

Rocketship Los Suenos Academy

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013

Rocketship Education



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



Published by
SCHOOL WISE PRESS

Rocketship Los Suenos Academy

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013 Rocketship Education

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 2012–2013 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://pub.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links_2013_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

331 South 34th Street
San Jose, CA 95116
Principal: Drew Sarratore
Phone: (408) 684-4028

How to Contact Our District

420 Florence St, Suite 300
Palo Alto, CA 94301
Phone: (877) 806-0920
<http://www.rsed.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 2013–2014](#)
[Data Almanac](#)



Published by
SCHOOL WISE PRESS
466 Green Street, Suite 303
San Francisco, CA 94133
Phone: (415) 432-7800
www.schoolwisepress.com

©2013 Publishing 20/20

Rocketship Los Suenos Academy

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013
Rocketship Education

» Principal's Message

Rocketship Education is reinventing the elementary school education model.

Each student is unique at Rocketship Los Sueños Academy, so individual instruction is a critical component for achievement at Rocketship. This manifests through purposeful focus on guided reading within literacy classes, the use of centers and pullout groups in math, leveled reading in the reading center, a focus on targeted online curriculum in the computer center, and individualized tutoring in small groups during and after school for students that are struggling to master various concepts.

The Rocketship model allows each school to implement a wide array of classes and skills and an individualized approach to learning. Rocketship utilizes a robust Response to Intervention program, which allows educators to address the special needs of every student achieving below grade level. As part of its Response to Intervention program, Rocketship writes Individualized Learning Plans for each student and focuses a significant amount of time, instruction, planning, and professional development in regards to in-class individualized instruction. Through the use of targeted and individualized instruction and interventions, Rocketship teachers are able to meet the needs of specific students and realize the 1.5 years of academic growth that are necessary for them to lay the foundation for college.

Rocketship Los Sueños Academy also believes that parents are critical participants in the academic success of their student. Classroom teachers conduct at least one home visit in the first semester, two parent conferences, and make formal contacts with each Rocketeer parent twice per month. Additionally, Rocketship Los Sueños Academy conducts monthly Community Meetings which have over 70 percent parent attendance, and conducts multiple family activities throughout the year. Through this significant outreach and community building, Rocketship not only provides an individualized classroom experience for students, but also creates a community that encourages and focuses on parent participation and empowerment as a critical element of a Rocketeer's success.

Drew Sarratore, PRINCIPAL

**Grade range
and calendar**

K–5

TRADITIONAL

**Academic
Performance Index**

790

County Average: 856
State Average: 810

Student enrollment

626

County Average: 547
State Average: 534

School Expenditures

Rocketship Los Sueños Academy runs a Response to Intervention program which is a 1:1 tutoring program for all students in need of additional instructional assistance. We also operate a Learning Lab in which students spend 90 minutes a day on 1:1 computerized instruction with curriculum that is assigned to each student based on his/her ELA and Silent Sustained Reading using leveled library books and an online assessment system called Accelerated Reader.

Safety

Rocketship has a comprehensive school site safety plan (Health/Safety Plan), last updated prior to the 2013–14 school year. This Plan was created in compliance with state and local requirements and is revised annually. A copy of this Health/Safety Plan and all associated safety documentation is available in the Front Office of every school. Every classroom is equipped with a first aid kit, an evacuation map, and a comprehensive safety clipboard with condensed versions of our emergency procedures and information on the location of safety equipment and evacuation areas. Campuses are also equipped with personal protective equipment, safety/survival buckets, and spill cleanup equipment.

The Rocketship Health/Safety Plan contains detailed emergency procedures for fire, earthquake, severe weather, lockdowns, car accidents, terrorist attacks, threats against the school, safe facilities, communicable and contagious diseases, accidents and incidents, blood borne pathogens, medication administration, medical conditions, and other topics related to student, staff, and campus safety. Rocketship also maintains explicit policies on Fingerprinting and Background Checks, Tuberculin Examinations, Safe Facilities, Immunizations and Physical Exams, First Aid and CPR Training, and Health Screening, among other areas. Rocketship creates additional policies and procedures as the need occurs and to stay in compliance with changes to local, state and federal laws and regulations.

All school staff are trained in safety practices and procedures every summer. Fire drills are conducted at school sites on a monthly basis, earthquake drills are conducted four times a year, and lockdown drills are also conducted every year. Safety checklists are conducted at every school site three times a year and safety teams are established at each school site at the beginning of the year and also meet regularly. Rocketship's Regional Operations team also conducts audits of each school site to make sure that every school is keeping updated documentation on safety training and practices at the school.

Support staff who handle food are specially trained in food safety and food safety checklists are conducted every month in the cafeteria area.

Employees and contractors of each Rocketship school who are in the presence of our students are required to submit a criminal background check and furnish a criminal record summary. School volunteers who have not been subject to a criminal background check are always under the direct supervision of a credentialed employee, per the requirements of our Volunteer Policy. All visitors are required to sign in and sign out at the Front Office and to wear badges when on campus.

Buildings

Launchpad Development Company builds and leases brand new facilities to each Rocketship Charter School. Rocketship Los Sueños Academy's school built in July 2010. The school holds up to 650 students and all locations are similar in design. The school has 14 classrooms, a multi-purpose room, administrative offices, a parent and community room, staff room, playground, parking lot, recess and physical education area.

All Rocketship schools are cleaned on a daily basis. Student bathrooms are swept and mopped during school hours and additionally in the evenings. All school areas are cleaned on a daily basis and deep cleaned twice annually. Quarterly the HVAC systems are serviced and checked for preventative maintenance. Other improvements scheduled for 2012 include computer lab electrical upgrades, copier outlet installation, installation of roll down awning to outdoor shade structure, and beautification days where students, parents and volunteers help to garden, paint and make improvements to school grounds.

Parent Involvement

Rocketship believes that parents are critical participants in the academic success of their student. Classroom teachers conduct at least one home visit in the first semester, two parent conferences, and make formal contacts with each Rocketeer parent twice per month. Additionally, Rocketship conducts monthly Community Meetings which have over 70 percent parent attendance, and conducts multiple family activities throughout the year. Through this significant outreach and community building, Rocketship not only provides an individualized classroom experience for students, but also creates a community that encourages and focuses

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.

CALIFORNIA API ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
Met schoolwide growth target	No
Met growth target for prior school year	No
API score	790
Growth attained from prior year	-3
Met subgroup* growth targets	No

Los Suenos Academy’s API was 790 (out of 1000). This is a decline of 3 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.

SOURCE: API based on spring 2013 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of December 2013.

API RANKINGS: Based on our 2011–2012 test results, we started the 2012–2013 school year with a base API of 793. 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 4 out of 10.


*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. N/A - Results not available.

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 7 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 did not meet some or all of our assigned growth targets during the 2012–2013 school year. Just for reference, 48 percent of elementary schools statewide met their growth targets.

API, Spring 2013



SOURCE: API based on spring 2013 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 nine out of 17 criteria for yearly progress. Because we fell short in eight areas, we did not make 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): 89.2 percent on the English/language arts test and 89.5 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 770 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	No
Met schoolwide participation rate	Yes
Met schoolwide test score goals	No
Met subgroup* participation rate	Yes
Met subgroup* test score goals	No
Met schoolwide API for AYP	Yes
Program Improvement school in 2013	Yes

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of September 2013. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students’ test results in the 2012–2013 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. 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 89.2% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 89.5% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?
SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS	●	●	●	●
SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS				
Low income	●	●	●	●
Students learning English	●	●	●	●
STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY				
Hispanic/Latino	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of September 2013, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2012–2013 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

IMPROVEMENT: Los Suenos Academy has been in Program Improvement (PI) since 2012. In 2013, the school moved one stage lower in the program, from stage (year) 1 to 2. There are five stages in total. In California, 623 elementary schools were in stage 2 of PI as of December 2013.

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	
PI	
PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	
In PI since	2012
Stage of PI	2 of 5
Change in 2013	Moved one stage lower (did not make AYP)

SOURCE: PI status is based on the Accountability Progress Report of September 2013. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students’ test results in the 2012–2013 school year or earlier.

YEAR	PI STAGE	SUMMARY OF EVENTS FOR THIS YEAR	AYP GOALS NOT MET ■	AYP GOALS MET ■
2011	Not in PI	Los Suenos Academy met 13 of the 17 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress established by the federal law known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB).	4	13
2012	1	We met nine of the 17 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress, causing the school to enter the first stage of Program Improvement.	8	9
2013	2	We met nine of the 17 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress. As a result, the school moved to stage 2 of Program Improvement.	8	9

SOURCE: PI status is based on the Accountability Progress Report of September 2013. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students’ test results in the 2012–2013 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

PARENTS: Because Los Suenos Academy is in stage (year) 2 of PI, parents of students have two options. They can enroll their children in different schools in the district. To see the list of these schools, parents can contact either the principal or the district office staff. Their children are also entitled to free tutoring. Details about the district’s list of approved tutoring providers are available from the district office. More information about both options is available on the [US Department of Education Web site](#).

SCHOOL: The school staff is hard at work improving classroom teaching. The school may set aside ten percent of its Title I (federal) funding to help teachers improve.

DISTRICT: The district is providing coaching to teachers and helping the school’s staff revise its improvement plan.

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 2013 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

HAVE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS KEPT UP WITH THE CHANGES IN WHAT WE TEACH? In two subjects, the answer is “yes,” and in two more the answer is “no.” The Common Core transition is the reason for this. The test questions in math and English/language arts in 2012–13 were likely to be less well aligned with the official standards for California curriculum than they were three years ago. But the test questions in social studies and science were just as well aligned in 2012–13 as they were in the past.

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 57 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 63 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
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			45%	96%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 12 percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			69%	95%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			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
Boys			37%	174	GENDER: About 15 percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			52%	194	
English proficient			66%	143	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			31%	225	
Low income			42%	326	INCOME: About 18 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			60%	42	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	18	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			46%	350	
Asian American			83%	30	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Hispanic/Latino			40%	314	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 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			72%	97%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About nine percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			74%	92%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			63%	91%	

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			68%	176	GENDER: About eight percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			76%	195	
English proficient			82%	143	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			66%	228	
Low income			71%	328	INCOME: About six percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			77%	43	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	21	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			75%	350	
Asian American			96%	30	ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
Hispanic/Latino			70%	316	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 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			37%	92%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 20 percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			70%	93%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			57%	93%	

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	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	15	GENDER: The number of boys who took this test is too small to be counted in this analysis.
Girls			32%	31	
English proficient	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	26	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested was too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	20	
Low income			29%	38	INCOME: 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.
Not low income	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	8	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	6	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			40%	40	
Hispanic/Latino			30%	40	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.

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 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 Los Suenos Academy, 29 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared with 70 percent of elementary school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	29%	67%	70%
English Learners	71%	33%	30%

SOURCE: Language census for the 2012–2013 school year. 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 443 students classified as English Learners. At Los Suenos Academy, 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	92%	64%	84%
Vietnamese	5%	13%	3%
Cantonese	0%	2%	1%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	0%	3%	1%
Korean	0%	1%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	0%	0%
All other	3%	17%	9%

SOURCE: Language census for the 2012–2013 school year. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

Ethnicity

Most students at Los Suenos Academy identify themselves as Hispanic/Latino. In fact, there are about 11 times as many Hispanic/Latino students as Asian/Pacific Islander students, the second-largest ethnic group at Los Suenos Academy. 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	3%	2%	6%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	8%	32%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	86%	40%	54%
White	2%	21%	25%

SOURCE: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), October 2012. 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 \$42,643 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2012–2013 school year. At Los Suenos Academy, 90 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 61 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	90%	40%	61%
Parents with some college	37%	69%	58%
Parents with college degree	16%	52%	34%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2012–2013 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 37 percent of the students at Los Suenos Academy have attended college and 16 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 Los Suenos Academy varies across grade levels from a low of 25 students to a high of 32. Our average class size schoolwide is 30 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY GRADE	OUR SCHOOL	OUR DISTRICT
Kindergarten	31	29
First grade	31	29
Second grade	30	29
Third grade	18	27
Fourth grade	31	31
Fifth grade	25	30

SOURCE: California Department of Education, SARC Research File. District 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
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%
Fully credentialed teachers	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	69%	N/A	N/A
Teachers lacking a full credential	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	31%	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 as of December 2013.

“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 31 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. 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.

DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT
Districtwide	Percentage of core courses not taught by “highly qualified” teachers (HQT)	0%
Schools with more than 40% of students from lower-income homes	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	0%
Schools with less than 25% of students from lower-income homes	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	0.0
Psychologists	0.3
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.0
Speech/language/hearing specialists	0.1
Resource specialists	2.0

SOURCE: Data provided by the school district.

TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY: All data is the most current available as of December 2013. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2012–2013 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 2012); Language Census (March 2013); California Standards Tests (spring 2013 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (September 2013 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (September 2013).

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.

rev20140107_43-10439-0120642e/41913

» Adequacy of Key Resources 2013–2014

Here you'll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2013–2014. Please note that these facts are based on evaluations our staff conducted in accordance with the Williams legislation.

This section also contains information about 2012–2013 staff development days, and, for high schools, percentages of seniors who met our district's graduation requirements.



TEACHERS

Teacher Vacancies

KEY FACTOR	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	19	21	24
Number of classes that lacked a permanently assigned teacher within the first 20 days of school	0	0	0
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Number of classes where the permanently assigned teacher left during the year	1	1	1
Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher	1	1	1

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	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
Teacher Misassignments	Total number of classes taught by teachers without a legally recognized certificate or credential	0	0	0
Teacher Misassignments in Classes that Include English Learners	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
Other Employee Misassignments	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
2012–2013	52.00
2011–2012	22.00
2010–2011	22.00

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.

This information was collected on 11/25/2013.

NOTES:

TAUGHT AT OUR SCHOOL?	SUBJECT	ARE THERE TEXTBOOKS OR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN USE?		ARE THERE ENOUGH BOOKS FOR EACH STUDENT?	
		STANDARDS ALIGNED?	FROM THE MOST RECENT OFFICIAL ADOPTION?	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		
Jolly Phonics	Jolly Learning	2013
Words Their Way	Pearson	2013
MATH		
EnVision Math	Pearson	2013
SCIENCE		
Seeds of Science Roots of Reading	Amplify Learning	2013
GLAD Units	GLAD Project	2013
SOCIAL SCIENCE		
GLAD Units	GLAD Project	2013

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 11/19/2013 by Angela Andrews. The most recent facilities inspection occurred on 11/19/2013.

ADDITIONAL INSPECTORS: There were no other inspectors used in the completion of this form.

Area	Rating	Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
Overall Rating		No apparent problems
A. Systems		
1. Gas		N/A
2. Mechanical/HVAC		HVAC settings to be adjusted during Winter Break.
3. Sewer		No apparent problems
B. Interior Surfaces		
1. Interior Surfaces		Wall showing wear and tear and in need of repair / replacement.
C. Cleanliness		
1. Overall cleanliness		Deep cleaning required during Winter Break.
2. Pest/Vermin		No apparent problems
D. Electrical Components		
1. Electrical Components		No apparent problems
E. Rest Rooms/Fountains		
1. Rest Rooms		No apparent problems
2. Drinking Fountains		Outdoor drinking fountain to be repaired within the month.
F. Safety		
1. Fire Safety		No apparent problems

Area	Rating	Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
<p>2. Hazardous Materials</p>		<p>No apparent problems</p>
<p>G. Structural</p>		
<p>1. Structural Damage</p>		<p>No apparent problems</p>
<p>2. Roofs/Gutters</p>		<p>Architect to review downspout design in lunch area. Roof inspection within the month due to leaks in multiple classrooms.</p>
<p>H. External</p>		
<p>1. Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences</p>		<p>No apparent problems</p>
<p>2. Playgrounds/School Grounds</p>		<p>No apparent problems</p>

SCHOOL FINANCES, 2011–2012

We are required by the California Dept. of Education to report financial data from the 2011–2012 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
Unrestricted funds (\$/student)				\$5,596	
Restricted funds (\$/student)				\$2,786	
Total (\$/student)				\$8,382	

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
Salary (\$/certificated staff)	56136.52			\$71,848	
Benefits (\$/certificated staff)	12720.26			\$16,999	
Total (\$/certificated staff)	68856.78			\$88,847	

* 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	626
Black/African American	3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	7%
Filipino	1%
Hispanic or Latino	86%
Pacific Islander	0%
White (not Hispanic)	2%
Two or more races	0%
Ethnicity not reported	0%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	90%
English Learners	80%
Students with disabilities	6%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CALPADS, October 2012. 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	123
Grade 1	117
Grade 2	122
Grade 3	120
Grade 4	95
Grade 5	49
Grade 6	0
Grade 7	0
Grade 8	0
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012.

Average Class Size by Grade Level

GRADE LEVEL	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
Kindergarten	30	28	31
Grade 1	27	27	29
Grade 2	22	24	31
Grade 3	20	26	30
Grade 4	N/A	28	32
Grade 5	N/A	N/A	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	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012.

Average Class Size by Grade Level, Detail

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

GRADE LEVEL	2010–2011			2011–2012			2012–2013		
	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+
Kindergarten	0	8	0	0	8	0	0	8	0
Grade 1	0	8	0	0	8	0	0	8	0
Grade 2	8	0	0	0	8	0	0	8	0
Grade 3	8	0	0	0	8	0	0	8	0
Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	6	0	0	2	4
Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	2	0
Grade 6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined K–3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 3–4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 4–8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012.

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
	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013	2012–2013
With Full Credential	6	15	11	65
Without Full Credential	6	2	5	34

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		
	MET FOUR OR MORE STANDARDS	MET FIVE OR MORE STANDARDS	MET ALL SIX STANDARDS
Grade 5	55%	33%	12%
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 9	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 2012–2013 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.

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Suspensions per 100 students			
2012–2013	3	1	N/A
2011–2012	4	1	N/A
2010–2011	0	0	5
Expulsions per 100 students			
2012–2013	0	0	N/A
2011–2012	0	0	N/A
2010–2011	0	0	0

SOURCE: Information for the two most recent years provided by the school district. Prior 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.

During the 2012–2013 school year, we had 19 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.

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		
	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
English/ language arts	48%	42%	43%	N/A	N/A	N/A	54%	56%	55%
Mathematics	82%	74%	71%	N/A	N/A	N/A	49%	50%	50%
Science	N/A	N/A	37%	N/A	N/A	N/A	57%	60%	59%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2013 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 2012–2013	MATHEMATICS 2012–2013	SCIENCE 2012–2013
African American	8%	42%	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	87%	97%	N/A
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	39%	69%	30%
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	36%	66%	47%
Girls	51%	76%	32%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	41%	70%	29%
English Learners	30%	65%	15%
Students with disabilities	12%	30%	N/A
Receives migrant education services	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2013 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	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
Statewide rank	N/A	7	4
Similar-schools rank	N/A	10	7

SOURCE: The API Base Report from May 2013.

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
	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013	2012–2013
All students at the school	N/A	-46	-3	790
Black/African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	663
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	-11	980
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	-50	-9	771
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	N/A	-57	-3	778
English Learners	N/A	-47	-5	788
Students with disabilities	N/A	-40	-27	564

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013. Students from all elementary, middle and high schools are included in the district and state columns for comparison.

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	371	790	N/A	N/A	4,655,989	790
Black/African American	12	663	N/A	N/A	296,463	708
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	30,394	743
Asian	30	980	N/A	N/A	406,527	906
Filipino	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	121,054	867
Hispanic or Latino	316	771	N/A	N/A	2,438,951	744
Pacific Islander	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	25,351	774
White (non Hispanic)	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,200,127	853
Two or more races	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	125,025	824
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	335	778	N/A	N/A	2,774,640	743
English Learners	291	788	N/A	N/A	1,482,316	721
Students with disabilities	40	564	N/A	N/A	527,476	615

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013. Students from all elementary, middle and high schools are included in the district and state columns for comparison.

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 770 or growth of at least one point.

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
Overall	N/A
Graduation rate	N/A
Participation rate in English/language arts	N/A
Participation rate in mathematics	N/A
Percent Proficient in English/language arts	N/A
Percent Proficient in mathematics	N/A
Met Academic Performance Index (API)	N/A

SOURCE: The AYP Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013.

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	N/A
The year the district entered PI	N/A
Number of schools currently in PI	4
Percentage of schools currently in PI	57%

SOURCE: The Program Improvement Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES

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
FISCAL YEAR 2011–2012			
Total expenses	N/A	N/A	\$46,420,178,248
Expenses per student	N/A	N/A	\$8,382
FISCAL YEAR 2010–2011			
Total expenses	N/A	N/A	\$46,278,595,991
Expenses per student	N/A	N/A	\$8,323

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

District Salaries, 2011–2012

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2011–2012 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	N/A	N/A
Midrange teacher’s salary	N/A	N/A
Highest-paid teacher’s salary	N/A	N/A
Average principal’s salary (elementary school)	N/A	N/A
Superintendent’s salary	N/A	N/A
Percentage of budget for teachers’ salaries	N/A	N/A
Percentage of budget for administrators’ salaries	N/A	N/A

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