



Valley View 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.

Valley View 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

4900 Maryland Ave.
La Crescenta, CA 91214
Principal: Carla Walker
Phone: (818) 236-3771

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

Valley View Elementary School

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

» Principal's Message

Located in a quaint, mountainous residential area of La Crescenta, Valley View's reputation for excellence draws many new families into the area. Our culturally diverse student body of over 400 students supports each other in their daily activities and shares perspectives from their cultural viewpoint. Everyone works together to create a student-centered school environment. Visitors to our school are impressed with the respectful behavior and high level of student engagement demonstrated by Valley View students. The school community is proud of its tradition of volunteerism and business support, a culture that has been firmly established by everyone to work tirelessly, side by side to maximize student academic and social growth.

Valley View teachers engage inquiring, diligent students in achievement-centered classrooms. The efforts of the teachers and staff to create a challenging climate for learning are evidenced in the accomplishments of our students. At the end of each month, the Valley View School family comes together to celebrate student and teacher achievements, to promote school spirit, and to review the character and ethics theme of the month. Local eateries provide certificates as an incentive for students, and they are given out to the Students of the Month. At Valley View, we are dedicated to ensuring the academic, emotional, and social success of every student. "Soaring to New Heights" is our motto.

Parent volunteerism is impressive, with parents logging in 6,025 volunteer hours in 2006–2007 to provide amazing support and leadership to the school.

Carla Walker, PRINCIPAL

Grade range and calendar

K-6

TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index

920

County Average: 751
State Average: 763

Student enrollment

442

County Average: 637
State Average: 531

Teachers

20

County Average: 32
State Average: 26

Students per teacher

22

County Average: 20
State Average: 20

Students per computer

6

County Average: 4
State Average: 5

Major Achievements

- As an award-winning school with California Distinguished School and National Blue Ribbon Award recognition, Valley View is proud to share its many accolades with our community. It was chosen as one of 570 schools in California as an Honor Roll Scholar School for 2006–2007. This honor is presented by the California Business Education Excellence Foundation and Just for the Kids California for commitment to high expectations and success in closing the achievement gap.
- Our innovative technology program is an influential model of a schoolwide, differentiated (individualized) instructional strategy allowing all students to flourish. One of our fifth grade students, Taylor Hill, won first place in the LACOE Digital Voice Awards Multimedia Services Student Science Presentation for her PowerPoint project on the solar system. Fifth Grader Isabel Martos-Repath created an award-winning digital photograph featured on a nationally distributed poster by Discovery Education’s “Connect to a World of Learning” Technology in Education Program.
- In 2006–2007 our students earned a ROAR (Reach Out Act Respond) assembly from Discovery Education and the Animal Planet channel for having the most pledges received from any school in Los Angeles County. The students wrote pledges to have a lifelong commitment to protecting animals, endangered animal species, and animal habitats. For their commitment, Animal Planet came to our school with a host of live animals and an exciting, educational program.
- Valley View’s math achievement soars and our Math Field Day Team placed first among all the elementary schools in our district.

Focus for Improvement

- As part of Focus on Results (FOR), a districtwide professional development initiative that is a data-driven decision-making process to increase student achievement, Valley View developed SMARTe Goals (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound, every student). This is an internal accountability system that uses data continuously adjust daily instruction, paying particular attention to achievement gaps among student groups. These goals drive all decisions. Our SMARTe goal this year is that all Valley View students will progress at least a half level towards writing proficiency as measured by the GUSD Writing Rubric per grade level on a scale of 0 to 4 by June. The FOR framework ensures evidence-based teaching practices meet the needs of each student.
- The motivational slogan for our writing focus paints a visual picture of our bald eagle mascot, Valiant, soaring across the horizon: Writing Gives Us Wings To SOAR (See, Organize, Assess, Respond).
- Three of our most important programs, Accelerated Reader, Larson’s Intermediate and Middle School Math, and Let’s Go Learn, Inc.’s DORA (Diagnostic Online Reading Assessment and Unique Reader Online Instruction) allow teachers to efficiently and effectively assess students to provide individual information and instructional strategies for every child. These programs adapt the level of difficulty according to each child’s abilities and provide instruction tailored to meet the needs of each student in an engaging and highly motivational, interactive, digital environment. Teachers remain active participants by providing individual instruction and encouragement.

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.

Valley View’s API was 920 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 9 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 911. 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 10 out of 10.

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.

CALIFORNIA API ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
Met schoolwide growth target	Yes
Met growth target for prior school year	Yes
API score	920
Growth attained from prior year	+9
Met subgroup* growth targets	Yes
Underperforming school	No

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.

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 17 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				
Students learning English	●	●	●	●
STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY				
Asian American	●	●	●	●
White/Other	●	●	●	●

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.

SOURCE: AYP release of March 2008, CDE.


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			78%	99%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 33 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			75%	173	GENDER: About seven percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			82%	165	
English proficient			86%	257	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			56%	81	
Low income	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	30	INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income			81%	308	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	29	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			81%	309	
Asian American			80%	154	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%	157	

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.
 NS: 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			85%	99%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 32 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			83%	173	GENDER: About four percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			87%	165	
English proficient			88%	257	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			74%	81	
Low income	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	30	INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income			86%	308	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	29	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			87%	309	
Asian American			91%	154	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			80%	157	

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.
 NS: 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			70%	100%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 33 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			70%	37	GENDER: About the same percentage of boys and girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			71%	34	
English proficient			80%	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	12	
Low income	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	6	INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income			74%	65	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	4	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			70%	67	
Asian American			71%	35	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			71%	31	

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)	43%	12%	15%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	78%	33%	39%
LANGUAGE				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	57%	17%	19%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	81%	42%	46%
MATH				
High-scoring students	Percentage of students scoring in the top quarter nationally (above the 75th percentile)	76%	28%	30%
Students scoring at or above average	Percentage of students scoring in the top half nationally (at or above the 50th percentile)	88%	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 Valley View, 78 percent of students scored at or above average in reading (compared to 39 percent statewide); 81 percent scored at or above average in language (compared to 46 percent statewide); and 88 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 Valley View, 43 percent of students scored at the top in reading (compared to 15 percent statewide); 57 percent scored at the top in language (compared to 19 percent statewide); and 76 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 Valley View, 80 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	80%	62%	68%
English learners	20%	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 88 students classified as English learners. At Valley View, 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	6%	89%	85%
Vietnamese	0%	1%	2%
Cantonese	0%	2%	1%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	1%	1%	1%
Korean	69%	1%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	0%	0%
All other	24%	6%	9%

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

Ethnicity

Most students at Valley View 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	0%	9%	7%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	44%	10%	11%
Latino/Hispanic	4%	64%	50%
White/European American/Other	52%	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 Valley View, eight 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	8%	67%	56%
Parents with some college	83%	47%	54%
Parents with college degree	71%	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 83 percent of the students at Valley View have attended college, and 71 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 72 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 Valley View varies across grade levels from a low of 18 students to a high of 36. Our average class size schoolwide is 24 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	18	20	20
First grade	18	19	19
Second grade	19	19	19
Third grade	19	19	20
Fourth grade	34	28	29
Fifth grade	35	28	29
Sixth grade	36	30	29

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

Safety

Safety on our campus is a priority. Our campus entrances are limited to the front office during school hours. All visitors must sign in, wear a visitor’s badge, and sign out as they are leaving. Our Safety Plan was revised in November 2006. The key elements of our Safety Plan focus on one of our target areas: reducing the frequency of harassment and bullying. We use the Second Step Violence Prevention Program at all grade levels.

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

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

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	2	6	5
2005–2006	1	4	5
2004–2005	1	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 seven 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

Our school follows the traditional school calendar. For our kindergarten through sixth grade students, supervision begins at 8 a.m., and instruction begins at 8:15 a.m. Kindergarten is an extended-day program that goes to 1:25 p.m., and our kindergartners are included in the lunch program. Students in grades one through three dismiss at 2:12 p.m., and students in grades four through six dismiss at 2:36 p.m. Thursdays are our early-release days, when kindergarten through third grade students end at 1:25 p.m., and grades four through six end at 1:35 p.m. This provides teachers with time for planning and teacher development. Our afterschool clubs, chorus, and orchestra, also meet on Thursdays.

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%	22%	25%
Girls in Fitness Zone	76%	28%	30%
Fifth graders in Fitness Zone	59%	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	59%	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

Carla Walker has been the principal at Valley View for three years. She has worked as an educator for 17 years. We have several decision making teams on campus. We have a Leadership Team, comprised of representatives from all grade levels, kindergarten through sixth, who discuss and provide suggestions about site-based decisions, playground rules, and purchasing materials for classes. These grade-level experts meet on a monthly basis. We have an Instructional Leadership Team (ILT), comprised of individuals who work on providing staff development for our instructional focus on writing. They discuss writing programs, data analysis, and appropriate materials for instruction. We have a Technology Team that reviews the technology standards, and develops activities in the computer lab that incorporate the curriculum into the program. We have a School Site Council (SSC), comprised of an equal number of staff and parents, that meets five times per year to discuss school issues, curriculum, safety, and our school site budget. Our Safety Committee, comprised of several parents as well as teachers, reviews safety issues and discusses them with the other teams at our school.

Teacher Experience and Education

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Teaching experience	Average years of teaching experience	16	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	70%	38%	33%
Teachers holding a BA degree alone	Percentage of teachers whose highest degree is a bachelor's degree from a four-year college	30%	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, 16 years of experience. About 30 percent of our teachers hold only a bachelor's degree from a four-year college or university. About 70 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 Valley View hold a full credential. This number is close to the average for all elementary schools in the state. None of the faculty at Valley View 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). All of the faculty at Valley View 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	0%	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.

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

Our major area of focus for the 2006–2007 school year was the adoption of our new social studies curriculum, and the visual and performing arts. We focused on standards for social studies and received the support of the publisher and the district representative. For the visual and performing arts standards, we worked together as a staff. We felt it was an area we wanted to add to the other curricular areas, and we worked to find ways to incorporate visual and performing arts throughout the rest of the curriculum. Teachers also designed lesson plans specific to visual and performing arts standards.

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	1.0
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	1.0
Speech/language/hearing specialists	1.0
Resource specialists	1.0

SOURCE: CBEDS census, October 2006.

Specialized Programs and Staff

We have many special programs at our school, including an Accelerated Reader Club, color guard, student council, intervention classes, orchestra, honors orchestra, reflections art classes, Caldecott Newbury Award club, summer academy, chorus, GATE enrichment classes, math club, art showcase, and science fair. Teachers are the leaders in these programs. We have a psychologist one day per week, a nurse one day per week, a full-time resource specialist, and an ELD teacher specialist two days per week. We also have a full-time computer assistant and a half-time librarian.

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.

All of our teachers have received training in differentiation of instruction to meet the needs of our GATE students. We have two teachers who are GATE coaches who provide support for all grade levels, describing different ways to group students and how to share information and materials with teachers and parents. Each spring, we provide an afterschool enrichment program, incorporating technology. In 2006–2007, students participated in a multimedia class where they created their own videos using curriculum from the American Film Institute.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM: We have a Special Day Class for students in grades one through three. These are students who have been identified through the Individual Education Program (IEP) process and need a smaller learning environment and specific strategies that support their learning style (either cognitive or developmental). We have a Resource Specialist Program, where students who are identified through reports from the school psychologist and special education teacher receive support in language arts and math, where the children have a deficit.

ENGLISH LEARNER PROGRAM: Our focus is to encourage and promote fluency in English in daily English Language Development (ELD) instruction. The students work on conversational skills, vocabulary, and self confidence in using the English language. We have an ELD teacher specialist who coordinates the program, and an educational assistant who supports the technology component. We use many computer programs and Web sites designed for English language instruction.

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

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

Each class attends the library every week for 30 minutes. Our library is stocked with a wide variety of different genres, including fiction, nonfiction, and reference. Our student to book ratio is 23 books per child, which is above the statewide goal of 22 books per child. Most of the reference books were purchased in the 2006–2007 school year, so most of them are current. We have science and social science books, as well as encyclopedias that can be checked out from the library. All books are a part of the Accelerated Reader program, so they are easily identifiable for the student's level in the program. Each year we add new titles such as the Caldecott Newbury award winning books for that year. Each year, proceeds from our book fair provide money and books to be used directly for the school library. We have a fully computerized check-out system, Destiny, which maintains records of each title a student has checked out. This helps teachers in assisting students and encouraging them to read a variety of books, not only one genre.

Computers

We have 78 computers available for student use, which means that, on average, there is one computer for every six students. All of our classrooms are connected to the Internet.

RESOURCES	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Students per computer	6	4	5
Internet-connected classrooms	23	33	30

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

All classes visit the computer lab once per week. Kindergarten through third grade students visit for 30 minutes, while fourth through sixth grade students visit for one hour. The computer lab contains 36 Internet-connected work stations. All instruction is aligned to technology standards and state content standards. All classrooms have two to three computers available for student use, and are all connected to the Internet. These computers are used on a daily basis. Our Accelerated Reader program ties together our library and computer lab. At the end of each year, every grade level has specific projects assigned that students are able to complete independently. They use Microsoft PowerPoint and other programs and multimedia to create charts and graphs, import pictures, and even write music. Our kindergarten students are also able to access Web sites and import pictures into Word documents.

Parent Involvement

We are proud to have a very active parent population, and encourage parent involvement in all areas of our school program. Parents log in thousands of hours per year volunteering. We have numerous parents volunteering in our classrooms every day, assisting with small groups, helping teachers, and chaperoning field trips. There are opportunities for parents to participate in the School Site Council (SSC) to provide their input. We also have opportunities to join our PTA, and our Education Foundation (our fund-raising parent group). There are many ways that parents can assist through joining these organizations, and helping in special events throughout the school year. We have a Korean Parents Club, due to our large Korean population, who help support our PTA. Our contact person for parent involvement is the PTA president, Molly Hwang, (818) 541-0451.

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_19-64568-6013825e/16385

» 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	442
African American	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	41%
Filipino	3%
Hispanic or Latino	4%
Pacific Islander	0%
White (not Hispanic)	49%
Multiple or no response	3%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	8%
English learners	24%
Students with disabilities	10%

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	44
Grade 1	59
Grade 2	67
Grade 3	62
Grade 4	68
Grade 5	70
Grade 6	72
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	18
Grade 1	19	20	18
Grade 2	19	20	19
Grade 3	20	20	19
Grade 4	33	35	34
Grade 5	34	36	35
Grade 6	29	34	36
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined K–3	20	17	20
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	2	0	0	2	0	0
Grade 1	3	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0
Grade 2	2	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0
Grade 3	3	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0
Grade 4	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	2
Grade 5	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2
Grade 6	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Combined K–3	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	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	20	20	20	1,239
Without Full Credential	0	0	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	74%	76%	78%	54%	56%	58%	40%	42%	43%
Mathematics	84%	86%	85%	55%	57%	57%	38%	40%	40%
Science	63%	53%	70%	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%	91%	71%
Filipino	91%	91%	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	50%	71%	N/A
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	78%	80%	71%
Boys	75%	83%	70%
Girls	82%	87%	71%
Economically disadvantaged	53%	73%	N/A
English Learners	56%	74%	25%
Students with disabilities	48%	59%	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	63%	59%	78%	49%	52%	53%	41%	42%	42%
Mathematics	89%	84%	88%	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	67%	90%
Filipino	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	N/A
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	85%	88%
Boys	79%	85%
Girls	75%	92%
Economically disadvantaged	N/A	N/A
English learners	57%	86%
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	10	10	10
Similar-schools rank	5	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	+17	+7	+9	920
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	+2	+25	-13	934
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)	+30	-8	+23	911
Economically disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
English learners	N/A	+32	+5	905
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.