

El Crystal Elementary

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013
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

El Crystal Elementary

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013
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 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

201 North Balboa Way
San Bruno, CA 94066
Principal: Karl E. (Skip) Johnson
Phone: (650) 624-3150

How to Contact Our District

500 Acacia Ave.
San Bruno, CA 94066
Phone: (650) 644-3100
<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 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

El Crystal Elementary

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013
San Bruno Park Elementary School District

» Principal's Message

El Crystal has one motto: Where Everyone Matters: Where Everyone Can Learn. Therefore, our school programs are devoted to giving all of our students access to a rigorous, standards-based curriculum. Along with using district-approved pacing guides in mathematics and language arts, we use sophisticated hardware and software tools to enhance the learning journey for our students. The PTA, English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC), School Site Council (SSC), parents, greater school community, and teachers work to make learning fun and meaningful for our students. In November the governing board approved our change in status from a Demonstration School to a STEM/Magnet beginning in August 2013. We are also a Demonstration School for the Integration of Curriculum and Technology. We implemented a take-home AudioBook Project using iPods.

Karl E. (Skip) Johnson, PRINCIPAL

Grade range and calendar

K–5

TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index

838

County Average: 854

State Average: 810

Student enrollment

210

County Average: 450

State Average: 534

Major Achievements

- Our school has been the recipient of over \$270,000 in donations from the Danford Foundation to support and enhance our curriculum through the use of laptop computers, wireless Internet access, iPod Touches, iPads, and sophisticated, relevant software programs. These programs include Inspiration, Reading Counts, vMathLive, Lexia, and Ticket to Read. We also implemented a learning program with iPads called eSpark in the third/fourth grade classroom.

Focus for Improvement

- Our continuous goals are to improve student proficiency in writing, to help our students master reflexive response with their basic math facts, to expand our AudioBook Project (eCAP) and to promote student responsibility for learning and behavior. We will be implementing an iPad program for all grade levels and a take-home book program for grades K–2. These programs are designed to promote parents reading to their children. In December of 2012, the governing board designated El Crystal as a STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) Magnet School beginning in 2013/2014.

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	838
Growth attained from prior year	-32
Met subgroup* growth targets	No

El Crystal’s API was 838 (out of 1000). This is a decline of 32 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 870. 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 8 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 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 five out of nine criteria for yearly progress. Because we fell short in four areas, we did not make AYP.

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	No

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	●	●	●	●
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.


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			58%	99%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About one percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			66%	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			64%	74	GENDER: About 12 percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			52%	66	
English proficient			64%	107	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			25%	33	
Low income			52%	49	INCOME: About ten percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			62%	91	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	4	LEARNING DISABILITIES: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled			59%	135	
Hispanic/Latino			52%	56	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.
 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			67%	99%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About four percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			72%	89%	
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			72%	75	GENDER: About ten percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			62%	66	
English proficient			76%	107	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			17%	34	
Low income			62%	50	INCOME: About 11 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			73%	91	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	5	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			69%	135	
Hispanic/Latino			47%	57	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.
 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			83%	100%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 26 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			63%	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	22	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	13	
English proficient	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	28	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	7	
Low income	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	8	INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	27	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	1	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			85%	34	
Hispanic/Latino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	13	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.



Other Measures of Student Achievement

San Bruno Park School District has developed a comprehensive assessment and accountability plan to ensure that information regarding student performance is used to continuously improve the instructional program, and to communicate with parents about their child's achievement. Standardized tests data, district performance assessments, and classroom tests are all used to determine whether each student is performing below, at, or above grade-level standards.

STUDENTS

Students’ English Language Skills

At El Crystal, 76 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	76%	68%	70%
English Learners	24%	32%	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 50 students classified as English Learners. At El Crystal, 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	62%	73%	84%
Vietnamese	0%	1%	3%
Cantonese	12%	3%	1%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	6%	7%	1%
Korean	0%	1%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	0%	0%
All other	20%	15%	9%

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

Ethnicity

Most students at El Crystal identify themselves as Hispanic/Latino. In fact, there are about two times as many Hispanic/Latino students as Asian/Pacific Islander students, the second-largest ethnic group at El Crystal. 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	1%	2%	6%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	21%	22%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	43%	39%	54%
White	21%	30%	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 El Crystal, 32 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	32%	39%	61%
Parents with some college	68%	67%	58%
Parents with college degree	45%	50%	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 68 percent of the students at El Crystal have attended college and 45 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 66 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 El Crystal varies across grade levels from a low of 28 students to a high of 31. Our average class size schoolwide is 30 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY GRADE	OUR SCHOOL	OUR DISTRICT
Kindergarten	28	28
First grade	31	29
Second grade	31	30
Third grade	31	29
Fourth grade	28	29
Fifth grade	29	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, a comprehensive School Site Safety Plan has been developed by the SSC. The SSC, which meets throughout the year and sets long-term goals for the school. The Safety Plan is updated each fall and covers various safety procedures, including the visitor policy, emergency materials, and evacuation procedures. The Safety Plan is reviewed with all staff members at the beginning of each school year. Safety drills are held on a regular basis; fire drills are held monthly, earthquake drills are held twice a year, and intruder/lockdown drills are held as appropriate. The Safety Plan is located for public access in the school office. All visitors 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 breaks, at lunch, and after school. Supervision is a responsibility shared among noon supervisors, teachers, and the school’s administration.

Discipline

Students at El Crystal School are guided by specific rules and classroom expectations that promote respect, cooperation, courtesy, and acceptance of others. The school’s discipline philosophy promotes a safe school, a warm and friendly classroom environment, and demonstrates that good discipline is a solid foundation on which to build an effective school. Each parent receives a parent/student handbook during Back-to-School Night containing the Student Behavior Management Plan.

The goal at El Crystal School is to provide students with opportunities to learn self-discipline techniques to manage their behavior in a positive manner.

Homework

Homework is a fundamental part of the learning process and helps develop basic academic and study skills, as well as promote student responsibility and self-discipline. Each teacher determines the appropriate measure of homework for his or her students based on 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.

Schedule

For the 2012–2013 school year, El Crystal offered 180 days of instruction, comprising 166 regular days and 14 minimum days. Kindergarten students were offered an extended day as well. 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 8:15 a.m. and ended at 11:35 a.m. for kindergarten, and 2:40 p.m. for first through sixth grade. Office hours are from 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Parent Involvement

Parents are afforded every opportunity to become involved in the learning journey for our students. Parents volunteer in the classroom to help with tutoring and making copies. They sponsor the highly successfully Art Appreciation program, which is in its seventh year. The PTA not only fund-raises to bring field trips and assemblies into the school, they sponsor family-oriented activities such as a pancake breakfast, Family Day in the Park, monthly spirit days, and Bowling Days. Parents serve on the SSC and ELAC.

LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

Leadership

Leadership at El Crystal School is shared among the principal, Site Leadership Team, ELAC, and PTA. Each of these elements brings leadership and representation to the decision-making process with one goal in mind: the betterment of the learning journey of our students. Our principal of 20 years, Skip Johnson, believes that it is better to be inclusive rather than exclusive. Therefore, decision-making situations aim for the involvement of all constituents including staff, students, parents, and the greater school community.

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 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. 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 2013–2014 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. 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.

Staff Development

The school site provides time and resources for collaboration, planning, and professional development for all staff. Teachers at El Crystal School receive training directly related to curriculum and instruction by attending workshops and conferences, which are approved by the district and administration. We no longer have funded professional development days. We provided STEM professional development with site funds and donations at the end of the school year.

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
2012–2013	0.0
2011–2012	0.0
2010–2011	0.0

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. The principal, who has been trained and certified for competency to perform teacher evaluations, conducts evaluations.

Evaluation criteria includes: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning, Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning, Assessing Student Learning, Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning, Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students, and Developing as a Professional Educator. San Bruno Park School District’s Peer Assistance and Review program provides new teachers (those with fewer than three years of full-time teaching experience) and affected veteran teachers with personal support, guidance, modeling, direction, and mentoring in the areas of subject matter knowledge, teaching strategies, classroom management, and overall professional competence. In addition, a Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment facilitator works with beginning teachers to improve their skills and address the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.

Substitute Teachers

Generally, the district does not experience any problems finding qualified substitute teachers and has an adequate pool of fully credentialed substitutes. However, 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	0.0
Librarians and media staff	.2
Psychologists	0.0
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.0
Speech/language/hearing specialists	0.0
Resource specialists	1.0

SOURCE: Data provided by the school district.

Specialized Programs and Staff

The district psychologist and counselor are devoted to helping students deal with problems, assisting them in reaching positive goals, and providing additional counseling services. In addition, the district contracts out with nurses for vision, hearing, and scoliosis testing.

All students participate in physical education provided by an outside agency.

Extracurricular activities for our students include Tech Squad, cafeteria helpers, office helpers, and cross-age buddies. In the cross-age buddies program, older students work side by side with their younger peers with laptop computers on a weekly basis. Fourth grade students and their kindergarten buddies work on a character building activity by using the computers to write myths about social traits such as honesty.

Gifted and Talented Education (GATE)

A Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) program is available for those students who previously qualified. Due to budget cuts, students are no longer identified through test results and teacher recommendations. Students may also participate in the GATE summer school program and regular district workshops.

Special Education Program

The staff at El Crystal School assists students in their social and personal development as well as academics. The district provides special attention to students who experience difficulty achieving, coping with personal and family problems, making decisions, or handling peer pressure. 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.

El Crystal School provides additional support for students with special needs. Special education services are tailored to the Individualized Educational Program (IEP) of each student with physical, emotional, or learning disabilities.

English Learner Program

The English Language Development (ELD) program at El Crystal Elementary School assists students who are English learners. The program provides special instruction in core curriculum subject areas and is conducted by Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) certificated teachers. Student progress is based on California English Language Development Test results. All ELD instruction is fully integrated into the classroom curriculum.

RESOURCES

Buildings

El Crystal School was built in 1948 and provides a safe, clean environment for students, staff, and volunteers. A \$30-million bond was approved to modernize the entire school district. The project included a new roof and remodeling of all classrooms, the library, cafeteria, and the administration office. Recent remodeling includes repaving the playground and parking lot. El Crystal School is currently composed of nine classrooms, a library, a computer lab, a cafeteria, a staff lounge, and three playground areas. We remodeled the media center over the summer to better accommodate STEM activities for small and large groups of students.

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

This year we distributed the computers in the media center to the classrooms. There are three mobile carts of laptops and one cart of iPod Touches that move from classroom to classroom. The School and Library Improvement Program grant supports a media/library aide for 10 hours per week.

Computers

We maintain a ratio of three students per computer. We have 70 laptop computers in two multimedia carts available to all grade levels. All El Crystal teachers completed the Building the Tech Savvy Teacher Program. Through participation in this program each teacher received an interactive whiteboard, a short throw LCD projector, a document camera, and other digital tools. The entire campus maintains wireless internet access.

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 2013–2014 school year and whether those [textbooks](#) covered the California Content Standards.

Curriculum and the Transition to the Common Core

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.

In 2010, California's State Board of Education voted to redefine what we teach. We are calling this the Common Core curriculum, because it is common or shared among schools in most states, and because it affects the core subjects. In 2012–2013, our district's teachers were already delivering a somewhat different curriculum in math and English/language arts. Changes to the science standards will follow in 2013–2014.

The [California Department of Education \(CDE\)](#) has published helpful background information about the Common Core curriculum. This includes a helpful [video introduction](#) as well as access to a [handbook for parents](#) of students in kindergarten through eighth grade. The full [math standards](#) are available as well as the standards for [English/language arts](#).

SCHOOL EXPENDITURES

We sponsor a part-time media aide, improvements to hardware and software, and an afterschool club called the Tech Squad. These students learn aspects of technology not afforded during the regular school day. We expanded this program to include LEGO Robotics Kits. The PTA sponsors standards-based assemblies and field trips.

Spending per Student (2011–2012)

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 248 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)	\$3,998	\$5,444	-27%	\$5,653	-29%
Restricted funds (\$/student)	\$419	\$2,519	-83%	\$3,083	-86%
TOTAL (\$/student)	\$4,418	\$7,963	-45%	\$8,736	-49%

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 (2011–2012)

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)	\$665,488	\$42,897	\$708,385	65%
Other staff salaries	\$86,030	\$20,658	\$106,688	10%
Benefits	\$215,752	\$11,788	\$227,540	21%
Books and supplies	\$12,189	\$18,853	\$31,042	3%
Equipment replacement	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Services and direct support	\$12,158	\$9,774	\$21,932	2%
TOTAL	\$991,617	\$103,970	\$1,095,587	

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

Compensation of Staff with Teaching Credentials (2011–2012)

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 9 FTE teachers working in our school.

CATEGORY	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE *	SCHOOL VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE
Salaries	\$82,466	\$93,640	-12%	\$71,848	15%
Retirement benefits	\$6,801	\$7,651	-11%	\$5,888	16%
Health and medical benefits	\$12,364	\$11,714	6%	\$10,391	19%
Other benefits	\$0	\$437	-100%	\$720	-100%
TOTAL	\$101,631	\$113,442	-10%	\$88,847	14%

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 (2011–2012)

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	\$708,385	81%
Retirement benefits	\$58,420	7%
Health and medical benefits	\$106,209	12%
Other benefits	\$0	0%
TOTAL	\$873,014	

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 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.

rev20131231_41-69013-6044663e/23548

» 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.



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	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	9	7	9
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	0	N/A
Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher	0	0	N/A

NOTES:

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	N/A
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	N/A
Other Employee Misassignments	Total number of service area placements of employees without the required credentials	0	0	N/A

NOTES:

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:

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)		[STATUS AS OF Jan 16 2012] Full replacement of windows completed January, 2012
OTHER DEFICIENCIES	N/A	No apparent problems.

INSPECTORS AND ADVISORS: This report is not yet completed. It is subject to change. The facilities inspection occurred on Wednesday, January 16, 2013. There were no other inspectors used in the completion of this form.

» 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	210
Black/African American	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	6%
Filipino	10%
Hispanic or Latino	43%
Pacific Islander	6%
White (not Hispanic)	21%
Two or more races	9%
Ethnicity not reported	4%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	33%
English Learners	25%
Students with disabilities	4%

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	29
Grade 1	38
Grade 2	33
Grade 3	37
Grade 4	38
Grade 5	35
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	31	26	29
Grade 1	24	30	19
Grade 2	26	30	17
Grade 3	28	30	19
Grade 4	28	28	19
Grade 5	31	29	18
Grade 6	31	24	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	9	0	1	9	0	0	9	0
Grade 1	0	18	0	1	16	0	9	9	0
Grade 2	0	9	0	0	10	0	9	9	0
Grade 3	1	9	0	0	9	0	18	0	0
Grade 4	5	21	0	0	25	0	13	13	0
Grade 5	0	13	0	1	13	0	13	13	0
Grade 6	0	12	0	0	12	0	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	13	8	7	101
Without Full Credential	0	1	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	71%	40%	17%
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	0	2	N/A
2011–2012	0	4	N/A
2010–2011	1	2	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 no 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	62%	68%	57%	58%	63%	58%	54%	56%	55%
Mathematics	74%	75%	68%	65%	69%	64%	49%	50%	50%
Science	71%	77%	83%	61%	64%	58%	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	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A
Filipino	47%	87%	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	51%	47%	100%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	63%	80%	N/A
Two or more Races	59%	71%	N/A
Boys	62%	72%	91%
Girls	52%	62%	69%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	50%	58%	N/A
English Learners	35%	41%	N/A
Students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	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	8	8	8
Similar-schools rank	9	8	8

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	-6	+14	-32	838
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	+20	-9	N/A	N/A
Filipino	N/A	+78	-56	848
Hispanic or Latino	+9	+10	-29	791
Pacific Islander	-56	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	-16	+8	-33	864
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	-12	843
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	-14	+65	-60	796
English Learners	+10	+27	-71	759
Students with disabilities	-82	+35	N/A	N/A

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	139	838	1,970	818	4,655,989	790
Black/African American	3	N/A	37	789	296,463	708
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	N/A	6	N/A	30,394	743
Asian	8	N/A	194	912	406,527	906
Filipino	14	848	211	885	121,054	867
Hispanic or Latino	56	791	872	764	2,438,951	744
Pacific Islander	5	N/A	119	792	25,351	774
White (non Hispanic)	36	864	432	862	1,200,127	853
Two or more races	11	843	88	840	125,025	824
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	46	796	799	760	2,774,640	743
English Learners	34	759	770	759	1,482,316	721
Students with disabilities	8	N/A	232	645	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	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 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	3 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 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	\$19,861,246	\$8,575,019,725	\$46,420,178,248
Expenses per student	\$7,813	\$7,846	\$8,382
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

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	\$39,125	\$41,327
Midrange teacher’s salary	\$68,226	\$63,903
Highest-paid teacher’s salary	\$75,123	\$81,573
Average principal’s salary (elementary school)	\$100,025	\$103,887
Superintendent’s salary	\$132,138	\$155,551
Percentage of budget for teachers’ salaries	35%	41%
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 (Belle Air k-5)	EL	2010	2010