

Parkside Intermediate

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



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



Published by
SCHOOL WISE PRESS

Parkside Intermediate

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

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

The information in this report represents the 2011–2012 school year, not the current school year. In most cases, this is the most recent data available. We present our school's results next to those of the average middle school in the county and state to provide the most meaningful and fair comparisons. To find additional facts about our school online, please use the [DataQuest](#) tool offered by the California Department of Education.

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

http://www.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links_2012_en.html

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


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

How to Contact Our School

1801 Niles Avenue
San Bruno, CA 94066
Principal: Angela Addiego
Phone: (650) 624-3180

How to Contact Our District

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



» Contents

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

[Principal's Message](#)
[Measures of Progress](#)
[Student Achievement](#)
[Students](#)
[Climate for Learning](#)
[Leadership, Teachers, and Staff](#)
[Resources](#)
[School Expenditures](#)
[Adequacy of Key Resources 2012–2013](#)
[Data Almanac](#)



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

©2012 Publishing 20/20

Parkside Intermediate

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

» Principal's Message

Parkside Intermediate School is a place where children are valued and taught the fundamentals of life, and where learning and respect are the cornerstones to all school efforts. We believe that each and every child can learn. We believe that all children deserve to be taught from rigorous standards. We believe that we are responsible for the facilitation of knowledge, academics, and the fundamentals of respectful citizenship. We will not accept excuses for academic failure, poor attendance, noncompliance, or lack of discipline. We work to make the school a safe place, where all students achieve and succeed. We believe in an environment that values diversity. We believe we are a part of the greater community and world, and that our students will be prepared to contribute to society productively. We believe that middle school is the time in which young adolescents start their journey into adulthood and with collaborative guidance, they are the ambassadors to the future.

We are dedicated to the aforementioned beliefs and value the importance of middle school educators and parents in working together to guide our teens into productive adults. At this critical time in the development of our students, we provide a structured, well-defined path and environment so that students can succeed and failure is not an option.

Most importantly, the journey to high school and college is a focal point of the work we do here at Parkside. It has been the intent of Parkside administration to make the roads explicit for students and parents, so the transition from the elementary school to high school is seamless, ensuring a continuum of learning and socio-emotional development. You are welcome to visit us and share in the journey of educating young adolescents. As adults we can remember the antics of this time in our lives, so when you visit, bring a sense of humor and a passion for justice, and our students will captivate you! Parkside Panthers Rock!

Angela Addiego, PRINCIPAL

Grade range and calendar

7–8

TRADITIONAL

Academic Performance Index

774

County Average: 824
State Average: 791

Student enrollment

477

County Average: 582
State Average: 634

Major Achievements

- All curriculum development at Parkside Intermediate School revolves around the California State Content Standards. Teachers and the curricular departments align classroom curriculum to ensure that all students either meet or exceed state proficiency levels. The school's curricular focal points are updated regularly to align with the state standards, district goals, and the statewide assessment program.

Focus for Improvement

- In 2011–2012, we will continue to bring a focus on the use of one-to-one computer/technology and web-based programs to assist in direct intervention for all students.
- In 2011–2012, we will focus on implementation of a new tiered program for struggling students in English/language arts. Individualized data will be used to determine placement and student achievement needs.
- Classes for Technology and Leadership will be added to the daily schedule.
- We will continue to place emphasis on Advancement Via Individual Determination skills for organization and study habits.

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	No
API score	774
Growth attained from prior year	+9
Met subgroup* growth targets	No

Parkside’s API was 774 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 9 points compared with last year’s API. All students took the test. You can find three years of detailed API results in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

SOURCE: API based on spring 2012 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of December 2012.

*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 2010–2011 test results, we started the 2011–2012 school year with a base API of 765. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared with all middle schools in California, our school ranked 5 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 5 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 2011–2012 school year. Just for reference, 53 percent of middle schools statewide met their growth targets.

API, Spring 2012



SOURCE: API based on spring 2012 test cycle. State average represents middle 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 21 criteria for yearly progress. Because we fell short in seven areas, we did not make AYP. Our school is also on the federal watchlist known as Program Improvement (PI). See the next page for background on this matter and an explanation of the consequences.

To meet AYP, middle schools must meet three criteria. First, a certain percentage of students must score at or above Proficient levels on the California Standards Tests (CST), the California Modified Assessment (CMA), and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA): 78.4 percent on the English/language arts test and 79.0 percent on the math test. All ethnic, English Learners, special education, and socioeconomic subgroups of students also must meet these goals. Second, the schools must achieve an API of at least 740 or increase the API by one point from the prior year. Third, 95 percent of the student body must take the required standardized tests.

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

FEDERAL AYP ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS	
Met AYP	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 2012	Yes

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

*Ethnic groups, English Learners, special ed students, or socioeconomic groups of students that make up 15 percent or more of a school’s student body. These groups must meet AYP and API goals. N/A - Results not available.

Adequate Yearly Progress, Detail by Subgroup

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

	English/Language Arts		Math	
	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 78.4% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 79.0% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?
SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS	●	●	●	●
SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS				
Low income	●	●	●	●
Students learning English	●	●	●	●
STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY				
Hispanic/Latino	●	●	●	●
White/Other	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of October 2012, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2011–2012 school year. The green dots represent goals we met; red dots indicate goals we missed. Just one red dot means that we failed to meet AYP.

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

Program Improvement, a Federal Intervention Program

A BRIEF HISTORY OF OUR SCHOOL’S PLACEMENT IN PROGRAM

IMPROVEMENT: Parkside has been in Program Improvement (PI) since 2009. In 2012, the school moved one stage lower in the program, from stage (year) 3 to 4. There are five stages in total. In California, 113 middle schools were in stage 4 of PI as of December 2012.

FEDERAL INTERVENTION PROGRAM	
PI	
PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	
In PI since	2009
Stage of PI	4 of 5
Change in 2012	Moved one stage lower (did not make AYP)

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

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

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

YEAR	PI STAGE	SUMMARY OF EVENTS FOR THIS YEAR	AYP GOALS NOT MET ■ AYP GOALS MET ■
2009	1	We met 19 of the 21 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress, causing the school to enter the first stage of Program Improvement.	■
2010	2	We met 17 of the 21 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress. As a result, the school moved to stage 2 of Program Improvement.	
2011	3	We met 13 of the 21 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress. As a result, the school moved to stage 3 of Program Improvement.	
2012	4	We met 14 of the 21 criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress. As a result, the school moved to stage 4 of Program Improvement.	

SOURCE: PI status is based on the Accountability Progress Report of October 2012. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students’ test results in the 2011–2012 school year or earlier. Some schools were in Program Improvement prior to the passage of No Child Left Behind, when the definition of PI was significantly modified.

CONSEQUENCES

PARENTS: Because Parkside is in stage (year) 4 of PI, parents of students have two options. They can enroll their children in different schools in the district. To see the list of these schools, parents can contact either the principal or the district office staff. Their children are also entitled to free tutoring. Details about the district’s list of approved tutoring providers are available from the district office. More information about both options is available on the [US Department of Education Web site](#).

SCHOOL: The school staff is participating in a plan of corrective action. Teachers continue to work toward improving classroom teaching. The school may set aside ten percent of its Title I (federal) funding to help teachers improve.

DISTRICT: The district is taking more serious steps of corrective action. It is preparing a new plan for running the school. This plan can include reopening as a charter school, contracting with an outside agency to manage the school, replacing staff, naming a new principal, and changing the internal organization of the school. The district is also notifying parents of the corrective action plan, and what progress the staff is making toward improving instruction.































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 middle 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

TESTED SUBJECT	2011–2012		2010–2011		2009–2010	
	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher						
Average middle school Percent Proficient or higher						
MATH (excluding algebra)						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher						
Average middle school Percent Proficient or higher						
ALGEBRA						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher						
Average middle school Percent Proficient or higher						
HISTORY/SOCIAL SCIENCE						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher						
Average middle school Percent Proficient or higher						
SCIENCE						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher						
Average middle school Percent Proficient or higher						

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 test cycle. State average represents middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.

Frequently Asked Questions About Standardized Tests

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

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

HOW HARD ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS? Experts consider California's standards to be among the most clear and rigorous in the country. Just 59 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 63 percent scored Proficient or Advanced in math. You can review the [California Content Standards](#) on the CDE Web site.

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

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

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

English/Language Arts (Reading and Writing)

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			62%	92%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About three percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			68%	94%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			59%	94%	

Subgroup Test Scores

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


■ FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC ■ PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			58%	234	GENDER: About seven percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			65%	206	
English proficient			72%	323	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			28%	114	
Low income			41%	193	INCOME: About 36 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			77%	243	
Learning disabled	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	17	LEARNING DISABILITIES: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled			62%	423	
Asian American			83%	35	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.
Filipino			78%	46	
Hispanic/Latino			48%	188	
Pacific Islander			58%	31	
White/Other			70%	123	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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



Math (Excluding Algebra)

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			46%	78%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About six percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			61%	72%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			52%	71%	

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			40%	195	GENDER: About 12 percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			52%	179	
English proficient			56%	252	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			23%	121	
Low income			35%	186	INCOME: About 22 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			57%	186	
Learning disabled			15%	35	LEARNING DISABILITIES: Students classified as learning disabled scored lower than students without learning disabilities. The CST is not designed to test the progress of students with moderate to severe learning differences.
Not learning disabled			49%	339	
Asian American	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	22	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.
Filipino			63%	32	
Hispanic/Latino			36%	179	
Pacific Islander	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	28	
White/Other			55%	95	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle 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.

All sixth and most seventh graders take the same math courses. Starting as early as seventh grade, however, some students take algebra, while others take a general math course. We report algebra results separately. Here we present our students' scores for all math courses except algebra.

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.



Algebra I

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			84%	17%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 34 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California. But 16 percent fewer students took algebra than did students in the average middle school in the state.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			55%	39%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			50%	33%	

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			81%	52	GENDER: The number of girls who took this test is too small to be counted in this analysis.
Girls	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	28	
English proficient			82%	74	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	5	
Low income	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	19	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			82%	60	
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			84%	79	
Asian American	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.
Filipino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	14	
Hispanic/Latino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	18	
White/Other			71%	31	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle 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.

We report our students’ algebra results separately because of the central importance of algebra in the California math standards. It is also a gateway course for college-bound students, who should start high school ready for geometry.

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).

About 17 percent of our seventh and eighth grade students took the algebra CST, compared with 33 percent of all middle school students statewide. You can review the [math](#) standards on the CDE’s Web site.



History/Social 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			48%	99%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About four percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			61%	99%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			52%	98%	

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			49%	133	GENDER: About two percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			47%	102	
English proficient			59%	167	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			20%	66	
Low income			28%	111	INCOME: About 37 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			65%	122	
Learning disabled	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	24	LEARNING DISABILITIES: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled			53%	211	
Asian American	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	22	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.
Filipino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	25	
Hispanic/Latino			31%	102	
Pacific Islander	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	11	
White/Other			56%	64	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle 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 eighth grade 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 [history/social science 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			60%	90%	SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About four percent fewer students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			70%	94%	
AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			64%	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			63%	117	GENDER: About six percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			57%	97	
English proficient			71%	157	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			29%	55	
Low income			43%	95	INCOME: About 32 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			75%	117	
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			61%	211	
Asian American	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	22	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.
Filipino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	25	
Hispanic/Latino			44%	90	
White/Other			74%	60	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2012 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle 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 eighth grade 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).

Although we teach science at all grade levels, only our eighth graders took the California Standards Test in this subject. You can read the [science standards](#) on 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 used to determine whether each student is performing below, at, or above grade-level standards. This data is also used to place students in tiered/differentiated classes for English/language arts, math, and tech.

STUDENTS

Students’ English Language Skills

At Parkside, 72 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared with 83 percent of middle school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	72%	77%	83%
English Learners	28%	23%	17%

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

Languages Spoken at Home by English Learners

Please note that this table describes the home languages of just the 135 students classified as English Learners. At Parkside, 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	73%	82%	85%
Vietnamese	0%	0%	2%
Cantonese	1%	2%	1%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	5%	5%	2%
Korean	0%	1%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	0%	0%
All other	21%	10%	8%

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

Ethnicity

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

ETHNICITY	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
African American	3%	3%	7%
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	24%	20%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	44%	40%	50%
White	27%	32%	28%

SOURCE: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), October 2011. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

Family Income and Education

The **free or reduced-price meal** subsidy goes to students whose families earned less than \$41,348 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2011–2012 school year. At Parkside, 36 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 55 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	36%	40%	55%
Parents with some college	49%	67%	57%
Parents with college degree	27%	48%	33%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2011–2012 school year. Parents’ education level is collected in the spring at the start of testing. Rarely do all students answer these questions.

The parents of 49 percent of the students at Parkside have attended college and 27 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 94 percent of our students provided this information.

CLIMATE FOR LEARNING

Average Class Sizes

The table at the right shows average class sizes for core courses. For more information on our average class sizes, please contact the school directly.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZES OF CORE COURSES	OUR SCHOOL	OUR DISTRICT
English	N/A	N/A
History	N/A	N/A
Math	N/A	N/A
Science	N/A	N/A

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

Safety

To safeguard the well-being of students and staff, a comprehensive School Site Safety Plan has been developed by the assistant principal along with the PTO, which meets regularly throughout the year to set long-term goals for the school and assist in upgrading the school facilities. 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 quarterly, and earthquake and intruder/disaster drills are held once a year.

All visitors to Parkside Intermediate School must sign in at the office and wear a visitor’s pass at all times. Supervision is provided to ensure the safety of each student before school, during breaks, at lunch, and after school. Supervision is a responsibility shared among noon-time aides, parent volunteers, teachers, the counselor, and the administration.

Parent Involvement

The school district benefits from extensive support from parents and community members. Parkside Intermediate School is proud of its many opportunities for parents and community members to volunteer their time. These opportunities include classroom volunteers, coaching the afterschool sports program, helping with playground/lunchtime monitors, field trip chaperones, and fund-raising, as well as PTO and SSC membership.

LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

Leadership

This is our principal’s seventh year at Parkside Intermediate School. Leadership at Parkside Intermediate School is a responsibility shared among district administration, the principal, the vice-principal, instructional staff, students, and parents. Shared decision making, a broad-based curriculum, and research-based instructional strategies provide the basis for excellent instruction. The staff at Parkside Intermediate School strives to provide all students with a quality education and an opportunity for success. Leadership teams and committees at Parkside Intermediate School include School Site Council (SSC) and PTO.

Angela Addiego is the principal of Parkside Intermediate School. Prior to this position, she served as principal of Belle Air Elementary School as well as a classroom teacher in the San Bruno Park School District. Mrs. Addiego comes to this school with a total of 29 years of experience in education. She leads by the words of Ghandi: “Be the change you wish to see in the world.”

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%
Out-of-field teaching	Percentage of core courses taught by a teacher who lacks the appropriate subject area authorization for the course	0%	N/A	N/A
Fully credentialed teachers	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	100%	N/A	N/A
Teachers lacking a full credential	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	0%	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

TEACHING OUT OF FIELD: When a teacher lacks a subject area authorization for a course she is teaching, that course is counted as **out-of-field**. The students who take that course are also counted. For example, if an unexpected vacancy in a biology class occurs, and a teacher who normally teaches English literature (and who lacks a subject area authorization in science) fills in to teach for the rest of the year, that teacher would be teaching out of field.

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

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

Districtwide Distribution of Teachers Who Are Not “Highly Qualified”

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

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

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

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

Staff Development

The district provides time and resources for collaboration, planning, and professional development for all staff. Teachers at Parkside Intermediate School receive training directly related to curriculum and instruction by attending workshops and conferences which are approved by the district and administration. Staff development days enable staff members to deliver curriculum and instruction that is rigorous, challenging, and responsive to student needs. The focus on professional development for this year and the upcoming school year is the infusion of instructional strategies for English Learners and for students scoring below proficient.

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

SOURCE: This information is supplied by the school district.

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.

ACADEMIC GUIDANCE COUNSELORS: Our school has one full-time equivalent academic counselor, which is equivalent to one counselor for every 477 students. Just for reference, California districts employed about one academic counselor for every 656 middle school students in the state. More information about [counseling and student support](#) is available on the CDE Web site.

STAFF POSITION	STAFF (FTE)
Academic counselors	1.0
Behavioral/career counselors	1.0
Librarians and media staff	0.0
Psychologists	0.0
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.0
Speech/language/hearing specialists	0.0
Resource specialists	0.0

SOURCE: Data provided by the school district.

Specialized Programs and Staff

The staff at Parkside Intermediate 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 decision, 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.

Psychologists and counselors are devoted to helping students deal with problems and assisting them to reach positive goals. The district provides Parkside Intermediate School with a part-time psychologist who offers educational assessment and other counseling support services. North Peninsula Family Alternatives (NPFA) and Peninsula Conflict Resolution provide additional counseling services. In addition, the district contracts out with nurses for vision, hearing, and scoliosis testing.

Parkside Intermediate School provides additional support for students with special needs. The Special Educator Program provides Resource Specialist Program (RSP) and Special Day Class (SDC), which are tailored to the Individualized Education Program (IEP) of each student with physical, emotional, or learning disabilities. Whenever possible, special education students are mainstreamed into traditional classrooms.

The English Language Development (ELD) program at Parkside Intermediate School assists students who are English Learners. The self-contained program provides special instruction in High Point curriculum, and is conducted by a Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD)-certificated teacher. Students are mainstreamed in all other subject areas.

Special Education Program

We have two full-time RSP teachers for seventh and eighth grades, as well as two assistants who work with our special education students. Resource students stay in the regular classroom as much as possible but also work in the RSP classroom or one-on-one in their area of difficulty. In the regular classroom they receive accommodations according to their IEPs, such as more time to take tests, sitting close to the teacher, or receiving less homework. Our students also receive speech and language program assistance based upon their IEPs. Students with more serious challenges attend the SDC on our campus.

English Learner Program

Parkside Intermediate School services English Language Development (ELD) students with ELD classes and employs specific curriculum to teach English. All of our teachers have attended training that addresses ways to present subject matter to English Learners, and we have plans for further training. We encourage the parents of English Learners to join our English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC). Students are tested annually, and their California English Language Development Test scores are reviewed and used for appropriate class placement.

RESOURCES

Buildings

Parkside Intermediate School was originally built in 1952 and continues to provide a safe and clean environment for students, staff, and volunteers. Parkside Intermediate School is currently composed of 24 classrooms, a media center, a multipurpose room, a special education room, a counseling office, two locker rooms (boys/girls), a staff room, and a gym.

In the 2011–2012 school year, Parkside Intermediate School completed a total remodel of its facilities, including a demolition of two older wings. The removal of these wings led to the construction of a new two-story building with 23 classrooms that houses seventh and eighth graders, and the addition of a new sixth grade wing, as sixth graders will become part of our new middle school model for San Bruno Park School District in September 2012. State-of-the-art classroom technology will be a part of this renovation, achieving the school's focus of moving to a laptop for each student to use during instruction.

Our three custodians clean each classroom every other day and the rest rooms every day. District maintenance picks up litter, removes graffiti, and maintains landscaping on a regular weekly schedule.

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.

Computers

As part of the school improvement program, Parkside Intermediate School has acquired 90 new computers. Teachers have laptops and LCD and ELMO projectors. Additionally, the school is wireless.

Students are learning the skills necessary to do presentations using PowerPoint, YouTube, Podcasting, and Word. Parkside is working to use technology to complete project-based learning activities. In the 2011–2012, a technology class was added to the elective curriculum and will continue to provide individualized instruction in the 2012–2013 school year.

Parkside is moving toward each student having a laptop presently the ratio is 4:1 students to computers. Instruction/texts will be web-based. Interventions are individually tailored, and projects will be computer enhanced by this implementation.

Textbooks

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

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

Curriculum

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

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

SCHOOL EXPENDITURES

San Bruno Park School District spent an average of \$7,650 per pupil. This includes Federal Title I funds.

Spending per Student (2010–2011)

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we first report our overall spending per student. We base our calculations on our average daily attendance (ADA), which was 458 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)	\$5,217	\$4,996	4%	\$5,434	-4%
Restricted funds (\$/student)	\$1,138	\$1,083	5%	\$2,889	-61%
TOTAL (\$/student)	\$6,355	\$6,080	5%	\$8,323	-24%

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

Total Expenditures, by Category (2010–2011)

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

CATEGORY	UNRESTRICTED FUNDS	RESTRICTED FUNDS	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL*
Teacher salaries (all certificated staff)	\$1,658,300	\$223,317	\$1,881,617	65%
Other staff salaries	\$189,946	\$85,702	\$275,648	9%
Benefits	\$510,585	\$83,481	\$594,066	20%
Books and supplies	\$26,931	\$39,815	\$66,746	2%
Equipment replacement	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Services and direct support	\$3,825	\$88,695	\$92,520	3%
TOTAL	\$2,389,587	\$521,010	\$2,910,597	

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

Compensation per Staff with Teaching Credentials (2010–2011)

The total of what our certificated staff members earn appears below. A certificated staff person is a school employee who is required by the state to hold teaching credentials, including full-time, part-time, substitute or temporary teachers, and most administrators. You can see the portion of pay that goes to salary and three types of benefits.

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we first report our compensation per full-time equivalent (FTE) certificated staff member. A teacher/administrator/pupil services person who works full time counts as 1.0 FTE. Those who work only half time count as 0.5 FTE. We had 29 FTE teachers working in our school.

CATEGORY	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE *	SCHOOL VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL VARIANCE
Salaries	\$65,221	\$66,822	-2%	\$74,075	-12%
Retirement benefits	\$5,410	\$5,462	-1%	\$6,062	-11%
Health and medical benefits	\$9,320	\$8,501	10%	\$10,417	-11%
Other benefits	\$364	\$313	16%	\$635	-43%
TOTAL	\$80,314	\$81,098	-1%	\$91,189	-12%

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

Total Certificated Staff Compensation (2010–2011)

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

CATEGORY	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL*
Salaries	\$1,881,617	81%
Retirement benefits	\$156,078	7%
Health and medical benefits	\$268,876	12%
Other benefits	\$10,502	0%
TOTAL	\$2,317,073	

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

TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY: All data is the most current available as of December 2012. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2011–2012 school year after the publication date of this report. We rely on the following sources of information from the California Department of Education: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) (October 2011); Language Census (March 2012); California Standards Tests (spring 2012 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (November 2012 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (October 2012).

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

» Adequacy of Key Resources 2012–2013

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



TEACHERS

Teacher Vacancies

The Williams legislation asked districts to disclose how frequently full-time teachers were not permanently assigned to a classroom. There are two general circumstances that can lead to the unfortunate case of a classroom without a full-time, permanently assigned teacher. Within the first 20 days of the start of school, we can be surprised by too many students showing up for school, or too few teachers showing up to teach. After school starts, however, teachers can also be surprised by sudden changes: family emergencies, injuries, accidents, etc. When that occurs, it is our school’s and our district’s responsibility to fill that teacher’s vacancy with a qualified, full-time and permanently assigned replacement. For that reason, we report teacher vacancies in two parts: at the start of school, and after the start of school.

KEY FACTOR	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	128	128	N/A
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	0
Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher	0	0	0

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

Teacher Misassignments

A “misassigned” teacher is one who lacks the appropriate subject-area authorization for a class she is teaching.

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

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
Teacher Misassignments	Total number of classes taught by teachers without a legally recognized certificate or credential	0	0	0
Teacher Misassignments in Classes that Include English Learners	Total number of classes that include English learners and are taught by teachers without CLAD/BCLAD authorization, ELD or SDAIE training, or equivalent authorization from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing	0	0	0
Other Employee Misassignments	Total number of service area placements of employees without the required credentials	0	0	0

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

TEXTBOOKS

The main fact about textbooks that the Williams legislation calls for described whether schools have enough books in core classes for all students. The law also asks districts to reveal whether those books are presenting what the California content standards calls for. This information is far more meaningful when viewed along with the more detailed description of textbooks contained in our School Accountability Report Card (SARC). There you'll find the names of the textbooks used in our core classes, their dates of publication, the names of the firms that published them, and more.

SUBJECT	ARE THERE TEXTBOOKS OR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN USE?		ARE THERE ENOUGH BOOKS FOR EACH STUDENT?	
	STANDARDS ALIGNED?	FROM THE MOST RECENT OFFICIAL ADOPTION?	FOR USE IN CLASS?	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS HAVING BOOKS TO TAKE HOME?
English	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Math	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Science	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Social Studies	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Foreign Languages	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Health Sciences	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%
Visual and Performing Arts	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%

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

FACILITIES

To determine the condition of our facilities, our district sent experts from our facilities team to inspect them. They used a survey, called the Facilities Inspection Tool, issued by the Office of Public School Construction. Based on that survey, we’ve answered the questions you see on this report. Please note that the information reflects the condition of our buildings as of the date of the report. Since that time, those conditions may have changed.

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

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

INSPECTORS AND ADVISORS: This report was completed on Thursday, January 31, 2013 by STEVEN EICHMAN (CBO). The facilities inspection occurred on Thursday, January 17, 2013. There were no other inspectors used in the completion of this form. The Facilities Inspection Tool was completed on Thursday, January 17, 2013.

» Data Almanac

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



STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

Student Enrollment by Ethnicity and Other Characteristics

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

GROUP	ENROLLMENT
Number of students	477
Black/African American	3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	8%
Filipino	10%
Hispanic or Latino	44%
Pacific Islander	6%
White (not Hispanic)	27%
Two or more races	1%
Ethnicity not reported	0%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	41%
English Learners	32%
Students with disabilities	11%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CALPADS, October 2011. Data about students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged, English Learners, or learning disabled come from the School Accountability Report Card unit of the California Department of Education.

Student Enrollment by Grade Level

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

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS
Kindergarten	0
Grade 1	0
Grade 2	0
Grade 3	0
Grade 4	0
Grade 5	0
Grade 6	0
Grade 7	241
Grade 8	236
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2011.

Average Class Size by Core Course

The average class size by core courses.

SUBJECT	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
English	29	N/A	N/A
History	25	N/A	N/A
Math	25	N/A	N/A
Science	25	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2011. 2009–2010 data provided by the school district.

Average Class Size by Core Course, Detail

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

SUBJECT	2009–2010			2010–2011			2011–2012		
	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+	1–22	23–32	33+
English	17	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
History	18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science	18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2011. Data for 2009–2010 provided by the school district.

Physical Fitness

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

GRADE LEVEL	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING HEALTHY FITNESS ZONES		
	MET FOUR OR MORE STANDARDS	MET FIVE OR MORE STANDARDS	MET ALL SIX STANDARDS
Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Physical fitness test data is produced annually as schools test their students on the six Fitnessgram Standards. This information is from the 2011–2012 school year.

Suspensions and Expulsions

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

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Suspensions per 100 students			
2011–2012	15	15	N/A
2010–2011	14	14	16
2009–2010	9	9	18
Expulsions per 100 students			
2011–2012	1	1	N/A
2010–2011	0	0	0
2009–2010	0	0	0

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

During the 2011–2012 school year, we had 73 suspension incidents. We had six 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.

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. We also present three years' of data about the number of teachers who lacked the appropriate subject-area authorization for one or more classes they taught.

TEACHERS	SCHOOL			DISTRICT
	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012	2011–2012
With Full Credential	26	23	25	108
Without Full Credential	0	3	0	0
Teaching out of field	N/A	0	0	0

SOURCE: Information provided by the school district.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

California Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

The California Standards Tests (CST) show how well students are doing in learning what the state content standards require. The CST include English/language arts and mathematics in grades six through eight; science in grade eight; and history/social science in grade eight. Student scores are reported as performance levels. We also include results from the California Modified Assessment and California Alternative Performance Assessment (CAPA).

STAR Test Results for All Students: Three-Year Comparison

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

SUBJECT	SCHOOL PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			DISTRICT PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			STATE PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
English/ language arts	55%	55%	59%	58%	58%	62%	52%	54%	56%
History/social science	54%	44%	48%	54%	44%	48%	44%	48%	49%
Mathematics	54%	50%	51%	67%	65%	69%	48%	50%	51%
Science	64%	58%	60%	62%	61%	64%	54%	57%	60%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2012 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

STAR Test Results by Student Subgroup: Most Recent Year

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

STUDENT SUBGROUP	STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			
	ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS 2011–2012	HISTORY/ SOCIAL SCIENCE 2011–2012	MATHEMATICS 2011–2012	SCIENCE 2011–2012
African American	38%	0%	31%	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%	0%	0%	0%
Asian	83%	64%	83%	68%
Filipino	75%	76%	67%	84%
Hispanic or Latino	46%	31%	40%	44%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	55%	0%	48%	0%
White (not Hispanic)	68%	56%	58%	74%
Two or more races	0%	0%	0%	0%
Boys	55%	49%	48%	63%
Girls	63%	47%	56%	57%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	40%	28%	40%	43%
English Learners	28%	20%	25%	29%
Students with disabilities	30%	4%	21%	0%
Receives migrant education services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2012 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

ACCOUNTABILITY

California Academic Performance Index (API)

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

API Ranks: Three-Year Comparison

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

API RANK	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
Statewide rank	6	6	5
Similar-schools rank	6	7	5

SOURCE: The API Base Report from June 2012.

API Changes by Subgroup: Three-Year Comparison

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

SUBGROUP	ACTUAL API CHANGE			API
	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012	2011–2012
All students at the school	+24	-16	+9	774
Black/African American	N/A	-121	-69	636
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	-36	+47	899
Filipino	N/A	-36	+45	886
Hispanic or Latino	+46	-16	+2	709
Pacific Islander	N/A	+0	+24	739
White (non Hispanic)	+5	+9	-19	815
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	+30	+8	-20	688
English Learners	-31	-13	+0	641
Students with disabilities	N/A	+51	+46	585

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in November 2012. Students from all elementary, middle and high schools are included in the district and state columns for comparison.

API Scores by Subgroup

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

SUBGROUP	SCHOOL		DISTRICT		STATE	
	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API
All students	463	774	1,924	830	4,664,264	788
Black/African American	13	636	35	719	313,201	710
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	N/A	3	N/A	31,606	742
Asian	35	899	200	916	404,670	905
Filipino	47	886	206	902	124,824	869
Hispanic or Latino	200	709	848	783	2,425,230	740
Pacific Islander	31	739	116	788	26,563	775
White (non Hispanic)	130	815	455	868	1,221,860	853
Two or more races	6	N/A	48	852	88,428	849
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	212	688	842	772	2,779,680	737
English Learners	144	641	780	772	1,530,297	716
Students with disabilities	62	585	242	656	530,935	607

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in November 2012. Students from all elementary, middle and high schools are included in the district and state columns for comparison.

Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Intervention Programs

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

- (a) a 95-percent participation rate on the state’s tests
- (b) a CDE-mandated percentage of students scoring Proficient or higher on the state’s English/language arts and mathematics tests
- (c) an API of at least 740 or growth of at least one point.

AYP for the District

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

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

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

Intervention Program: District Program Improvement (PI)

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

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

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

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES

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

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

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

District Salaries, 2010–2011

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2010–2011 school year. This table compares our average salaries with those in districts like ours, based on both enrollment and the grade level of our students. In addition, we report the percentage of our district’s total budget dedicated to teachers’ and administrators’ salaries. The costs of health insurance, pensions, and other indirect compensation are not included.

SALARY INFORMATION	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Beginning teacher’s salary	\$39,125	\$40,962
Midrange teacher’s salary	\$68,226	\$63,212
Highest-paid teacher’s salary	\$75,155	\$80,545
Average principal’s salary (middle school)	N/A	\$106,108
Superintendent’s salary	\$132,138	\$152,557
Percentage of budget for teachers’ salaries	33%	40%
Percentage of budget for administrators’ salaries	6%	6%

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

TEXTBOOKS

Textbook Adoption List

TITLE	SUBJECT	DATE OF PUBLICATION	ADOPTION DATE
Holt Literature & Language Arts (Harcourt)	English LA	2005-06	2005
History Alive (TCI)	History/Social Studies	2004-05	2004
Medieval & Early Modern Times (Glencoe-McGraw Hill)	History/Social Studies	2006	2006
The American Journey to WWI (Glencoe-McGraw Hill)	History/Social Studies	2006	2006
Algebra Readiness (McDougal-Littell)	Math	2008	2008
Course 1 (McDougal-Littell)	Math	2008	2008
World of Music (Silver Gurdett Ginn)	Music	1994	1994
Focus on Life Science (Glencoe-McGraw Hill)	Science	2007	2007
Focus on Physical Science (Glencoe-McGraw Hill)	Science	2007	2007
Health Promotion Wave(Health Wave Inc.)	Health		1994
Discover: Skills for Life(AGS Publishers)	Health		1990
"Inside" (Hampton Brown/National Geographic	EL	2009	2010