

John Muir 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

John Muir 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

130 Cambridge Lane
San Bruno, CA 94066
Principal: Frances M. Dunleavy, Ed.D.
Phone: (650) 624-3160

How to Contact Our District

500 Acacia Ave.
San Bruno, CA 94066
Phone: (650) 624-3100
<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

John Muir Elementary

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

» Principal's Message

John Muir School is a caring cooperative of lifelong learners. We live the FISH! Philosophy: Choose Your Attitude, Be There, Make Their Day, and Play. We believe that education is a partnership among school, children, and parents. John Muir has a long history of academic excellence, involvement, and community. We invite you to come be a part of our warm family!

Frances M. Dunleavy, Ed.D., PRINCIPAL

**Grade range
and calendar**

K–5

TRADITIONAL

**Academic
Performance Index**

898

County Average: 854

State Average: 810

Student enrollment

303

County Average: 450

State Average: 534

Major Achievements

- Math scores continued to rise! On the 2013 math CST, over 81percent of students in 2nd -5th grades scored proficient or advanced. In the 4th grade, 100% of students scored proficient or advanced. In all grades, more students scored advanced than proficient.
- Math Boot Camp was created and run by the principal. Fourth through fifth grade students who did not demonstrate mastery of basic math facts attended forty-minute sessions, before-school, twice a week. The 10 week program started with 48 students. When mastery was demonstrated through testing, students exited the program. This program builds math fluency and mathematical reasoning.
- Our students continue to excel in the Scholastic Reading Counts program. Students in grades two through six are able to read, take computerized comprehension tests, and earn points. Each trimester, a specific number of points are required for each grade. Kindergarten and first grade students participate in Reading Counts as they become fluent readers. Kindergarten and first grade students have monthly at-home reading requirements.
- Dr. Dunleavy, our principal earned a district-wide grant from the San Bruno Education Foundation to fund Reading Counts testing at El Crystal twice a week for eight weeks during the summer. John Muir School had the highest number of students participate.
- Mrs. Marconi and her kindergarten students won a Silver Star from the San Mateo County Food System Alliance for their exemplary garden. This is the second year they have won this award.
- For a second year, our 4th and 5th grade students have enjoyed monthly performances by the Peninsula Symphony's Educational Outreach program.
- Retired teacher Sandra Bowlus, in the name of the international women's sorority Alpha Delta Kappa, volunteered and taught a ten-week English Learner program. Mrs. Bowlus has taught this program for ten years.
- For the fifth consecutive year, students from the College of San Mateo's Cal Teach program taught science for six hours a week in Phyllis Takahashi's fifth grade class.

Focus for Improvement

- In December of 2013, we became the first San Bruno School to pilot Recology's organics program. Our students sort trash into organics, recycling, and landfill. We have eliminated styrofoam from the lunch program and use compostable trays. Our school saves over \$3,000 each year through this organics program. Student teams oversee the organics program during recess and lunch.
- Dr. Dunleavy will lead Math Boot Camp to help students develop math fluency and number sense. Fourth and fifth grade students are required to demonstrate mastery of basic facts. Students needing additional practice and instruction will attend Math Boot Camp twice a week for 40 minutes before school. Students are very motivated to test out of this program.
- Students from the College of San Mateo's Cal Teach program will teach math for six hours per week in Phyllis Takahashi's fifth grade class and Marlene Morris's third grade class.
- Jeff Zable, a retired teacher, will lead a 10-week remedial reading program.

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 | 898 |
| Growth attained from prior year | +1 |
| Met subgroup* growth targets | Yes |

John Muir’s API was 898 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 1 point 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.

*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.


API RANKINGS: Based on our 2011–2012 test results, we started the 2012–2013 school year with a base API of 897. 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 9 out of 10.

SIMILAR SCHOOL RANKINGS: We also received a second ranking that compared us with the 100 schools with the most similar students, teachers, and class sizes. Compared with these schools, our school ranked 9 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 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 14 out of 17 criteria for yearly progress. Because we fell short in three 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 | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS | | | | |
| Students learning English | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY | | | | |
| Hispanic/Latino | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| White/Other | ● | ● | ● | ● |

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 | | | 71% | 99% | SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 14 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 | | | 71% | 95 | GENDER: About the same percentage of boys and girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced. |
| Girls | | | 72% | 103 | |
| English proficient | | | 76% | 150 | 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 | | | 58% | 48 | |
| Low income | | | 51% | 45 | INCOME: About 24 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students. |
| Not low income | | | 75% | 152 | |
| Learning disabled | NO DATA AVAILABLE | | N/A | 9 | 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 | | | 72% | 188 | |
| Hispanic/Latino | | | 70% | 54 | ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report. |
| White/Other | | | 72% | 88 | |

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 | | | 86% | 99% | SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 23 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 | | | 83% | 95 | GENDER: About six percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced. |
| Girls | | | 89% | 103 | |
| English proficient | | | 87% | 150 | ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: English Learners scored about the same on this test as did students who are proficient in English. Because we give this test in English, English Learners tend to be at a disadvantage. |
| English Learners | | | 87% | 48 | |
| Low income | | | 74% | 45 | INCOME: About 14 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students. |
| Not low income | | | 88% | 152 | |
| Learning disabled | NO DATA AVAILABLE | | N/A | 9 | 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 | | | 88% | 188 | |
| Hispanic/Latino | | | 83% | 54 | ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report. |
| White/Other | | | 88% | 88 | |

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 | | | 79% | 96% | SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 22 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 | 24 | 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 | | | 86% | 43 | 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 | 10 | |
| Low income | DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE | | N/S | 12 | INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from low-income families was too small to be statistically significant. |
| Not low income | | | 78% | 40 | |
| Learning disabled | NO DATA AVAILABLE | | N/A | 3 | 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 | | | 80% | 50 | |
| Hispanic/Latino | DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE | | N/S | 16 | ETHNICITY: Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report. |
| White/Other | DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE | | N/S | 22 | |

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

A comprehensive assessment and accountability plan is used 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 assessments, and program tests guide instruction and are used to determine each student’s performance level.

STUDENTS

Students’ English Language Skills

At John Muir, 75 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 | 75% | 68% | 70% |
| English Learners | 25% | 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 75 students classified as English Learners. At John Muir, 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 | 41% | 73% | 84% |
| Vietnamese | 0% | 1% | 3% |
| Cantonese | 3% | 3% | 1% |
| Hmong | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Filipino/Tagalog | 7% | 7% | 1% |
| Korean | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Khmer/Cambodian | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| All other | 48% | 15% | 9% |

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

Ethnicity

Most students at John Muir identify themselves as White. The state of California allows citizens to choose more than one ethnic identity, or to select “two or more races” or “decline to state.” As a consequence, the sum of all responses rarely equals 100 percent.

| ETHNICITY | OUR SCHOOL | COUNTY AVERAGE | STATE AVERAGE |
|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------|---------------|
| African American | 2% | 2% | 6% |
| Asian American/ Pacific Islander | 20% | 22% | 11% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 28% | 39% | 54% |
| White | 43% | 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 John Muir, 22 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 | 22% | 39% | 61% |
| Parents with some college | 83% | 67% | 58% |
| Parents with college degree | 58% | 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 83 percent of the students at John Muir have attended college and 58 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 65 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 John Muir 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 | 31 | 28 |
| First grade | 30 | 29 |
| Second grade | 30 | 30 |
| Third grade | 31 | 29 |
| Fourth grade | 30 | 29 |
| Fifth grade | 28 | 29 |

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

Safety

The School Site Council’s Safety Committee was formed in 2009. This committee worked vigorously following the September 2010 gas line explosion. This committee reviewed and revised the School Safety Plan, emergency drills, and safety equipment and supplies.

The Safety Plan is updated annually and covers safety procedures, including the visitor policy, emergency materials, and evacuation procedures. The Safety Plan is reviewed with all staff at the beginning of each year. Drills are held on a monthly basis and include fire, earthquake, lockdown, and evacuation. The Safety Plan is located in the office for public access. All visitors must sign in and out in the office and wear visitors’ stickers. Visitors are accounted for in all drills. Supervision is provided to ensure the safety of each student before school, during breaks, at lunch, and after school. Supervision is shared among noon supervisors, teachers, instructional aides, and the administration.

Parent Involvement

Parents are active participants in their child’s education. They are encouraged to supervise homework, volunteer in classrooms, and drive on field trips. The PTA has numerous volunteer activities, including Walk to School Days, Ice Cream Social, Carnival, Haunted House, Family Dinner, Posy Parade, Frosty’s Workshop, Kids’ Night Out, Pancake Breakfast, Parents’ Night Out, Talent Show, picture days, Gardening Club, School Beautification, school picnic, movie nights, and more. Parents and family members also participate on the School Site Council and district committees. Contact our PTA President, Charlie Attard or any PTA officer for information on volunteering.

LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

Leadership

Our principal, Frances M. Dunleavy, Ed.D has worked in this district for 32 years. She taught at Crestmoor for seven years and then at John Muir for 16 years before becoming principal in 2006. She taught at the University of San Francisco, coordinated the tri-district GATE program for 14 years, and served the district as master teacher, mentor teacher, and GATE mentor. Dr. Dunleavy believes in John Muir School. She and her husband chose to send their own children here.

Parents, teachers, staff, and the principal compose the School Site Council (SSC). The SSC, Leadership Team, staff, and PTA work together to guide curricular and budget decisions.

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

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

| 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.

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 | .3 |
| 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

Students are encouraged to participate in extracurricular activities, including Student Council, Spanish, football, kickball, basketball, Lego Robotics, Newcomb tournament, Outdoor Education, Gardening Club, Posy Parade, carnival, and spirit days. State and federal funds provide a library media aide and the Rhythm and Moves PE program. The district provides a full range of special education programs and contracts with nurses for vision and hearing testing.

Special Education Program

John Muir provides 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. Our part time special educator and aide work with special education students daily. The speech therapist sees students five days a week, and the district counselor sees students once a week. The PTA funds a counseling intern from the University of San Francisco for ten hours a week.

English Learner Program

The English Language Development (ELD) program at John Muir School assists students who are English learners. The program provides special instruction in core curriculum subject areas and is taught by teachers with Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) certification or teachers certified through SB 1969 (certification to teach English learners).. All John Muir teachers are either CLAD or SB 1969 certified. Student progress is based on California English Language Development Test results. All ELD instruction is fully integrated into classroom teaching. Rosetta Stone is an effective tool in developing the English skills of our English Learners.

RESOURCES

Buildings

John Muir School was built in 1960 and provides a safe, clean environment for students, staff, and families. A \$30-million bond allowed modernization of the entire school district in 2000. At John Muir, the project included a new roof and remodeling of all classrooms, the library, and the administration office. The kitchen was remodeled in 2005. John Muir is composed of 19 classrooms, a library, a computer lab, a cafeteria, a staff lounge, two playgrounds, and a large green.

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.

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

State and federal monies fund the following programs: Remedial Reading, library media aide, a PE specialist for fourth and fifth grades, and school supplies. The PTA funds the University of San Francisco counseling intern and the music specialist. The PTA provides decodable books for grades K–3, field trip fees and buses, supplies for the school wide Arts Attack program, Outdoor Education scholarships, transportation to Outdoor Ed, PE equipment, classroom materials and supplies, and much, much more. Teachers volunteer their time to offer Morning Reading and Morning Math programs.

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 349 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) | \$4,115 | \$5,444 | -24% | \$5,653 | -27% |
| Restricted funds (\$/student) | \$313 | \$2,519 | -88% | \$3,083 | -90% |
| TOTAL (\$/student) | \$4,428 | \$7,963 | -44% | \$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) | \$978,870 | \$33,753 | \$1,012,623 | 66% |
| Other staff salaries | \$130,701 | \$38,183 | \$168,884 | 11% |
| Benefits | \$295,337 | \$12,585 | \$307,922 | 20% |
| Books and supplies | \$18,601 | \$6,722 | \$25,323 | 2% |
| Equipment replacement | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0% |
| Services and direct support | \$12,711 | \$17,925 | \$30,636 | 2% |
| TOTAL | \$1,436,220 | \$109,168 | \$1,545,388 | |

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 11 FTE teachers working in our school.

| CATEGORY | OUR SCHOOL | DISTRICT AVERAGE * | SCHOOL VARIANCE | STATE AVERAGE | SCHOOL VARIANCE |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Salaries | \$92,731 | \$93,640 | -1% | \$71,848 | 29% |
| Retirement benefits | \$7,726 | \$7,651 | 1% | \$5,888 | 31% |
| Health and medical benefits | \$11,074 | \$11,714 | -5% | \$10,391 | 7% |
| Other benefits | \$970 | \$437 | 122% | \$720 | 35% |
| TOTAL | \$112,500 | \$113,442 | -1% | \$88,847 | 27% |

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 | \$1,012,623 | 82% |
| Retirement benefits | \$84,366 | 7% |
| Health and medical benefits | \$120,923 | 10% |
| Other benefits | \$10,592 | 1% |
| TOTAL | \$1,228,504 | |

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_41-69013-6044671e/23549

» 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 | 12 | 10 | 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 | 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) | | No apparent problems. |
| 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 Thursday, January 17, 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 | 303 |
| Black/African American | 2% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0% |
| Asian | 9% |
| Filipino | 11% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 28% |
| Pacific Islander | 1% |
| White (not Hispanic) | 43% |
| Two or more races | 4% |
| Ethnicity not reported | 2% |
| Socioeconomically disadvantaged | 23% |
| English Learners | 30% |
| Students with disabilities | 6% |

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CALPADS, October 2012. Data about students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged, English Learners, or learning disabled come from the School Accountability Report Card unit of the California Department of Education.

Student Enrollment by Grade Level

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

| GRADE LEVEL | STUDENTS |
|--------------|----------|
| Kindergarten | 51 |
| Grade 1 | 47 |
| Grade 2 | 54 |
| Grade 3 | 50 |
| Grade 4 | 45 |
| Grade 5 | 56 |
| 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 | 27 | 28 | 26 |
| Grade 1 | 31 | 29 | 16 |
| Grade 2 | 30 | 32 | 27 |
| Grade 3 | 31 | 28 | 25 |
| Grade 4 | 31 | 28 | 23 |
| Grade 5 | 30 | 31 | 28 |
| Grade 6 | 28 | 30 | 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 | 27 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| Grade 1 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 2 | 32 | 0 | 18 | 9 | 0 |
| Grade 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Grade 3 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| Grade 4 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 |
| Grade 5 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 |
| Grade 6 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 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 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 101 |
| Without Full Credential | 0 | 0 | 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 | 91% | 76% | 42% |
| 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 | 7 | 2 | N/A |
| 2011–2012 | 6 | 4 | N/A |
| 2010–2011 | 3 | 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 22 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 | 74% | 72% | 72% | 58% | 63% | 58% | 54% | 56% | 55% |
| Mathematics | 76% | 85% | 87% | 65% | 69% | 64% | 49% | 50% | 50% |
| Science | 64% | 74% | 79% | 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 | 79% | 93% | N/A |
| Filipino | 83% | 96% | N/A |
| Hispanic or Latino | 65% | 80% | 56% |
| Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| White (not Hispanic) | 72% | 88% | 86% |
| Two or more Races | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Boys | 71% | 83% | 78% |
| Girls | 72% | 89% | 79% |
| Socioeconomically disadvantaged | 59% | 80% | 82% |
| English Learners | 56% | 85% | N/A |
| Students with disabilities | 64% | 64% | 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 | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| Similar-schools rank | 8 | 6 | 9 |

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 | -11 | +24 | +1 | 898 |
| 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 | -16 | -9 | -12 | 946 |
| Filipino | +17 | -9 | -2 | 929 |
| Hispanic or Latino | -20 | +17 | +23 | 868 |
| Pacific Islander | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| White (non Hispanic) | -8 | +33 | -9 | 901 |
| Two or more races | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Socioeconomically disadvantaged | -40 | +48 | -1 | 855 |
| English Learners | -5 | +2 | +2 | 858 |
| Students with disabilities | -32 | +136 | +89 | 787 |

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 | 199 | 898 | 1,970 | 818 | 4,655,989 | 790 |
| Black/African American | 4 | N/A | 37 | 789 | 296,463 | 708 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1 | N/A | 6 | N/A | 30,394 | 743 |
| Asian | 16 | 946 | 194 | 912 | 406,527 | 906 |
| Filipino | 24 | 929 | 211 | 885 | 121,054 | 867 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 54 | 868 | 872 | 764 | 2,438,951 | 744 |
| Pacific Islander | 2 | N/A | 119 | 792 | 25,351 | 774 |
| White (non Hispanic) | 91 | 901 | 432 | 862 | 1,200,127 | 853 |
| Two or more races | 7 | N/A | 88 | 840 | 125,025 | 824 |
| Socioeconomically disadvantaged | 43 | 855 | 799 | 760 | 2,774,640 | 743 |
| English Learners | 52 | 858 | 770 | 759 | 1,482,316 | 721 |
| Students with disabilities | 13 | 787 | 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 |