

Belle Air Elementary

School Accountability Report Card, 2011–2012
San Bruno Park 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

Belle Air Elementary

School Accountability Report Card, 2011–2012 San Bruno Park 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 2011–2012 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_2012_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

450 Third Avenue
San Bruno, CA 94066
Principal: Michael Rothhammer
Phone: (650) 624-3155

How to Contact Our District

500 Acacia Ave.
San Bruno, CA 94066
Phone: (650) 244-0133
<http://sbpsd.k12.ca.us/>



» 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](#)
[Resources](#)
[School Expenditures](#)
[Adequacy of Key Resources 2012–2013](#)
[Data Almanac](#)



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

©2012 Publishing 20/20

Belle Air Elementary

School Accountability Report Card, 2011–2012
San Bruno Park Elementary School District

Principal's Message



Welcome to Belle Air Elementary School! Belle Air Elementary serves a vibrant, linguistically and culturally diverse community in San Bruno, California.

Belle Air students are smart and enthusiastic learners. In collaboration with our parents and the community, we support, challenge and prepare our students as they progress in their educational journey. It is our expectation that when our students leave Belle Air they are prepared to be successful in middle school, to complete high school A-G requirements and to be eligible to go to the college of their choice. In addition, we train our students to be lifelong learners and knowledgeable, respectful and responsible members of their community.

Pre-school program on campus: We have a thriving pre-school program on campus that serves over 100 students from ages three to five. We incorporate hands-on activities, cultural experiences, kindergarten readiness and play to build a strong foundation for our children's future.

Partnership with Notre Dame De Namur University (NDNU): We have a unique partnership with NDNU as a "laboratory school" that draws upon the additional resources and expertise of a local university and teaching college. In every classroom a student teacher is matched with one of our "master" teachers resulting in a 1 to 15 adult to student ratio.

Parent engagement: Our parents are active at our school and we have a "can do" PTA that holds many functions and fundraisers throughout the year. The proceeds contribute to the many supplementary programs at Belle Air including a high quality physical education program and a weeklong outdoor education experience for our fifth grade students each year.

Technology: Technology is a priority at Belle Air. Every classroom is equipped with an LCD projector, document camera and "streaming" to bring the world into the classroom, and to enhance and deepen student learning. Our second through fifth grade students use ST Math, a mathematical reasoning and problem-solving program by the Mind Institute. In addition, there are two computer labs that students access multiple times each week. For 2012-2013, we plan to purchase iPads to further enhance student learning.

Meeting all student needs: There is a full-time "intervention" teacher to provide additional help for those students who are one or more grade levels behind their peers. We also have a full-time resource teacher, part-time speech teacher and counselors to provide services for selected students, such as those students with exceptional needs. There is an afterschool program on site that includes homework help, computer lab, enrichment activities and structured outdoor games.

You are welcome to visit our campus and see for yourself our smart and delightful students, exceptional staff and the abundant learning going on at Belle Air Elementary in San Bruno Park School District.

Michael Rothhammer, PRINCIPAL

Grade range and calendar

K-6

TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index

812

County Average: 854
State Average: 814

Student enrollment

402

County Average: 454
State Average: 535

Major Achievements

- A Reading Intervention teacher focused on the academic performance of students not meeting state language arts standards. The teacher taught a reading intervention core program for fourth and fifth grade students. This teacher also taught reading intervention and English language development lessons to small groups of students and worked closely with classroom teachers to support reading language arts instruction in the classroom.
- The After School Education and Safety grant allowed Belle Air School to provide an afterschool program on site. The program offered students in grades one through six homework support, enrichment activities, and a nutritious snack.
- Belle Air Elementary was one of four public elementary schools in the greater Bay Area that had an increase of 50 or more points in the Academic Performance Index (API), the state's academic ranking system. There were, of course, multiple factors that led to our students' academic success including our highly trained teaching staff, our new partnership with Notre Dame University, and our systematic intervention for students below grade level.
- Afterschool enrichment included arts and crafts, cooking, and folkloric dancing. In addition, all fifth grade students participated in the yearly outdoor education experience that provides a multitude of hands-on science activities.

Focus for Improvement

- In 2012–2013 we will continue to improve differentiated learning in all subject areas with additional emphasis on reading/language arts and mathematics. Belle Air will also continue to hold high expectations for all students including those below grade level, at grade level and those high achievers (some of who were formerly classified as GATE).
- In addition, we will continue to build a positive school climate through character and anti-bullying education.
- The City of San Bruno will provide our school with the high quality afterschool programs it is known for throughout the city. We are purchasing iPads and educational applications for students to use during and after school.
- In terms of technology, we are updating and reconfiguring the two computer labs. We are still contracted with Mind Research Institute for the online math program, ST Math, and Education City. For language development, our “newcomer”, or beginner English learners, also use Rosetta Stone. Through San Mateo County Office of Education we will continue to have streaming in every classroom.

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	Yes
Met growth target for prior school year	Yes
API score	812
Growth attained from prior year	+50
Met subgroup* growth targets	Yes

Belle Air’s API was 812 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 50 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 2012 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of December 2012.

API RANKINGS: Based on our 2010–2011 test results, we started the 2011–2012 school year with a base API of 762. 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 3 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 8 out of 10. The CDE recalculates this factor every year. To read more about the specific elements included in this calculation, refer to the [CDE Web site](#).

API GROWTH TARGETS: Each year the CDE sets specific API “growth targets” for every school. It assigns one growth target for the entire school, and it sets additional targets for ethnic 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 2011–2012 school year. Just for reference, 59 percent of elementary schools statewide met their growth targets.

API, Spring 2012



SOURCE: API based on spring 2012 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): 78.4 percent on the English/language arts test and 79.0 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 740 or increase the API by one point from the prior year. Third, 95 percent of the student body must take the required standardized tests.

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

FEDERAL AYP ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS	
Met AYP	Yes
Met schoolwide participation rate	Yes
Met schoolwide test score goals	Yes
Met subgroup* participation rate	Yes
Met subgroup* test score goals	Yes
Met schoolwide API for AYP	Yes
Program Improvement school in 2012	Yes

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of October 2012. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students’ test results in the 2011–2012 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 78.4% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 79.0% 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 October 2012, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2011–2012 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: Belle Air has been in Program Improvement (PI) since 2007. In 2012, the school met all of its goals, so it remained at stage (year) 5. There are five stages in total. In California, 968 elementary schools were in stage 5 of PI as of December 2012.

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	2007
Stage of PI	5 of 5
Change in 2012	No change (made AYP)

SOURCE: PI status is based on the Accountability Progress Report of October 2012. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2011–2012 school year or earlier.

YEAR	PI STAGE	SUMMARY OF EVENTS FOR THIS YEAR	AYP GOALS NOT MET 	AYP GOALS MET 
2009	3	We met 13 of the 17 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress. As a result, the school moved to stage 3 of Program Improvement.		
2010	4	We met 16 of the 17 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress. As a result, the school moved to stage 4 of Program Improvement.		
2011	5	We met nine of the 17 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress. As a result, the school moved to stage 5 of Program Improvement.		
2012	5	Our school met all of its criteria for progress. This good news enabled the school to reach the halfway mark on the road to exiting Program Improvement. In order to exit PI, a school has to meet its Adequate Yearly Progress targets two years in a row.		

SOURCE: PI status is based on the Accountability Progress Report of October 2012. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2011–2012 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 Belle Air is in stage (year) 5 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 district is likely to be recruiting a new staff and principal.

DISTRICT: The district is taking its most serious corrective steps. It is acting on its plan for a complete reorganization of the school. That reorganization should include one or more of the following: replacing the entire school staff; reopening the school as a charter school; contracting with an outside agency to run the school; and changing the internal organizational structure of the school. The district is also notifying parents of the school's reorganization.


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 2012 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 59 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			51%	92%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About eight percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			67%	95%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			59%	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			47%	117	GENDER: About seven percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			54%	129	
English proficient			78%	66	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			43%	180	
Low income			48%	194	INCOME: About 31 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			79%	50	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	11	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			53%	234	
Hispanic/Latino			47%	186	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 2012 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			74%	94%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 11 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			71%	89%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			63%	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
Boys			71%	121	GENDER: About five percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			76%	132	
English proficient			82%	66	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			70%	187	
Low income			73%	201	INCOME: About two percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			75%	50	
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			76%	234	
Hispanic/Latino			70%	194	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 2012 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			23%	88%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 36 percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			66%	94%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			59%	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	14	GENDER: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested was too small to be statistically significant.
Girls	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	29	
English proficient	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	12	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English proficient students tested was too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners			13%	31	
Low income			24%	33	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	9	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	N/A	LEARNING DISABILITIES: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled			23%	43	
Hispanic/Latino			25%	32	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 2012 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.



Other Measures of Student Achievement

San Bruno Park School District has developed an assessment and accountability plan to ensure that student performance is continuously monitored to improve the instructional program and to communicate with parents about their child's achievement. Standardized tests, district performance assessments, and classroom tests and assessments are all used to measure student progress.

STUDENTS

Students’ English Language Skills

At Belle Air, 32 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	32%	68%	70%
English Learners	68%	32%	30%

SOURCE: Language census for the 2011–2012 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 274 students classified as English Learners. At Belle Air, 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%	72%	84%
Vietnamese	1%	1%	3%
Cantonese	0%	4%	1%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	1%	7%	1%
Korean	0%	1%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	0%	0%
All other	10%	15%	9%

SOURCE: Language census for the 2011–2012 school year. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

Ethnicity

Most students at Belle Air identify themselves as Hispanic/Latino. In fact, there are about four times as many Hispanic/Latino students as Asian/Pacific Islander students, the second-largest ethnic group at Belle Air. 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	0%	3%	6%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	19%	21%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	76%	39%	53%
White	4%	31%	25%

SOURCE: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), October 2011. 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 \$41,348 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2011–2012 school year. At Belle Air, 67 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 58 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	67%	39%	58%
Parents with some college	25%	67%	57%
Parents with college degree	11%	49%	33%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2011–2012 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 25 percent of the students at Belle Air have attended college and 11 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 60 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 Belle Air varies across grade levels from a low of 25 students to a high of 31. Our average class size schoolwide is 28 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY GRADE	OUR SCHOOL	OUR DISTRICT
Kindergarten	31	25
First grade	31	28
Second grade	25	26
Third grade	29	29
Fourth grade	31	26
Fifth grade	27	26
Sixth grade	28	29

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

Safety

To safeguard the well-being of students and staff, the School Site Council developed a comprehensive School Site Safety Plan that is updated each year. The Safety Plan covers school disaster preparedness and various safety procedures such as the visitor policy, emergency materials, and evacuation procedures. Safety drills are held on a regular basis; fire and earthquake drills are held monthly. Intruder/lockdown drills are held as appropriate.

All visitors to Belle Air School must sign in at the office and wear a visitor’s pass at all times. Supervision is provided to ensure the safety of each student before school, during recess breaks, at lunch, and after school. Supervision is a responsibility shared among noon supervisors, teachers, and the administration. Students may also participate in the Student Safety Patrol before and after school. Shortly after the school day starts all gates are locked except for the main gate in the front of the school.

Discipline

One discipline-related goal at Belle Air is to provide students with support and strategies to treat each other with respect and a caring disposition. To that end, all staff reinforce positive Character Traits and support students to make good choices. Students also are taught to use conflict-management skills to help work through problems with their peers. In 2011–2012 a system of guidelines on appropriate and inappropriate behavior was implemented that includes yellow and blue slips with respective consequences.

Homework

Homework is a fundamental part of the learning process that helps to develop basic academic and study skills as well as promote student responsibility and self-discipline. Each teacher follows the guidelines provided in the district homework policy. Parents are encouraged to provide a supportive environment for homework activities and to be responsible for reviewing homework assignments with their child. The afterschool program provides additional instruction for students in grades one through six. Teachers also provide tutoring assistance for students after school.

Schedule

For the 2011–2012 school year, Belle Air School offered 180 days of instruction, comprising 166 regular days and 14 minimum days. Students were released early every Thursday to allow time for teacher planning and collaboration. All instructional days exceeded the daily instructional minute requirements specified in the California Education Code. Classes begin at 8 a.m. and end at 11:40 a.m. for kindergarten; 2:25 p.m. for first, second, and third grade; and 2:30 p.m. for fourth, fifth, and sixth grades.

Parent Involvement

Parents at Belle Air are involved in their students’ education in a variety of ways. Parents volunteer in the classroom and are active members of various school committees including PTA, School Site Council, and ELAC. The principal holds a monthly coffee to provide a forum for interested parents to discuss school related topics. There is also a part-time parent liaison who encourages parents to volunteer and helps address parent questions and concerns.

LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

Leadership

Michael Rothhammer is the current principal of Belle Air. He began his career in education in 1977. Before entering administration, he was an elementary classroom teacher and a district literacy coach and specialist for two years. Mr. Rothhammer came to Belle Air in 2011-2012 after ten years as a principal and assistant principal in other districts.

Belle Air is a professional learning community and follows a “distributed leadership” model. The Instructional Leadership Team is the decision making body for the school. Membership includes the principal, a classroom teacher from each grade level and a professor from Notre Dame University who is on the Belle Air campus part of the time. A Climate Committee was formed to promote prosocial behavior and address student discipline.

Additional teams of teachers, staff, and parents, who work together to make decisions to support our students include School Site Council (SSC), Student Success Team, and PTA.

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	100%	N/A	N/A
Teachers lacking a full credential	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	0%	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: This information provided by the school district. Data on NCLB standards is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file.

PLEASE NOTE: Comparative data (county average and state averages) for some of the data reported in the SARC is unavailable as of December 2012.

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

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

More facts about our teachers, called for by the Williams legislation of 2004, are available on our Accountability Web page, which is accessible from our district Web site. You will find specific facts about **misassigned teachers** and **teacher vacancies** in the 2012–2013 school year.

Districtwide Distribution of Teachers Who Are Not “Highly Qualified”

Here, we report the percentage of core courses in our district whose teachers are considered to be less than “highly qualified” by NCLB’s 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.

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.

Staff Development

The district and school site provide time and resources for collaboration, planning, and professional development for all staff. Teachers receive training directly related to instructional practices by attending afterschool professional development, workshops and conferences. Professional development days enable staff members to receive training that is rigorous, challenging, and responsive to student learning needs and best practices. Staff members were offered three staff development days annually for the past year; topics included character education, data analysis and intervention strategies, intervention software instruction, and writing best teaching practices.

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
2011–2012	0.0
2010–2011	0.0
2009–2010	N/A

SOURCE: This information is supplied by the school district.

Evaluating and Improving Teachers

A constructive evaluation process promotes quality instruction and is a fundamental element in a sound educational program. Evaluations and formal observations are designed to encourage common goals and to comply with the state’s evaluation criteria and district policies. Temporary and probationary teachers are evaluated annually, and tenured teachers are evaluated every other year. Evaluations are conducted by the principal, who has been trained and certified for competency to perform teacher evaluations.

The district’s Peer Assistance and Review program provides new teachers and affected veteran teachers with personal mentoring in the areas of subject matter knowledge and overall professional competence.

Substitute Teachers

The district generally does not experience any problems finding qualified substitute teachers and has an adequate pool of fully credentialed substitutes. However, on rare occasions when a substitute is unavailable, the students are placed into other classrooms to receive instruction from other certificated teachers.

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	0.2
Librarians and media staff	0.0
Psychologists	0.0
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.0
Speech/language/hearing specialists	1.0
Resource specialists	1.0

SOURCE: Data provided by the school district.

Specialized Programs and Staff

Students are encouraged to participate in the school's additional academic and extracurricular activities, which are an integral part of the educational program. These programs promote positive attitudes, encourage achievement, and aid in the prevention of behavioral problems. Extracurricular activities and programs in the 2011–2012 school year at Belle Air Elementary School include the afterschool program, Homework Club, Posy Parade, and Spirit Days. Through district and school funding, all students participate in the Rhythm and Moves PE program.

The district psychologist and counselor are devoted to helping students deal with problems, assisting them to reach positive goals, and providing additional counseling services. The district contracts out with nurses for vision, hearing, and scoliosis testing. Most years there is an intern social worker or counselor who works with small groups or individual students.

Gifted and Talented Education (GATE)

The Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) program is no longer funded by the Department of Education. However, classroom teachers continue to address the learning needs of high achieving and gifted students through student learning opportunities that provide greater depth and complexity. For example, students receive challenging supplemental lessons within their regular classrooms through differentiated instruction.

Special Education Program

The Belle Air staff assists students in their social and personal development as well as academics. The school provides qualified personnel to offer counseling and support services on a part-time and/or full-time basis. When students require additional assistance, support staff is available. Belle Air Elementary School provides additional support for students with special needs. Special education services are tailored to the Individualized Education Program (IEP) of each student with physical, emotional, or learning disabilities.

English Learner Program

The English Language Development (ELD) program assists students who are English learners. The Academic Language Development program provides specialized instruction in English language. Students are grouped by their language proficiency level based on their California English Language Development Test, (CELDT) results. All teachers are Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) certificated. ELD instruction is fully integrated into classroom curriculum. All teachers participated in SB 472 training for English Language Development. This training was provided by the California Reading and Literacy Project (CRLP) and consisted of 40 hours of workshop time. Teachers utilize these research-based strategies to improve academic English for our English Learners.

RESOURCES

Buildings

Belle Air Elementary School was built in 1951 and provides a safe, clean environment for students, staff, and volunteers. The school was reconstructed in the summer of 2000. The campus had a “quad” distribution and is fully gated for safety. In the quad area there is a central playground area with two play structures, one for primary and one for upper grade. In the front of the school there is a preschool playground with a climbing structure. Belle Air Elementary School is composed of 18 preschool to sixth grade classrooms, a library/media center, two computer labs, a counseling room, a staff lounge, and a cafeteria. Portables contain a special education room and speech room.

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

Library

An instructional media aide was hired to assist students with acquiring library skills such as finding books of high interest and research materials for reports or presentations. Students have weekly access to the library and are able to obtain books needed to support and supplement their academic learning.

Computers

Classrooms are equipped with LCD projectors, document cameras, student computers, and Internet access. There are two computer labs to provide all students with access to technology. Our teachers have access to email and use computers to keep attendance, record grades, and correspond via email with parents and colleagues.

Textbooks

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

We have also reported additional facts about our textbooks called for by the Williams legislation of 2004. This online report shows whether we had a textbook for each student in each core course during the 2012–2013 school year and whether those [textbooks](#) covered the California Content Standards.

Curriculum

For many years, panels of scholars have decided what California students should learn and be able to do. Their decisions are known as the California Content Standards, and they apply to all public schools in the state. The textbooks we use and the tests we give are based on these content standards, and we expect our teachers to be firmly focused on them. Policy experts, researchers, and educators consider our state’s standards to be among the most rigorous and challenging in the nation.

You can find information about the content standards for each subject at each grade level on the Web site of the [California Department of Education \(CDE\)](#). California adopted new Common Core Standards for English/language arts and math in August 2010. However, the full implementation of those standards is still a few years off. Please refer to the [CDE FAQs](#) for details about the new standards.

SCHOOL EXPENDITURES

Belle Air’s afterschool program is funded through a grant from the State of California. Economic Impact Aid (EIA) and Title I funds pay for our Parent Liaison and Reading Intervention Teacher. A physical education program is funded through the Belle Air PTA. Title I, Title 3, and EIA funds support an intervention teacher, supplemental instructional materials, and technology. Finally, a state ASES grant funds the afterschool program.

Spending per Student (2010–2011)

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), which was 412 students.

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.

TYPE OF FUNDS	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE *	SCHOOL VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE
Unrestricted funds (\$/student)	\$3,824	\$4,996	-23%	\$5,434	-30%
Restricted funds (\$/student)	\$937	\$1,083	-13%	\$2,889	-68%
TOTAL (\$/student)	\$4,761	\$6,080	-22%	\$8,323	-43%

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.
 * Districts allocate most of their costs to school sites and attribute other costs to the district office. When calculating the district average for school level spending per student, we include these district related costs in the denominator. This will often cause most schools to fall below the district average.

Total Expenditures, by Category (2010–2011)

Here you can see how much we spent on different categories of expenses. We’re reporting the total dollars in each category, not spending per student.

CATEGORY	UNRESTRICTED FUNDS	RESTRICTED FUNDS	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL*
Teacher salaries (all certificated staff)	\$1,111,978	\$133,333	\$1,245,311	63%
Other staff salaries	\$135,270	\$20,538	\$155,808	8%
Benefits	\$320,962	\$31,487	\$352,449	18%
Books and supplies	\$6,720	\$27,630	\$34,350	2%
Equipment replacement	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Services and direct support	\$647	\$173,056	\$173,703	9%
TOTAL	\$1,575,577	\$386,044	\$1,961,621	

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.
 * Totals may not add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

Compensation per Staff with Teaching Credentials (2010–2011)

The total of what our certificated staff members earn appears below. 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. You can see the portion of pay that goes to salary and three types of benefits.

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we first report our compensation per full-time equivalent (FTE) certificated staff member. 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. We had 19 FTE teachers working in our school.

CATEGORY	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE *	SCHOOL VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE
Salaries	\$65,543	\$66,822	-2%	\$74,075	-12%
Retirement benefits	\$5,405	\$5,462	-1%	\$6,062	-11%
Health and medical benefits	\$8,676	\$8,501	2%	\$10,417	-17%
Other benefits	\$0	\$313	-100%	\$635	-100%
TOTAL	\$79,623	\$81,098	-2%	\$91,189	-13%

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.
 * Districts allocate most of their staff costs to school sites, but attribute other staff costs to the district office. One example is a reading resource teacher or librarian who works at all school sites. When calculating the district average for compensation per staff member, we include these district related costs in the denominator. This will often cause most schools to fall below the district average.

Total Certificated Staff Compensation (2010–2011)

Here you can see how much we spent on different categories of compensation. We’re reporting the total dollars in each category, not compensation per staff member.

CATEGORY	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL*
Salaries	\$1,245,311	82%
Retirement benefits	\$102,689	7%
Health and medical benefits	\$164,839	11%
Other benefits	\$0	0%
TOTAL	\$1,512,839	

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.
 * Totals may not add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY: All data is the most current available as of December 2012. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2011–2012 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 2011); Language Census (March 2012); California Standards Tests (spring 2012 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (November 2012 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (October 2012).

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.

rev20130109_41-69013-6044614e/23545

» Adequacy of Key Resources 2012–2013

Here you'll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2012–2013. Please note that these facts are based on evaluations our staff conducted in accordance with the Williams legislation.



TEACHERS

Teacher Vacancies

The Williams legislation asked districts to disclose how frequently full-time teachers were not permanently assigned to a classroom. 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.

KEY FACTOR	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	15	14	12
Number of classes which 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	0	1	0
Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher	0	1	0

NOTES: This report was completed on Thursday, January 31, 2013.

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	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
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: This report was completed on Thursday, January 31, 2013.

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 calls for. This information is far more meaningful when viewed along with the more detailed description of textbooks contained in our School Accountability Report Card (SARC). There you'll find the names of the textbooks used in our core classes, their dates of publication, the names of the firms that published them, and more.

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?
English	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Math	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Science	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Social Studies	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Foreign Languages	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Health Sciences	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Visual and Performing Arts	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%

NOTES: This report was completed on Thursday, January 31, 2013.

FACILITIES

To determine the condition of our facilities, our district sent experts from our facilities team to inspect them. They used a survey, called the Facilities Inspection Tool, 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.

AREA	RATING		DESCRIPTION
OVERALL RATING	N/A	N/A	
A. SYSTEMS			
Gas Leaks			No apparent problems.
Mechanical Problems (Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning)			No apparent problems.
Sewer System			No apparent problems.
B. INTERIOR			
Interior Surfaces (Walls, Floors, and Ceilings)			No apparent problems.
C. CLEANLINESS			
Overall Cleanliness			No apparent problems.
Pest or Vermin Infestation			No apparent problems.
D. ELECTRICAL			
Electrical Systems and Lighting			No apparent problems.
E. RESTROOMS/FOUNTAINS			
Bathrooms			No apparent problems.
Drinking Fountains (Inside and Out)			No apparent problems.
F. SAFETY			
Fire Safety (Sprinkler Systems, Alarms, Extinguishers)			No apparent problems.
Hazardous Materials (Lead Paint, Asbestos, Mold, Flammables, etc.)			No apparent problems.
G. STRUCTURAL			
Structural Damage (Cracks in Walls and Foundations, Sloping Ceilings, Posts or Beams Missing)			No apparent problems.
Roofs			No apparent problems.

AREA	RATING	DESCRIPTION
H. EXTERNAL		
Playground/School Grounds		No apparent problems.
Windows, Doors, Gates, Fences (Interior and Exterior)		No apparent problems.
OTHER DEFICIENCIES	N/A	No apparent problems.

INSPECTORS AND ADVISORS: This report was completed on Thursday, January 31, 2013 by STEVEN EICHMAN (CBO). The facilities inspection occurred on Tuesday, January 15, 2013. There were no other inspectors used in the completion of this form. The Facilities Inspection Tool was completed on Tuesday, January 15, 2013.

» 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	402
Black/African American	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	5%
Filipino	2%
Hispanic or Latino	76%
Pacific Islander	11%
White (not Hispanic)	4%
Two or more races	0%
Ethnicity not reported	1%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	71%
English Learners	69%
Students with disabilities	7%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CALPADS, October 2011. 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	63
Grade 1	62
Grade 2	49
Grade 3	57
Grade 4	62
Grade 5	53
Grade 6	56
Grade 7	0
Grade 8	0
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2011.

Average Class Size by Grade Level

GRADE LEVEL	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
Kindergarten	20	31	31
Grade 1	20	28	31
Grade 2	19	32	25
Grade 3	18	26	29
Grade 4	31	31	31
Grade 5	31	30	27
Grade 6	31	29	28
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 2011. 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	2009–2010			2010–2011			2011–2012		
	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+
Kindergarten	3	N/A	N/A	0	18	0	0	18	0
Grade 1	3	N/A	N/A	0	18	0	0	18	0
Grade 2	4	N/A	N/A	0	18	0	0	18	0
Grade 3	4	N/A	N/A	0	27	0	0	18	0
Grade 4	N/A	2	N/A	0	26	0	0	26	0
Grade 5	N/A	2	N/A	0	26	0	0	26	0
Grade 6	N/A	2	N/A	0	24	0	0	24	0
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 2011. 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
	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012	2011–2012
With Full Credential	23	16	14	108
Without Full Credential	0	2	0	0

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
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 2011–2012 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			
2011–2012	0	4	N/A
2010–2011	1	2	5
2009–2010	0	1	6
Expulsions per 100 students			
2011–2012	0	0	N/A
2010–2011	0	0	0
2009–2010	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.

During the 2011–2012 school year, we had two 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		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
English/ language arts	38%	40%	50%	58%	58%	62%	52%	54%	56%
Mathematics	59%	57%	71%	67%	65%	69%	48%	50%	51%
Science	37%	42%	23%	62%	61%	64%	54%	57%	60%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2012 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 2011–2012	MATHEMATICS 2011–2012	SCIENCE 2011–2012
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%	0%	0%
Asian	87%	100%	0%
Filipino	0%	0%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	47%	68%	25%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	50%	74%	0%
White (not Hispanic)	45%	64%	0%
Two or more Races	N/A	N/A	N/A
Boys	45%	66%	36%
Girls	54%	75%	17%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	48%	71%	24%
English Learners	43%	67%	13%
Students with disabilities	26%	35%	0%
Receives migrant education services	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2012 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	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
Statewide rank	2	3	3
Similar-schools rank	6	7	8

SOURCE: The API Base Report from June 2012.

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
	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012	2011–2012
All students at the school	+31	+5	+50	812
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	+57	+59	933
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	+24	+2	+60	804
Pacific Islander	N/A	+13	+10	796
White (non Hispanic)	N/A	N/A	N/A	818
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	+23	-1	+64	809
English Learners	+13	+3	+72	798
Students with disabilities	N/A	-48	+45	626

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in November 2012. 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	259	812	1,924	830	4,664,264	788
Black/African American	0	N/A	35	719	313,201	710
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	N/A	3	N/A	31,606	742
Asian	15	933	200	916	404,670	905
Filipino	8	N/A	206	902	124,824	869
Hispanic or Latino	198	804	848	783	2,425,230	740
Pacific Islander	27	796	116	788	26,563	775
White (non Hispanic)	11	818	455	868	1,221,860	853
Two or more races	0	N/A	48	852	88,428	849
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	208	809	842	772	2,779,680	737
English Learners	202	798	780	772	1,530,297	716
Students with disabilities	33	626	242	656	530,935	607

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in November 2012. 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 740 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	No
Graduation rate	N/A
Participation rate in English/language arts	Yes
Participation rate in mathematics	Yes
Percent Proficient in English/language arts	No
Percent Proficient in mathematics	No
Met Academic Performance Index (API)	Yes

SOURCE: The AYP Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in October 2012.

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	2 of 3
The year the district entered PI	2011
Number of schools currently in PI	3
Percentage of schools currently in PI	38%

SOURCE: The Program Improvement Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in October 2012.

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 2010–2011			
Total expenses	\$19,578,196	\$8,497,573,732	\$46,278,595,991
Expenses per student	\$7,841	\$7,789	\$8,323
FISCAL YEAR 2009–2010			
Total expenses	\$20,811,221	\$8,704,399,331	\$47,205,560,698
Expenses per student	\$8,249	\$7,973	\$8,452

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

District Salaries, 2010–2011

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2010–2011 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	\$39,125	\$40,962
Midrange teacher’s salary	\$68,226	\$63,212
Highest-paid teacher’s salary	\$75,155	\$80,545
Average principal’s salary (elementary school)	\$97,877	\$102,057
Superintendent’s salary	\$132,138	\$152,557
Percentage of budget for teachers’ salaries	33%	40%
Percentage of budget for administrators’ salaries	6%	6%

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

TEXTBOOKS

Textbook Adoption List

TITLE	SUBJECT	DATE OF PUBLICATION	ADOPTION DATE
Open Court (McGraw Hill)	English/Language Arts	2002-03	2003
California Vista (MacMillan)	History/Social Studies	2006	2006
Houghton (Houghton-Mifflin)	Math	2008	2008
California Science (Pearson, Scott, Foresman)	Science	2007	2007
Health Promotion Wave (Health Wave Inc)	Health		1994
Discover: Skills for Life(AGS Publisher)	Health		1990
World of Music (Silver Burdett Ginn)	Music		1994
Language Central-Pearson (Belle Air K-5)	English L.A.	2010	2011
Language Central-Pearson	EL	2010	2010