

# **Cesar Chavez Elementary School**

School Accountability Report Card, 2010–2011

Alum Rock Union Elementary School District



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



Published by  
**SCHOOL WISE PRESS**

# Cesar Chavez Elementary School

## School Accountability Report Card, 2010–2011 Alum Rock Union Elementary School District

This School Accountability Report Card (SARC) provides information that can be used to evaluate and compare schools. State and federal laws require all schools to publish a SARC each year.

The information in this report represents the 2010–2011 school year, not the current school year. In most cases, this is the most recent data available. We present our school's results next to those of the average elementary school in the county and state to provide the most meaningful and fair comparisons. To find additional facts about our school online, please use the [DataQuest](#) tool offered by the California Department of Education.

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

[http://www.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links\\_2011\\_en.html](http://www.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links_2011_en.html)

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

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

### How to Contact Our School

2000 Kammerer Ave.  
San Jose, CA 95116  
Principal: Rene Sanchez  
Phone: (408) 928-7300

### How to Contact Our District

2930 Gay Ave.  
San Jose, CA 95127  
Phone: (408) 928-6800  
<http://www.arusd.org>



## » Contents

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

[Principal's Message](#)  
[Measures of Progress](#)  
[Student Achievement](#)  
[Students](#)  
[Climate for Learning](#)  
[Leadership, Teachers, and Staff](#)  
[Adequacy of Key Resources](#)  
[Data Almanac](#)



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

©2011 Publishing 20/20

# Cesar Chavez Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2010–2011  
Alum Rock Union Elementary School District



## » Principal's Message

César Chávez Elementary School is where students are inspired and motivated to excel in all academic areas emphasizing the use of technology. At César Chávez School, students are challenged to maximize their full potential, both academically and socially. Our goal is to have all of our students reach grade level proficiency by the end of the academic year. Teachers focus on the use of technology in creating an engaging learning environment for all students. Teachers, parents and administrators work hand-in-hand in order to provide the best possible education for our college-bound students. The expectation is that all students will reach grade level standards mastery and be prepared to embark on a lifelong journey towards academic excellence. There are no limits to what our students can achieve; there are only endless possibilities. ¡Sí se puede! Yes we can!

Rene Sanchez, PRINCIPAL

**Grade range  
and calendar**

**K–5**

**TRADITIONAL**

**Academic  
Performance Index**

**772**

County Average: 852

State Average: 807

**Student enrollment**

**485**

County Average: 542

State Average: 534

**Teachers**

**23**

**Students per teacher**

**21**

## School Expenditures

Chávez provides the following regular program services and/or activities to enable underperforming students to meet standards:

Before/after school intervention classes were offered to at-risk students scoring below proficiency levels in language arts

A Supplementary Educational Service Program after school and/or Saturday Academies were offered to all underperforming students

Appropriate grade-level, standards-based, state-adopted curriculum were used in the intervention programs.

Students received differentiated instruction in English levels for a 45-minute English Language Development block in grades 1-5

Students in grades 1st – 5th receive differentiated instruction incorporated into our Reading and Language Arts three-hour block (Response to Intervention)

Teachers differentiate instruction during the school day in an effort to best serve the underperforming students

Saturday Academies in writing/language arts were offered to students scoring below basic and basic on the district writing assessment

Our coach serves as a resource to classroom teachers to provide input on best practices and teaching strategies to meet the needs of students scoring below proficiency in reading

The Resource Teacher serves as a resource to classroom teachers to provide input and support with those students that need additional help.

## Safety

César Chávez Elementary School has a very detailed, comprehensive school safety plan that outlines protocols, systems, and procedures in the event of any/all emergencies. The plan also contains the yearly safety goals as determined by the students, staff, and parents. The Safety Plan is developed by the César Chávez Safety Committee before it is presented to the Alum Rock Union Elementary School District Board of Trustees for annual approval. The Safety Plan and drill procedures were revised in November of 2010 and Board approved in April 2011. Safety alerts are shared with all staff as needed throughout the school year. In addition, all required drills are calendared and completed, and the results are shared with the staff.

The César Chávez Safety Plan has a comprehensive, enforceable, and continuous behavior policy, set of rules and regulations, dress code policy, set of protocols for safety/emergency drills, tardy policy, attendance policy, referral policy, non-discriminatory policy on student rights and responsibilities, campus security policy, harassment policy, conflict management policy, Internet safety policy, and an intervention policy. The Safety Plan is updated yearly with emergency procedures clearly outlined. All students are supervised during recess, after school and before school by certificated teachers, Para-educators, or the principal. Visitors have to sign in and out of the front office of the school and wear a visitor's badge during the duration of their visit. Grounds are monitored regularly by administrators and teachers.

## Buildings

The District makes every effort to ensure all schools are clean, safe, and functional. To assist in this effort, the district uses a facility survey instrument developed by the State of California Office of Public School Construction. The results of this survey are available at the school office and at the district office.

Chavez School was constructed in 1950. School facilities are being renovated according to the Field Act requirements of the State Building Code with a focus on earthquake safety. In the event that asbestos and lead containing building materials are found, they are removed according to Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), State, and Local requirements. Deferred maintenance funds have been used to properly maintain and renovate district buildings. Needed repairs and maintenance projects are completed in a timely manner.

Whenever possible, school facilities are upgraded to support and maintain a safe, clean and secure campus. Sufficient classroom, office, library, playground, staff space, and rest room facilities are allocated to support stakeholders' needs and the instructional program. The Alum Rock School District Maintenance and Grounds staff, in conjunction with day and night custodians, ensure the school buildings and grounds are safe, clean, and in good repair. Rigorous daily custodial schedules ensure that classrooms, lavatories, serving kitchens, eating areas, offices, and playgrounds are clean for both student and staff use. Regular oversight by district maintenance

and grounds crews ensure that grass and landscaped areas are well maintained, and that the school's buildings, grounds and play areas are safe for use.

### **Parent Involvement**

Parent involvement is essential to effective schooling and student academic success, Chávez actively promotes a strong, comprehensive parent involvement policy. Not only does Chávez promote two-way communication about school programs and students' progress, but we also involve parents in instructional and support roles at the school. In addition to preparing parents to actively participate in school decision-making and developing their leadership skills in governance and advocacy, Chávez also provides parents with strategies and techniques to assist their children with learning activities at home. Finally, to ensure that parents receive the health, social, and other support services that are necessary to live healthy lives and promote student achievement, Chávez provides parents with the skills and resources to access community and support services.

Below are a multitude of services and/or programs offered to parents:

Parent Literacy workshops provide parents with skills to better support students' academic needs at home

Parenting, Technology and ESL classes

Parent Coffees are opportunities for parents and the principal to come together, share concerns and problem-solve

Parent training is provided by Chávez teachers and administration on topics that address academic achievement and accountability

Community agencies provide counseling and family support to students and parents

Because parents are valued; we provide a variety of other opportunities for our parents to be collaborative partners in the education of their children. We have monthly School Site Council Meetings in order to gather their input for the school plan, safety plan, budget, and other programs and activities. We also have an active Gifted and Talented Program, which addresses the needs of students with high academic achievement. Parents receive a presentation from the GATE teacher to learn more about the program and to know how to better support their child who is gifted. Parents are invited to student presentations and project displays.

The last Friday of each month we have an open Parent Coffee forum with the principal so we can share upcoming events, plan events, and have time for questions and answers on issues related to the school and the children's education. We host Science Nights and Math Nights for our parents and students. This is an opportunity for our parents to learn about what our students are learning at school, how to help their children, instructional strategies, and much more. In addition, parents participate in the School Site Council, English Learners Advisory Committee and Gifted and Talented Education meetings, all of which are conducted in Spanish and English.

In fall, we hold a Back-to-School event for parents to learn about the curriculum presented during the year, and in spring, we hold an Open House to showcase student work and projects. We also hold quarterly assemblies where students are rewarded for their academic achievement. Parents of students receiving awards are sent an invitation to come to this event and celebrate this wonderful accomplishment with their child.

Our contact person for parent involvement is Rene Sanchez @ 408-928-7300.

## MEASURES OF PROGRESS

### Academic Performance Index

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

Chavez's API was 772 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 63 points compared with last year's API. All students took the test. You can find three years of detailed API results in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

**API RANKINGS:** Based on our 2009–2010 test results, we started the 2010–2011 school year with a base API of 709. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared with all elementary schools in California, our school ranked 1 out of 10.

**SIMILAR SCHOOL RANKINGS:** We also received a second ranking that compared us with the 100 schools with the most similar students, teachers, and class sizes. Compared with these schools, our school ranked 2 out of 10. The CDE recalculates this factor every year. To read more about the specific elements included in this calculation, refer to the [CDE Web site](#).

**API GROWTH TARGETS:** Each year the CDE sets specific API "growth targets" for every school. It assigns one growth target for the entire school, and it sets additional targets for ethnic groups, English Learners, special education students, or socioeconomic subgroups of students that make up a significant portion of the student body. Schools are required to meet all of their growth targets. If they do, they may be eligible to apply for awards through the California School Recognition Program and the Title I Achieving Schools Program.


We met our assigned growth targets during the 2010–2011 school year. Just for reference, 64 percent of elementary schools statewide met their growth targets.

CALIFORNIA API ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
Met schoolwide growth target	Yes
Met growth target for prior school year	Yes
API score	772
Growth attained from prior year	+63
Met subgroup* growth targets	Yes

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

\*Ethnic groups, English Learners, special ed students, or socioeconomic groups of students that make up 15 percent or more of a school's student body. These groups must meet AYP and API goals.  
R/P - Results pending due to challenge by school.  
N/A - Results not available.

### API, Spring 2011



SOURCE: API based on spring 2011 test cycle. State average represents elementary schools only.  
NOTE: Only groups of students that represent at least 15 percent of total enrollment are calculated and displayed as student subgroups.

## Adequate Yearly Progress

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

We met all 17 criteria for yearly progress. As a result, we succeeded at making AYP. Our school is also on the federal watchlist known as Program Improvement (PI). See the next page for background on this matter and an explanation of the consequences.

To meet AYP, elementary schools must meet three criteria. First, a certain percentage of students must score at or above Proficient levels on the California Standards Tests (CST), the California Modified Assessment (CMA), and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA): 67.6 percent on the English/language arts test and 68.5 percent on the math test. All ethnic, English Learners, special education, and socioeconomic subgroups of students also must meet these goals. Second, the schools must achieve an API of at least 710 or increase the API by one point from the prior year. Third, 95 percent of the student body must take the required standardized tests.

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

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

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of November 2011. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2010–2011 school year or earlier.

\*Ethnic groups, English Learners, special ed students, or socioeconomic groups of students that make up 15 percent or more of a school's student body. These groups must meet AYP and API goals. R/P - Results pending due to challenge by school. N/A - Results not available.

## Adequate Yearly Progress, Detail by Subgroup

● MET GOAL ● DID NOT MEET GOAL — NOT ENOUGH STUDENTS

	English/Language Arts		Math	
	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 67.6% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 68.5% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?
<b>SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS</b>	●	●	●	●
<b>SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS</b>				
Low income	●	●	●	●
Students learning English	●	●	●	●
<b>STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY</b>				
Hispanic/Latino	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of November 2011, CDE.

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

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

## Program Improvement, a Federal Intervention Program

### A BRIEF HISTORY OF OUR SCHOOL'S PLACEMENT IN PROGRAM

**IMPROVEMENT:** Chavez improved two years in a row, and is no longer in Program Improvement. Just 55 elementary schools exited Program Improvement as of November 2011.

**THE STAGES OF PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:** Program Improvement is a five-stage process for monitoring, improving, and, if necessary, reorganizing any school that receives federal money under the Title I section of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Schools in PI get extra attention from their district office to help them improve.

When a school misses even one of its goals for Adequate Yearly Progress, it is at risk of entering PI. If a school misses the same AYP goals two years in a row, it enters stage 1 of PI. Each subsequent year that a school misses any of its AYP goals, it goes one stage deeper into the process. Each stage results in increasingly severe consequences. The first stage gives parents the right to choose another school. In the second stage, students have the right to free tutoring in addition to the option to change schools. The last three stages can result in a change of staff and leadership, the conversion of the school to charter status, transferring the school to another district, or even the school's closure.

FEDERAL INTERVENTION PROGRAM	
<b>PI</b>	
PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	
<b>In PI since</b>	<b>2004</b>
<b>Stage of PI</b>	<b>Exited PI</b>
<b>Change in 2011</b>	<b>Improved and is now out of PI</b>

SOURCE: PI status is based on the Accountability Progress Report of November 2011. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2010–2011 school year or earlier.

YEAR	PI STAGE	SUMMARY OF EVENTS FOR THIS YEAR	AYP GOALS NOT MET <span style="color: red;">■</span> AYP GOALS MET <span style="color: green;">■</span>
2008	5	We met nine of the 17 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress. As a result, the school moved to stage 5 of Program Improvement.	<span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span>
2009	5	We met 13 of the 17 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress. Because we were already at stage 5 of Program Improvement, the school remained at stage 5.	<span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: red;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span>
2010	5	In 2010, the school met all of its criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress for the second year in row. This enabled the school to leave Program Improvement and return to normal status.	<span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span>
2011	Not in PI	In 2011, the school met all of its criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress for the second year in row. This enabled the school to leave Program Improvement and return to normal status.	<span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span> <span style="color: green;">■</span>

SOURCE: PI status is based on the Accountability Progress Report of November 2011. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2010–2011 school year or earlier. Some schools were in Program Improvement prior to the passage of No Child Left Behind, when the definition of PI was significantly modified.

### CONSEQUENCES

Chavez has succeeded in attaining its Adequate Yearly Progress goals for two years in a row and is no longer in PI. Few schools have accomplished this feat. The district is no longer required to take corrective action; teachers don't have to work longer hours to improve their teaching; and the school no longer needs to offer free tutoring or school choice.




## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

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

### California Standards Tests

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

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



SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2011 test cycle. State average represents elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.

## Frequently Asked Questions About Standardized Tests

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

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

**HOW HARD ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS?** Experts consider California's standards to be among the most clear and rigorous in the country. Just 56 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 62 percent scored Proficient or Advanced in math. You can review the [California Content Standards](#) on the CDE Web site.

**ARE ALL STUDENTS' SCORES INCLUDED?** No. Only students in grades two through eleven are required to take the CST. When fewer than 11 students in one grade or subgroup take a test, state officials remove their scores from the report. They omit them to protect students' privacy, as called for by federal law.

**CAN I REVIEW SAMPLE TEST QUESTIONS?** Sample test questions for the CST are on the [CDE's Web site](#). These are actual questions used in previous years.

**WHERE CAN I FIND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION?** The CDE has a wealth of resources on its Web site. The STAR Web site publishes detailed reports for schools and districts, and assistance packets for parents and teachers. This site includes explanations of [technical terms](#), scoring methods, and the [subjects](#) covered by the tests for each grade. You'll also find a [guide](#) to navigating the STAR Web site as well as help for understanding how to [compare test scores](#).

## English/Language Arts (Reading and Writing)

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			46%	95%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About ten percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			66%	95%	
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			56%	95%	

## Subgroup Test Scores

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


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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>Boys</b>			39%	147	<b>GENDER:</b> About 13 percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
<b>Girls</b>			52%	151	
<b>English proficient</b>			71%	109	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> 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.
<b>English Learners</b>			31%	189	
<b>Low income</b>			46%	298	<b>INCOME:</b> We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested who were not from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
<b>Not low income</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	N/A	
<b>Learning disabled</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	16	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> 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.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			46%	282	
<b>Asian American</b>			36%	38	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> 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.
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>			43%	249	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2011 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.  
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.  
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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



## Math

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			62%	95%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> The same percentage of students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced as did students at the average elementary school in California.
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			72%	92%	
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			62%	90%	

## Subgroup Test Scores

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


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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>Boys</b>			61%	149	<b>GENDER:</b> About three percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
<b>Girls</b>			64%	151	
<b>English proficient</b>			82%	109	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> 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.
<b>English Learners</b>			51%	191	
<b>Low income</b>			62%	300	<b>INCOME:</b> We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested who were not from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
<b>Not low income</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	N/A	
<b>Learning disabled</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	18	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> 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.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			62%	282	
<b>Asian American</b>			82%	38	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> 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.
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>			58%	251	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2011 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.  
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.  
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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



## Science

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			51%	91%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About six percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			69%	94%	
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			57%	94%	

## Subgroup Test Scores

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


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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>Boys</b>			48%	44	<b>GENDER:</b> About six percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
<b>Girls</b>			54%	46	
<b>English proficient</b>			84%	45	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> 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.
<b>English Learners</b>			18%	45	
<b>Low income</b>			51%	90	<b>INCOME:</b> We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested who were not from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
<b>Not low income</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	N/A	
<b>Learning disabled</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	1	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> 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.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			52%	89	
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>			47%	78	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> 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.

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2011 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.  
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.  
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

The science standards test was administered only to fifth graders. Of course, students in all grade levels study science in these areas: physical science, life science, earth science, and investigation and experimentation. For background, you can review the [science standards](#) by going to the CDE's Web site.



## STUDENTS

### Students' English Language Skills

At Chavez, 30 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared with 77 percent of elementary school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	30%	68%	77%
English Learners	70%	32%	23%

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

### Languages Spoken at Home by English Learners, 2010–2011

Please note that this table describes the home languages of just the 341 students classified as English Learners. At Chavez, the language these students most often speak at home is Spanish. 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	88%	64%	82%
Vietnamese	5%	12%	3%
Cantonese	0%	2%	2%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	1%	3%	2%
Korean	0%	2%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	4%	0%	0%
All other	2%	17%	9%

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

### Ethnicity

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

ETHNICITY	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
African American	2%	2%	6%
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	14%	32%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	83%	40%	53%
White	0%	21%	26%

SOURCE: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), October 2010. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

### Family Income and Education

The [free or reduced-price meal](#) subsidy goes to students whose families earned less than \$40,793 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2010–2011 school year. At Chavez, 86 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 60 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	86%	42%	60%
Parents with some college	19%	66%	56%
Parents with college degree	7%	48%	32%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2010–2011 school year. Parents' education level is collected in the spring at the start of testing. Rarely do all students answer these questions.

The parents of 19 percent of the students at Chavez have attended college and seven 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 56 percent of our students provided this information.

**CLIMATE FOR LEARNING****Average Class Sizes**

Because funding for class-size reduction was focused on the early grade levels, our school's class sizes, like those of most elementary schools, differ across grade levels.

The average class size at Chavez varies across grade levels from a low of 19 students to a high of 28. Our average class size schoolwide is 22 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY GRADE	OUR SCHOOL
Kindergarten	21
First grade	19
Second grade	20
Third grade	20
Fourth grade	28
Fifth grade	25

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

## LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

### Indicators of Teachers Who May Be Underprepared

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
<b>Core courses taught by a teacher not meeting NCLB standards</b>	Percentage of core courses not taught by a “highly qualified” teacher according to federal standards in NCLB	0%	N/A	0%
<b>Fully credentialed teachers</b>	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	85%	N/A	N/A
<b>Teachers lacking a full credential</b>	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	15%	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

**CREDENTIAL STATUS OF TEACHERS:** Teachers who lack full credentials are working under the terms of an emergency permit, an internship credential, or a waiver. They should be working toward their credential, and they are allowed to teach in the meantime only if the school board approves. About 15 percent of our teachers were working without full credentials.



### Districtwide Distribution of Teachers Who Are Not “Highly Qualified”

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

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

		CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT
DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	
<b>Districtwide</b>	Percentage of core courses not taught by “highly qualified” teachers (HQT)	0%
<b>Schools with more than 40% of students from lower-income homes</b>	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	0%
<b>Schools with less than 25% of students from lower-income homes</b>	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	0%

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

### Specialized Resource Staff

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

STAFF POSITION	STAFF (FTE)
Academic counselors	0.0
Behavioral/career counselors	0.0
Librarians and media staff	0.25
Psychologists	0.33
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.0
Speech/language/hearing specialists	0.33
Resource specialists	0.5

SOURCE: Data provided by the school district.

**TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA REGENCY:** All data is the most current available as of November 2011. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2010–2011 school year after the publication date of this report. We rely on the following sources of information from the California Department of Education: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) (October 2010); Language Census (March 2011); California Standards Tests (spring 2011 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (November 2011 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (November 2011).

**DISCLAIMER:** School Wise Press, the publisher of this accountability report, makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of this information but offers no guarantee, express or implied. While we do our utmost to ensure the information is complete, we must note that we are not responsible for any errors or omissions in the data. Nor are we responsible for any damages caused by the use of the information this report contains. Before you make decisions based on this information, we strongly recommend that you visit the school and ask the principal to provide the most up-to-date facts available.

rev20111213\_43-69369-6046239e/23824

## » Adequacy of Key Resources

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

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



## TEACHERS

## Teacher Vacancies

KEY FACTOR	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	24	22	23
Number of classes that lacked a permanently assigned teacher within the first 20 days of school	1	0	1
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Number of classes where the permanently assigned teacher left during the year	0	0	0
Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher	0	0	0

**NOTES:**

There are two general circumstances that can lead to the unfortunate case of a classroom without a full-time, permanently assigned teacher. Within the first 20 days of the start of school, we can be surprised by too many students showing up for school or too few teachers showing up to teach. After school starts, however, teachers can also be surprised by sudden changes: family emergencies, injuries, accidents, etc. When that occurs, it is our school's and our district's responsibility to fill that teacher's vacancy with a qualified, full-time, and permanently assigned replacement. For that reason, we report teacher vacancies in two parts: at the start of school and after the start of school.

## Teacher Misassignments

A “misassigned” teacher is one who lacks the appropriate subject-area authorization for a class she is teaching. Under the terms of the Williams settlement, schools must inform the public of the number of their teachers who are misassigned. It is possible for a teacher who lacks the authorization for a subject to get special permission—in the form of an emergency permit, waiver, or internship authorization—from the school board or county office of education to teach the subject anyway. This permission prevents the teacher from being counted as misassigned.

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
<b>Teacher Misassignments</b>	Total number of classes taught by teachers without a legally recognized certificate or credential	0	0	0
<b>Teacher Misassignments in Classes that Include English Learners</b>	Total number of classes that include English Learners and are taught by teachers without CLAD/BCLAD authorization, ELD or SDAIE training, or equivalent authorization from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing	0	0	0
<b>Other Employee Misassignments</b>	Total number of service area placements of employees without the required credentials	0	0	0

### NOTES:

## Staff Development

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

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
<b>2010–2011</b>	0.00
<b>2009–2010</b>	0.00
<b>2008–2009</b>	0.00

## TEXTBOOKS

The main fact about textbooks that the Williams legislation calls for described whether schools have enough books in core classes for all students. The law also asks districts to reveal whether those books are presenting what the California Content Standards call for.

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

This information was collected on 09/10/2010.

### NOTES:

TAUGHT AT OUR SCHOOL?	SUBJECT	ARE THERE TEXTBOOKS OR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN USE?		ARE THERE ENOUGH BOOKS FOR EACH STUDENT?	
		STANDARDS ALIGNED?	OFFICIALLY ADOPTED?	FOR USE IN CLASS?	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS HAVING BOOKS TO TAKE HOME?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Math	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Science	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Social Science	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Foreign Languages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Health	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Visual/Performing Arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

## Textbooks in Use

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

SUBJECT AND TITLE	PUBLISHER	YEAR ADOPTED
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS		
Imagine It!	SRA	2008
Language! 3 <sup>rd</sup> Edition	Sopris West	2006
MATH		
California Math	Houghton Mifflin	2008
California Math Triumphs	Glencoe	2009
SCIENCE		
California Science	Pearson-Scott Foresman	2007
SOCIAL SCIENCE		
History-Social Science for California	Pearson-Scott Foresman	2006

## FACILITIES

To determine the condition of our facilities, our district sent experts from our facilities team to perform an inspection using a survey called the Facilities Inspection Tool, which is issued by the Office of Public School Construction.

Based on that survey, we've answered the questions you see on this report. Please note that the information reflects the condition of our buildings as of the date of the report. Since that time, those conditions may have changed.

**INSPECTORS AND ADVISORS:** This report was completed on 10/13/2011 by Vince Quiroz. The most recent facilities inspection occurred on 10/13/2011.

**ADDITIONAL INSPECTORS:** Jesse Ramirez, Johnny Villalobos, Primo Velasquez, Sal Madrigal

AREA	RATING	REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Fair</b>	
<b>A. Systems</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Gas</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Mechanical/HVAC</b>		A/C not working (6, 10)
<b>3. Sewer</b>		No apparent problems
<b>B. Interior Surfaces</b>	<b>Fair</b>	
<b>1. Interior Surfaces</b>		Missing/stained ceiling tiles (several rooms); Missing/damaged floor tiles (several rooms); Damaged carpet/baseboard (Music Rm); Painting needed (kitchen, Counselors Rm, Presley Migrant Rm); hole in wall (K2 RR)
<b>C. Cleanliness</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Overall cleanliness</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Pest/Vermin</b>		No apparent problems
<b>D. Electrical Components</b>	<b>Poor</b>	
<b>1. Electrical Components</b>		Lights out (several rooms); Light covers missing (several rooms); light switch needs replacing (6); intercom not working (3); Panduit cover missing (14); Clock not working (Speech Rm, 20, 21, 23, Presley Office)
<b>E. Rest Rooms/Fountains</b>	<b>Poor</b>	
<b>1. Rest Rooms</b>		Restrooms used for storage (Boys' and Girls' - first wing); RR outside cafeteria in disrepair; Low flush pressure (Women's RR in Admin)
<b>2. Drinking Fountains</b>		Fountain/sink repairs needed (kitchen, K2, K1, 13, 14, Boys' RR-last wing, 21, Lib, 26, 30, 31; repair water line (25); No



AREA	RATING	REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED
		water (C1)
<b>F. Safety</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Fire Safety</b>		Replace fire extinguisher bracket (21)
<b>2. Hazardous Materials</b>		No apparent problems
<b>G. Structural</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Structural Damage</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Roofs/Gutters</b>		No apparent problems
<b>H. External</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences</b>		Window screens torn/missing (kitchen)
<b>2. Playgrounds/School Grounds</b>		Playground border repair needed (K playground, Presley playground); Graffiti on slide and benches (K playground)

## SCHOOL FINANCES, 2009–2010

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

### Spending per Student

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

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

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

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

TYPE OF FUNDS	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE
<b>Unrestricted funds (\$/student)</b>	\$5,125	\$5,488	-7%	\$5,513	-7%
<b>Restricted funds (\$/student)</b>	\$2,882	\$2,230	29%	\$2,939	-2%
<b>Total (\$/student)</b>	\$8,007	\$7,718	4%	\$8,452	-5%

### Compensation for Staff with Teaching Credentials

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

CERTIFICATED STAFF*	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE
<b>Salary (\$/certificated staff)</b>	\$64,912	\$65,984	-2%	\$71,246	-9%
<b>Benefits (\$/certificated staff)</b>	\$14,767	\$15,871	-7%	\$16,062	-8%
<b>Total (\$/certificated staff)</b>	\$79,679	\$81,855	-3%	\$87,308	-9%

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

## » Data Almanac

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



## STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

### Student Enrollment by Ethnicity and Other Characteristics

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

GROUP	ENROLLMENT
Number of students	485
Black/African American	2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	12%
Filipino	1%
Hispanic or Latino	83%
Pacific Islander	1%
White (not Hispanic)	0%
Two or more races	0%
Ethnicity not reported	0%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	99%
English Learners	82%
Students with disabilities	8%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CALPADS, October 2010. Data about students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged, English Learners, or learning disabled come from the School Accountability Report Card unit of the California Department of Education.

### Student Enrollment by Grade Level

Number of students enrolled in each grade level at our school.

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS
Kindergarten	82
Grade 1	77
Grade 2	81
Grade 3	61
Grade 4	83
Grade 5	101
Grade 6	0
Grade 7	0
Grade 8	0
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2010.

**Average Class Size by Grade Level**

GRADE LEVEL	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011
Kindergarten	20	20	21
Grade 1	20	20	19
Grade 2	20	21	20
Grade 3	20	21	20
Grade 4	20	27	28
Grade 5	22	24	25
Grade 6	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined K–3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 3–4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 4–8	N/A	14	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

**Average Class Size by Grade Level, Detail**

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

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

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

### Teacher Credentials

The number of teachers assigned to the school with a full credential and without a full credential, for both our school and the district.

TEACHERS	SCHOOL			DISTRICT
	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011	2010–2011
<b>With Full Credential</b>	26	24	22	605
<b>Without Full Credential</b>	6	4	4	45

SOURCE: Information provided by school district.

### Physical Fitness

Students in grades five, seven, and nine take the California Fitness Test each year. This test measures students' aerobic capacity, body composition, muscular strength, endurance, and flexibility using six different tests. The table shows the percentage of students at our school who scored within the "healthy fitness zone" on four, five, and all six tests. More information about [physical fitness testing and standards](#) is available on the CDE Web site.

GRADE LEVEL	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING HEALTHY FITNESS ZONES		
	FOUR OF SIX STANDARDS	FIVE OF SIX STANDARDS	SIX OF SIX STANDARDS
<b>Grade 5</b>	15%	24%	25%
<b>Grade 7</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Grade 9</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

### Suspensions and Expulsions

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

During the 2010–2011 school year, we had 18 suspension incidents. We had no incidents of expulsion. To make it easy to compare our suspensions and expulsions to those of other schools, we represent these events as a ratio (incidents per 100 students) in this report. Please note that multiple incidents may involve the same student.

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
<b>Suspensions per 100 students</b>			
<b>2010–2011</b>	4	5	N/A
<b>2009–2010</b>	7	3	6
<b>2008–2009</b>	3	2	6
<b>Expulsions per 100 students</b>			
<b>2010–2011</b>	0	0	N/A
<b>2009–2010</b>	0	0	0
<b>2008–2009</b>	0	0	0

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

## STUDENT PERFORMANCE

### California Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

The California Standards Tests (CST) show how well students are learning what the state content standards require. The CST include English/language arts and mathematics in grades two through five and science in grade five. We also include results from the California Modified Assessment and California Alternative Performance Assessment (CAPA).

### STAR Test Results for All Students: Three-Year Comparison

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

SUBJECT	SCHOOL PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			DISTRICT PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			STATE PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
English/ language arts	25%	30%	45%	38%	42%	48%	49%	52%	54%
Mathematics	37%	48%	63%	47%	51%	57%	46%	48%	50%
Science	29%	32%	51%	40%	44%	53%	50%	54%	57%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2011 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

### STAR Test Results by Student Subgroup: Most Recent Year

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

STUDENT GROUP	STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	ENGLISH/ LANGUAGE ARTS 2010–2011	MATHEMATICS 2010–2011	SCIENCE 2010–2011
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	58%	87%	N/A
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	42%	58%	47%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Two or more Races	N/A	N/A	N/A
Boys	38%	62%	48%
Girls	51%	64%	54%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	45%	63%	51%
English Learners	31%	52%	18%
Students with disabilities	36%	64%	0%
Receives migrant education services	32%	40%	0%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2011 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

## ACCOUNTABILITY

### California Academic Performance Index (API)

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

### API Ranks: Three-Year Comparison

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

API RANK	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011
Statewide rank	1	1	1
Similar-schools rank	1	1	2

SOURCE: The API Base Report from December 2011.

### API Changes by Subgroup: Three-Year Comparison

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

SUBGROUP	ACTUAL API CHANGE			API
	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011	2010–2011
All students at the school	+19	+64	+63	772
Black/African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	+63	882
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	+14	+70	+61	753
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	+19	+64	+63	772
English Learners	+26	+73	+70	759
Students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	+135	725

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



**API Scores by Subgroup**

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

SUBGROUP	SCHOOL		DISTRICT		STATE	
	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API
All students	304	772	9,184	770	4,683,676	778
Black/African American	6	N/A	169	733	317,856	696
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	N/A	24	818	33,774	733
Asian	37	882	1,033	879	398,869	898
Filipino	3	N/A	532	856	123,245	859
Hispanic or Latino	256	753	7,109	746	2,406,749	729
Pacific Islander	0	N/A	77	791	26,953	764
White (non Hispanic)	2	N/A	225	847	1,258,831	845
Two or more races	0	N/A	11	728	76,766	836
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	304	772	9,132	770	2,731,843	726
English Learners	249	759	6,090	744	1,521,844	707
Students with disabilities	33	725	1,205	610	521,815	595

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

### Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Intervention Programs

The federal law known as No Child Left Behind requires that all schools and districts meet all three of the following criteria in order to attain Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):

- (a) a 95-percent participation rate on the state's tests
- (b) a CDE-mandated percentage of students scoring Proficient or higher on the state's English/language arts and mathematics tests
- (c) an API of at least 710 or growth of at least one point
- (d) the graduation rate for the graduating class must be higher than 90 percent (or satisfy alternate improvement criteria).

#### AYP for the District

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

AYP CRITERIA	DISTRICT
<b>Overall</b>	No
<b>Graduation rate</b>	N/A
<b>Participation rate in English/language arts</b>	Yes
<b>Participation rate in mathematics</b>	Yes
<b>Percent Proficient in English/language arts</b>	No
<b>Percent Proficient in mathematics</b>	No
<b>Met Academic Performance Index (API)</b>	Yes

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

#### Intervention Program: District Program Improvement (PI)

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

INDICATOR	DISTRICT
<b>PI stage</b>	3 of 3
<b>The year the district entered PI</b>	2004
<b>Number of schools currently in PI</b>	5
<b>Percentage of schools currently in PI</b>	19%

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

## DISTRICT EXPENDITURES

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

Total expenses include only the costs related to direct educational services to students. This figure does not include food services, land acquisition, new construction, and other expenditures unrelated to core educational purposes. The expenses-per-student figure is calculated by dividing total expenses by the district's average daily attendance (ADA). More information is available on the [CDE's Web site](#).

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	OUR DISTRICT	SIMILAR DISTRICTS	ALL DISTRICTS
<b>FISCAL YEAR 2009–2010</b>			
Total expenses	\$108,252,851	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$8,736	\$7,973	\$8,452
<b>FISCAL YEAR 2008–2009</b>			
Total expenses	\$117,076,622	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$9,128	\$8,275	\$8,736

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

### District Salaries, 2009–2010

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2009–2010 school year. This table compares our average salaries with those in districts like ours, based on both enrollment and the grade level of our students. In addition, we report the percentage of our district's total budget dedicated to teachers' and administrators' salaries. The costs of health insurance, pensions, and other indirect compensation are not included.

SALARY INFORMATION	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Beginning teacher's salary	\$46,567	\$41,692
Midrange teacher's salary	\$72,497	\$68,251
Highest-paid teacher's salary	\$84,619	\$86,582
Average principal's salary (elementary school)	\$97,379	\$108,334
Superintendent's salary	\$198,000	\$180,492
Percentage of budget for teachers' salaries	44%	42%
Percentage of budget for administrators' salaries	7%	6%

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

