag football, chess, gardening, games, robotics, drama, jazz band, drumline, and various service organizations. Rosemont sponsors a team of students who train and run in the Los Angeles Marathon, participate in cross-country events, and compete in the districtwide middle school track meet. The school also produces a play that is outside the regular instructional day; it was *The Wizard of Oz* in 2006–2007. All students have PE daily as well as an elective. The electives include orchestra, chorus, Spanish, art, ceramics, yearbook/newspaper, student government, computer applications, drama, wood shop, and cooking.

Support from a grant provides two counselors who come to our school one day a week to work with students who need help; one speaks English and the other Korean. A nurse conducts vision and hearing screenings every fall.

GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION (GATE): Formal identification of gifted students for the GATE program begins in grade four and consists of teacher recommendations and individual performance on state tests, as well as on a district-adopted test (OLSAT). Seventh and eighth grade teachers participate in professional development provided by GATE consultants for differentiated instruction and higher level questioning.

The GATE program is offered to students in grades seven through twelve who have been recognized as capable of attaining high levels of achievement. We provide differentiated instruction, cooperative learning, and cluster groupings in classrooms during the school day, and students can participate in district-sponsored GATE activities, including the California Math League Contest, Math Field Day. Rosemont offers advanced English classes in seventh and eighth grade, advanced history classes in eighth grade, and an accelerated math program for seventh and eighth grade high-achieving and gifted students. These classrooms align instruction to the standards and then enhance the content through differentiated instruction.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM: In 2006–2007 Rosemont had four full-time teachers and several assistants who work with our special education students; a speech therapist three days a week; and two psychologists who are here a total of three days a week. Our special education teachers teach the core subjects English, history, science, and math to our Resource Specialist Program (RSP) and our Special Day Class (SDC) students. Nearly every student attends a regular classroom for the elective and for PE daily.

RSP students stay in the regular classroom as much as possible but come to the RSP classroom to work in small groups or one on one in their area of difficulty. In the regular classroom they receive accommodations, such as more time to take tests or less homework, according to their Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). In 2007–2008 we are planning to open an SDC for students who are struggling with learning, especially those with autism. For now the students with more serious challenges are mainstreamed into our existing classes.

ENGLISH LEARNER PROGRAM: We have one full-time teacher who teaches reading and writing to our English learners according their language acquisition level. The English Language Development (ELD) program consists of a two-hour-per-day block of time during which the students focus on acquiring English proficiency. The content is carefully tied to the ELD standards and to the English language arts standards so students can acquire the skills they need for ongoing success.

We have a part-time ELD teacher specialist and a three-hour classroom assistant who work with the most limited students daily to give them the background and the vocabulary to be successful in their history and science classes. Students are clustered with specific history and science teachers who target their instruction to allow students adequate access to the content despite their limited English.

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

In seventh grade, students write and research longer papers and essays that persuade others with logic and reason. In the eighth grade, we expect students to read serious novels and write book reports that draw conclusions. You can read the California standards for [English/language arts](#) on the CDE's Web site.

Math

In seventh grade, we expect students to understand the Pythagorean theorem, calculate surface area and volume, and increase their facility with fractional numbers, ratios, and proportion. Eighth graders now study algebra, which for decades was taught in ninth grade. You can read the [math standards](#) on the CDE's Web site.

Science

Our seventh graders study [life science](#), covering cell biology, genetics, evolution, and structure and function in living systems. In eighth grade, we focus on the [physical sciences and chemistry](#). Units in the physical sciences focus on motion, forces, and structures of matter. Chemistry units include the periodic table, reactions, and the properties of density and buoyancy. Science content standards are available for [all grade levels](#) on the CDE's Web site.

Social Science

In the seventh grade, they will continue their study of world history, starting with medieval times and continuing through the 18th century. They turn to American history in the eighth grade, up through Reconstruction. They learn to research topics on their own, develop their own point of view, and interpret history. You can read the [social studies standards](#) on 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

Rosemont was originally constructed in 1954 and recently underwent a major renovation. We upgraded the main building, made the campus fully accessible for the handicapped, retrofitted it for earthquakes, installed computer and technology access, installed new plumbing and electricity, and build a new six-classroom building. There are three large outside athletic areas plus a gymnasium.

The facility is maintained by two custodians during the day and five and a half custodians at night. It is immaculate and is the pride of the community. Every classroom is cleaned daily and rest rooms are sanitized. The students, staff, and custodial crew keep the campus free from litter. Ongoing maintenance is prompt and efficient, and the grounds are maintained weekly.

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

We have a spacious, inviting library that holds approximately 15,000 volumes and has room for 12 computer stations, as well as an adjacent computer lab. Our library technician supervises the library five days a week from 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.; parents can check out books as well. Students may use the library before and after school, and at snack and lunch time. Teachers often use the library and computer lab for student research. The library tech is an invaluable resource to teachers and students. We gather teacher and student input when new materials are ordered. The PTA actively and financially supports the library as well as the annual Book Fair. The library tech provides books to every classroom on campus for the daily silent-reading time.

Computers

We have 288 computers available for student use, which means that, on average, there is one computer for every five students. There are 54 classrooms connected to the Internet.

RESOURCES	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Students per computer	5	4	4
Internet-connected classrooms	54	44	34

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

We have several ways in which students have access to technology and computers during instruction. Approximately, 700 students each year participate in the computer application and word processing classes; this is nearly half of our enrollment. Teachers from every discipline sign up to take their classes to the computer lab adjacent to the library on a regular basis.

As part of the Enhancing Education Through Technology grant that we received in 2005, all English teachers use a Web-based writing program with all Rosemont students, including special education students and English learners. The Web-based access is through laptop computers used in the English classes. Another component of this grant was the acquisition of AlphaSmart keyboards that are used by students in history and science classes. All of our classrooms have at least one networked computer and printer that all teachers use to access email to correspond with parents and colleagues, the access the Internet, to keep attendance, and to record grades. Teachers also have access to Data Director, an online program that allows them to quickly generate reports and review student records.

Parent Involvement

Parents are active members of our School Site Council, which works with administration to help make financial decisions. Parents of English learners are vital to our ELAC and are active participants in our workshops to build parenting skills that support their children's learning. Parents chaperone on field trips and dances, hold bake sales, work in the library, volunteer to supervise at lunch and snack, maintain our Web site, publish our monthly parent newsletter, and support teachers in a variety ways. The PTA sponsors parent-information workshops and supports student learning through field trips and assemblies. We ask all parents to attend Back-to-School Night in the fall and Open House in the spring. We always need new volunteers!

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 (middle school)	\$106,788	\$103,687
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 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.

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_19-64568-6061303m/17346

» 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	1,349
African American	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	30%
Filipino	2%
Hispanic or Latino	9%
Pacific Islander	0%
White (not Hispanic)	56%
Multiple or no response	1%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	9%
English learners	9%
Students with disabilities	7%

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	0
Grade 1	0
Grade 2	0
Grade 3	0
Grade 4	0
Grade 5	0
Grade 6	0
Grade 7	659
Grade 8	690
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2006.

Average Class Size by Core Course

The average class size by core courses.

SUBJECT	2004–2005	2005–2006	2006–2007
English	27	27	27
History	31	31	27
Math	30	29	31
Science	30	32	31

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2006.

Average Class Size by Core Course, Detail

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

SUBJECT	2004–2005			2005–2006			2006–2007		
	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+
English	12	36	9	12	29	15	12	24	17
History	3	18	26	3	24	26	15	17	18
Math	5	19	24	4	25	20	5	20	19
Science	3	33	12	2	20	23	3	28	13

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	52	53	53	1,239
Without Full Credential	5	6	2	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 doing in learning what the state content standards require. The CST include English/language arts and mathematics in grades six through eight; science in grade eight; and history/social science in grade eight. Student scores are reported as performance levels.

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	73%	76%	76%	54%	56%	58%	40%	42%	43%
History/Social Social	59%	71%	71%	45%	46%	48%	32%	33%	33%
Mathematics	77%	80%	79%	55%	57%	57%	38%	40%	40%
Science	N/A	71%	75%	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	HISTORY/ SOCIAL SCIENCE 2006–2007	MATHEMATICS 2006–2007	SCIENCE 2006–2007
African American	67%	N/A	36%	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	77%	77%	89%	82%
Filipino	77%	56%	74%	62%
Hispanic or Latino	66%	61%	61%	57%
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	77%	69%	77%	74%
Boys	71%	72%	78%	76%
Girls	80%	69%	79%	74%
Economically disadvantaged	61%	50%	68%	64%
English learners	28%	29%	61%	49%
Students with disabilities	26%	30%	24%	32%
Students receiving migrant education services	N/A	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 Seventh 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	72%	74%	75%	49%	52%	53%	41%	42%	42%
Mathematics	83%	85%	85%	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 Seventh 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	76%	93%
Filipino	74%	84%
Hispanic or Latino	70%	76%
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	76%	82%
Boys	71%	85%
Girls	80%	84%
Economically disadvantaged	62%	74%
English learners	35%	68%
Students with disabilities	28%	32%
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 middle 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 middle 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	10	10	10
Similar-schools rank	6	8	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	+13	+17	-3	888
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	+8	+18	-10	928
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	+20	+34	+12	824
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	+11	+14	+2	880
Economically disadvantaged	+4	+10	+22	822
English learners	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
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
Holt Literature & Language	English key concepts	2002	2003
Mathematics, Concepts and Skills, Course 1	Math	2001	2002
Mathematics, Concepts and Skills, Course 2	PreAlgebra key concepts	2001	2002
Basic Algebra	Introduction to Algebra	2001	2003
Algebra 1, Concepts and Skills	Introduction to Algebra	2001	2003
Algebra I, Structure and Method by Brown & Dolciani	Algebra 1	2000	2003
"World History: Medieval & Early Modern Times, CA Edition	History/Social Studies	2006	2006
Creating America: Beginnings through World War I, CA Edition	History/Social Studies	2006	2006
California Life Science	Life Science	2008	2007
Focus on Life Science	Life Science	2008	2007
California Physical Science	Physical Science	2008	2007
Focus on Physical Science	Physical Science	2008	2007

SOURCE: Textbook data is supplied by the district.