

School Accountability Report Card

Issued Spring 2010 for Academic Year 2008–09

What Is a School Accountability Report Card?

Since November 1988, state law has required all public schools to prepare and distribute annually a School Accountability Report Card (SARC).

The purpose of the report card is to provide parents and the community with important information about the performance and condition of each California public school. The SARC can also be an effective way for a school to report the progress it has made toward achieving its goals. In addition, the public may use the SARC to evaluate and compare schools throughout the state on a variety of indicators.

More information about the requirements for the SARC is available on the state's SARC website:

www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/

Additional copies of this SARC may be obtained from the school office or from the district's SARC website:

studata.sandi.net/research/sarcs/

Longfellow School

5055 July St, San Diego, CA 92110-1114

Phone: (619) 276-4206

E-mail: *None provided*

Web: www.longfellowschool.org

Cynthia Garrison-Arce, Principal

School Description and Mission Statement

Longfellow School is a K–8 Spanish immersion magnet school located in the Clairemont area of San Diego. The magnet program, which began in 1977, serves more than 680 children from all over the city of San Diego.

At Longfellow, students receive a standards-based curriculum in all subject areas. Students are immersed in Spanish for 100 percent of the school day during kindergarten and grade 1. In grade 2, students start receiving approximately 90 minutes of English instruction on the minimum day only, with the remaining instructional time continuing to be in Spanish. In grades 3–5, students receive approximately 60 minutes of English language arts instruction on regular school days, and about 40 minutes on minimum days. Our grade 6 students receive instruction in Spanish in all subjects, except for a block of English language arts. In grades 7 and 8, the majority of instruction is in English, with the exception of history classes and Spanish language arts classes, which are taught in Spanish.

The mission of Longfellow's Spanish immersion magnet program is to provide a nurturing environment of academic excellence in order to help our students develop into responsible, cross-cultural world citizens, proficient in both Spanish and English and with an enriched understanding of themselves and others. Our motto is, "One who knows two languages enriches the world by two."

Contents

Data and Access	2
About This School	2
School Climate	3
School Facilities	3
Teachers	4
Support Staff	5
Curriculum and Instructional Materials	5
Instructional Planning and Scheduling	6
School Finances	6
Student Performance	7
National Assessment of Educational Progress	10
Accountability	10
School Completion and Postsecondary Preparation (Secondary Schools)	12
Appendix: Adopted Texts and Instructional Materials	12

Opportunities for Parent Involvement

We are committed to communicating with and engaging parents as partners in their children's education. The district has adopted *Parent Communications and Involvement Standards*, which clearly describe expectations for parent communications and involvement at the district, school, classroom, and home levels. We are also committed to obtaining community resources for our school and invite all members of our community to assist us in the education of our students. Parents have many opportunities to be involved at their children's school site (for example, governance committees, special events, fundraising events, parent organizations, and in classrooms) and at the district level (for example, district councils/committees, Parent University, and special events). We encourage parents to support their children at home by making their expectations about school clear and creating a positive homework and learning environment.

At Longfellow Spanish Immersion School, all parents have the opportunity to participate in decision making through the School Site Council and Site Governance Team. Both of these governing bodies meet monthly throughout the year to share the goal of improving the achievement of all students through quality teaching and learning experiences. Please note that these meetings are open forums for anyone to attend. The school also holds schoolwide events throughout the year to involve parents. Our school foundation, Los Compadres de Escuela Longfellow, sponsors many fundraisers, funds cultural arts assemblies, and funds a K–8 Art Corps program.

If you want to get involved, please contact Josie Ramirez at (619) 276-4206, ext. 104.



Data and Access

Most of the data in this SARC are from the 2008–09 school year or the two preceding years (2006–07 and 2007–08). Graduation, dropout, and fiscal data are from 2007–08. When no year is specified, data are from the most recent year available.

Data included in this SARC are consistent with State Board of Education guidelines, available at the California Department of Education website: www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/documents/definitions09.pdf.

DataQuest

DataQuest is an on-line data tool (<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>) that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district, the county, and the state. *DataQuest* is a dynamic system that provides reports for accountability, test results, enrollment, graduates, dropouts, course enrollments, staffing, and data regarding English learners.

Internet Access

Internet access is available at public libraries and other locations that are publicly accessible (e.g., the California State Library). Access to the Internet at libraries and public locations is generally provided on a first-come, first-served basis. Other use restrictions include the hours of operation, the length of time that a workstation may be used (depending on availability), the types of software programs available on a workstation, and the ability to print documents.

About This School

Student Enrollment by Grade Level

Grade Level	Enrollment on October 1, 2009
Kindergarten	100
1	120
2	98
3	89
4	90
5	60
6	41
7	37
8	48
TOTAL	683

Student Enrollment by Group (2008–09)

Student Subgroup	Number of Students	Percentage of Enrollment
African American	170	24.9
Asian	8	1.2
Filipino	11	1.6
Hispanic	225	32.9
Indochinese	0	0.0
Native American	6	0.9
Pacific Islander	3	0.4
White (Not Hispanic)	260	38.1
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	290	42.4
English Learners	26	3.8
Students with Disabilities	42	6.1

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)

This table displays the average class size for each grade level and the number of classrooms that fall into each class size category.

Grade Level	2006–07				2007–08				2008–09			
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms		
		1–20	21–32	33+		1–20	21–32	33+		1–20	21–32	33+
K	20	2	3	0	20	5	1	0	20	6	0	0
1	20	5	0	0	20	5	0	0	20	6	0	0
2	20	5	0	0	19	5	0	0	20	4	1	0
3	20	3	1	0	20	5	0	0	18	5	0	0
4	30	0	2	0	21	1	2	0	30	0	3	0
5	25	0	2	0	24	0	1	0	30	0	2	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
K–3	17	1	0	0	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
3–4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4–8	25	0	1	0	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)

This table displays the average class size for each subject area and the number of classrooms that fall into each class size category.

Subject	2006–07				2007–08				2008–09			
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms		
		1–22	23–32	33+		1–22	23–32	33+		1–22	23–32	33+
English	24	4	2	0	24	3	4	0	21	4	2	0
Mathematics	22	5	1	0	23	3	2	0	21	5	1	0
Science	22	5	1	0	23	3	2	0	21	5	1	0
History–Social Studies	22	5	1	0	23	3	2	0	21	4	2	0

School Climate

School Safety Plan (2008–09)

Last Review/Update: September 8, 2008

Last Discussed with Staff: October 8, 2008

Each school has a Crisis Response Box that includes its state-mandated comprehensive school safety plan. This plan meets the state requirements described in California Education Code Sections 35294–35297. The safety plan includes disaster procedures, procedures for safe entry and exit of students, procedures for serious disciplinary problems, a sexual harassment policy, child abuse reporting procedures, school dress codes, and school discipline policies.

Adult supervision is provided in the classrooms and outside areas before and after school, during recess and lunch, and during passing time between classes. Under the direction of the principal or site administrator, school staff members implement specific school-building security procedures. In addition, district offices support schools by reviewing and disseminating safety requirements and information, coordinating safety-related services, and providing safety training and assistance.

During the school day, all gates remain locked to better monitor visitors to our campus and ensure that students are safe at all times. Since the majority of our students arrive at school by bus each day, there is an organized plan for the unloading and loading of students to and from their buses. Adult supervision is provided from 8:40 a.m. till 9:00 a.m. and 3:45 p.m. till 4:05 p.m., except on Wednesdays, our minimum day, when afternoon supervision is provided from 12:50 p.m. till 1:10 p.m.

In addition, we review our Code of Conduct with all students to ensure that they know the expectations for, and consequences of, their conduct.

We have developed a comprehensive school safety plan that meets state requirements. Each year, this plan is updated, reviewed, shared, and distributed to all staff, parents, and students. Monthly safety drills are held throughout the school year to ensure that staff and students have the opportunity to practice for emergency situations such as fires, earthquakes, natural disasters, and campus emergencies.

Suspensions and Expulsions

The following table shows the numbers and rates of suspensions and expulsions. Rates per 100 students are the total number of incidents divided by the school's enrollment for the given year, multiplied by 100. The district comparison rates are the expected rates for the school's enrollment and grade-level composition, based on actual districtwide rates. Because suspension and expulsion rates vary greatly by grade level, and since any given two schools are not likely to have identical enrollment numbers per grade, schools will have different district comparison rates.

Type of Action		2006–07		2007–08		2008–09	
		School	District	School	District	School	District
Suspensions	Number	24	14,740	14	12,848	21	12,832
	Rate per 100 students	3.62	6.67	2.04	5.86	3.07	6.60
Expulsions	Number	0	398	0	380	0	278
	Rate per 100 students	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.11

School Facilities

School Facility Conditions and Improvements (2009–10)

The main facility is a single-story building consisting of 18 permanent classrooms and 16 portable classrooms. The lack of a parking lot creates ongoing traffic and safety problems for the community and staff. The school is over 50 years old. To be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, a ramp and restroom for the disabled have been installed. Other facility improvements, funded by Proposition MM, include upgrades of technology and electrical wiring, a new lunch-court structure, additional library facilities, and other major repairs. During the 2007–08 school year, the school and foundation collaborated on two projects. In our effort to “go green,” a paper and plastic recycling program was successfully implemented. Finally, gardening boxes were constructed behind the library building to beautify the campus and enhance the instructional program at Longfellow.

School Facility Good-Repair Status (2009–10)

This table displays the results of the most recently completed school-site inspection to determine the facility’s good-repair status. The data are not comparable with some previous years’ summaries, which cited only “emergency needs.”

Inspection Date: October 19, 2009

Item Inspected	Repair Status*				Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	E	G	F	P	
Systems: Gas, Mechanical, Sewer		✓			
Interior: Interior surfaces		✓			
Cleanliness: Overall, pest/vermin		✓			
Electrical: Interior/Exterior			✓		Ballast & hand dryer
Restrooms / fountains:		✓			
Safety: Fire Safety / Has. Mat.		✓			
Structural: Damage, roofs,		✓			
External: Playground, gates, fences		✓			

* Repair Status: Exemplary, Good, Fair, Poor

	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
Overall Rating		✓		

Teachers

Teacher Credentials

This table displays the number of teachers assigned to the school who are fully credentialed, who are working without a full credential, and who are credentialed but teaching outside of their subject area of competence. District totals do not include charter schools.

Number of Teachers	School			District
	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2008–09
Full credential and teaching in subject area	36	34	40	7,413
Full credential but teaching outside subject area	1	0	1	243
Without full credential	2	4	1	100
Total	39	38	42	7,756

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

This table displays the number of teacher misassignments (teachers assigned without proper legal authorization) and the number of vacant teacher positions (long-term vacancies for which there was no teacher assigned by the twentieth school day of each semester). Total teacher misassignments includes the number of misassignments of teachers of English learners. For 2009–10, the most current data are reported.

Indicator	2007–08		2008–09		2009–010	
	Semester 1	Semester 2	Semester 1	Semester 2	Semester 1	Semester 2
Misassignments of Teachers of English	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0	1	3	N/A

Core Academic Courses Taught by Teachers in Compliance with the No Child Left Behind Act (2008–09)

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act required all teachers of core academic subjects to be “highly qualified” no later than the end of the 2007–08 school year. In general, NCLB requires that each teacher must have: (1) a bachelor’s degree, (2) a state credential (or an Intern Certificate/Credential for no more than three years), and (3) demonstrated subject-matter competence for each core subject he or she will teach.

This table displays the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by teachers who are compliant with NCLB at this school, at all schools in the district, in high-poverty schools in the district, and in low-poverty schools in the district. (High-poverty schools are those with a student participation rate of 75 percent or greater in the free and reduced-price lunch program. Low-poverty schools are those with rates of 25 percent or less in the program.) More information on teacher qualifications required under NCLB can be found at the CDE website at www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/tq/.

Location of Classes	Percentage of Classes in Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by NCLB-Compliant Teachers	Taught by Non-NCLB-Compliant Teachers
This School	86.0	14.0
All Schools in District	99.4	0.6
High-Poverty Schools in District	99.5	0.5
Low-Poverty Schools in District	99.7	0.3

Support Staff

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (2008–09)

This table displays, in units of full-time equivalents (FTE), the number of academic counselors and other support staff who are assigned to the school and the average number of students per academic counselor. One FTE equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time.

Position	Number of FTE Assigned to the School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor	0.6	683
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	0.0	
Library Media Services Staff (paraprofessional)	1.0	
Psychologist	0.2	
Social Worker	0.0	
Nurse	0.6	
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	0.4	
Resource Specialist (Non-Teaching)	1.0	

Curriculum and Instructional Materials

Quality, Currency, and Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (2009–10)

The district adopts textbooks and instructional materials based on the implementation cycle established by the state. It provides a sufficient number of standards-aligned textbooks and other instructional materials for all students in the subject areas of English language arts, health, history–social studies, mathematics, science, and world languages. Science laboratory equipment is available to students enrolled in laboratory science courses in grades 9–12. The following table displays information about the availability of the standards-aligned textbooks and other instructional materials used at the school.

Core Curriculum Area	Percentage of Pupils Who Lack Their Own Assigned Textbooks and Instructional Materials
English Language Arts	0
Health	0
History–Social Studies	0
Mathematics	0
Science	0
Science Laboratory Equipment (grades 9–12)	0
Visual and Performing Arts	0
World Language	0

List of Textbooks and Instructional Materials Used in Core Subject Areas (2009–10)

All textbooks and instructional materials come from state or district lists. A list of all textbooks and instructional materials used in the school in the core subjects (English language arts, mathematics, science, and history-social science), may be found at the end of this document in the appendix entitled Adopted Texts and Instructional Materials.

Instructional Planning and Scheduling

Professional Development

Through the district’s educational strategies, the Instructional Support Services Division collaborates with other departments to provide teachers and administrators with ongoing professional development to improve teaching and learning in the areas of literacy, mathematics, science, history–social studies, visual and performing arts, physical education, health, educational technology, and gifted and talented education. Sessions focus on differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all learners and often target the needs of our English language learners, Special Education students, and other struggling learners. Each year, principals identify a focus for schoolwide professional development, as well as determine areas of individual need. Throughout the year, principals conduct large- and small-group staff conferences and coach teachers at the school site to improve instructional practice. Teachers in the district participated in a total of three mandatory staff development days in each of the last four school years. These days focused primarily on school-based professional learning in relation to the school’s needs.

School Finances

Expenditures per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2007–08)

This table displays a comparison of the school’s per pupil expenditures from unrestricted (basic) sources with other schools in the district and throughout the state, and a comparison of the average teacher salary at the school site with average teacher salaries at the district and state levels. Detailed information regarding school expenditures and teacher salaries can be found at the CDE website at www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/ec/ and www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/.

Level	Total Expenditures Per Pupil	Expenditures Per Pupil (Supplemental)	Expenditures Per Pupil (Basic)	Average Teacher Salary
School Site	\$6,060	\$1,182	\$4,878	\$62,801
District			\$4,629	\$63,424
Difference: School Site and District (%)			5.4	-1.0
State			\$5,512	\$67,049
Difference: School Site and State (%)			-11.5	-6.3

Types of Services Funded (2008–09)

The district’s general fund includes monies for:

- General operations—salaries, benefits, services, materials, and support to the general education
- Special Education—programs offering appropriate, individualized instruction to students with special needs
- Targeted Instructional Improvement Program—staff salaries, staff benefits, services, materials, and support for low-achieving students
- School-Based Coordinated Program—staff salaries, staff benefits, services, materials, and support for our lowest performing schools
- Gifted and Talented Education Program—specialized learning assistance for identified students of high ability, achievement, or potential
- Special projects—monies from agencies (federal or state) earmarked for specific programs/projects or services
- Transportation
- Maintenance and operations
- District administration

Each school in the district receives an instructional budget based on enrollment, programs, and formulas set by Board of Education policy, state law, agreements with employee bargaining units, and guidelines of outside funding sources.

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2007–08)

This table displays district-level salary information for teachers, principals, and the superintendent, and compares these figures to the state averages for districts of the same type and size. The table also displays teachers and administrative salaries as a percentage of a district's budget, and compares these figures to the state averages for districts of the same type and size. Detailed information regarding salaries may be found at the CDE website at www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/.

Position	District Amount	Statewide Average for Districts in Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$39,412	\$42,065
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$59,886	\$67,109
Highest Teacher Salary	\$80,592	\$86,293
Average Principal Salary (Elementary School Level)	\$109,261	\$107,115
Average Principal Salary (Middle School Level)	\$111,356	\$112,279
Average Principal Salary (High School Level)	\$118,395	\$122,532
Superintendent Salary	\$269,000	\$216,536
Percentage of Budget for Teachers' Salaries	38.1	39.4
Percentage of Budget for Administrative Salaries	5.1	5.5

Student Performance

Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

The Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program consists of several key components, including the California Standards Tests (CST), the California Modified Assessment (CMA), and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA).

The CSTs show how well students are doing in relation to the state's content standards. The CSTs include English–language arts (ELA) and mathematics in grades 2–11; science in grades 5, 8, and 9–11; and history-social studies in grades 8 and 9–11.

The CMA is an alternate assessment that is based on modified achievement standards. The CMA is designed to assess those students whose disabilities preclude them from achieving grade-level proficiency on an assessment of the California content standards, with or without accommodations. The CMA includes ELA for grades 3–8 and science for grades 5 and 8.

The CAPA is given to those students with significant cognitive disabilities whose disabilities prevent them from taking either the CSTs with accommodations or modifications or the CMA with accommodations. The CAPA includes ELA and mathematics in grades 2–11 and science in grades 5, 8, and 10.

Detailed information regarding the STAR Program results for each grade and performance level, including the percentage of students not tested, may be found on the CDE's STAR results website: star.cde.ca.gov. General information about the STAR Program may be found in the "Explaining 2008 STAR Program Summary Results to the Public" guide: www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/documents/starpkt5intrpts.pdf.

STAR Program Results

STAR scores are ranked according to five "performance levels": Advanced (exceeds state standards), Proficient (meets state standards), Basic (approaching state standards), Below Basic (below state standards), and Far Below Basic (well below state standards). Students scoring at the Proficient and Advanced levels have met state standards in that content area.

The following tables show the percentage of students in each grade who achieved the Proficient or Advanced levels (meeting or exceeding state standards) at the school, district, and state levels for the last three years. Statewide data are rounded to the nearest percentage point.

STAR – English–Language Arts

Grade Level	School			District			State		
	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09
2	36.4	42.0	54.8	49.9	49.5	55.6	48	48	53
3	41.0	37.4	48.8	39.5	40.8	47.7	37	38	47
4	69.6	56.7	69.0	53.1	56.9	63.7	51	55	61
5	54.0	70.1	63.3	46.5	49.3	57.9	44	48	54
6	61.3	70.7	92.7	44.5	49.2	54.5	42	47	52
7	45.8	69.2	74.3	48.7	49.0	54.8	46	49	54
8	28.6	50.0	81.3	42.7	47.2	49.7	41	45	48

STAR – Mathematics

Grade Level	School			District			State		
	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09
2	37.4	59.0	67.7	61.3	62.4	65.4	59	59	63
3	65.4	73.7	73.5	60.6	62.4	66.4	58	61	64
4	53.6	50.7	64.7	56.5	61.1	67.7	56	61	66
5	49.2	70.1	43.3	49.4	52.3	59.9	49	51	57
6	58.1	70.7	85.4	43.2	45.9	49.2	42	44	49
7	33.3	45.1	80.6	41.0	44.7	47.1	40	41	43
8	2.9	0.0	85.4	27.9	31.9	36.0	33	35	40

STAR – Grade-Level Science

Grade Level	School			District			State		
	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09
5	47.6	74.6	46.7	38.4	46.5	55.5	37	46	49
8	2.9	25.0	79.2	35.9	47.8	50.8	42	52	56

STAR – History–Social Science

Grade Level	School			District			State		
	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09
8	14.3	25.0	66.7	33.7	35.9	39.8	35	36	42

The following tables show the percentage of students in various state-defined subgroups who achieved the Proficient or Advanced levels (meeting or exceeding state standards) for the most recent STAR testing period (2008–09).

Note: No group score is reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student. Scores are not shown when the number of students tested in a particular subgroup is 10 or fewer, either because the number of students is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect students’ privacy. Such cases are indicated by an asterisk (*). Data on students receiving migrant education services are not available.

2008–09 STAR Subgroups – English–Language Arts

Grade Level	Gender		English Learner?		Economically Disadvantaged?		Students with Disabilities?	
	Male	Female	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
2	51.2	57.7	*	54.9	50.0	59.2	*	60.7
3	35.9	60.0	*	49.4	33.3	57.4	*	49.4
4	65.4	70.7	*	70.4	60.0	77.3	*	72.2
5	71.4	56.3	*	64.9	43.3	83.3	*	65.5
6	82.4	100.0	*	95.0	84.6	96.4	—	92.7
7	66.7	80.0	*	76.5	58.8	88.9	*	75.0
8	69.6	92.0	—	81.3	64.3	88.2	*	80.4

* = 10 or fewer students tested; — = no data available for this field.

2008–09 STAR Subgroups – Mathematics

Grade Level	Gender		English Learner?		Economically Disadvantaged?		Students with Disabilities?	
	Male	Female	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
2	70.7	65.4	*	68.1	63.6	71.4	*	70.2
3	74.4	72.7	*	73.2	55.2	83.3	*	77.9
4	74.1	60.3	*	65.9	59.5	69.8	*	67.1
5	53.6	34.4	*	45.6	30.0	56.7	*	47.3
6	94.1	79.2	*	85.0	61.5	96.4	—	85.4
7	81.3	80.0	*	80.0	66.7	94.4	*	84.4
8	91.3	80.0	—	85.4	64.3	94.1	*	89.1

* = 10 or fewer students tested; — = no data available for this field.

2008–09 STAR Subgroups – Grade-Level Science

Grade Level	Gender		English Learner?		Economically Disadvantaged?		Students with Disabilities?	
	Male	Female	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
5	60.7	34.4	*	49.1	30.0	63.3	*	47.3
8	82.6	76.0	—	79.2	57.1	88.2	*	78.3

* = 10 or fewer students tested; — = no data available for this field.

2008–09 STAR Subgroups – History–Social Science

Grade Level	Gender		English Learner?		Economically Disadvantaged?		Students with Disabilities?	
	Male	Female	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
8	73.9	60.0	—	66.7	28.6	82.4	*	65.2

* = 10 or fewer students tested; — = no data available for this field.

2008–09 STAR Racial/Ethnic Groups – English–Language Arts

Grade Level	African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic	Indochinese	Native American	Pacific Islander	White (Not Hispanic)
2	28.6	*	*	58.6	—	—	—	63.4
3	12.5	—	—	60.0	—	—	—	55.8
4	45.5	—	*	73.5	—	*	—	79.2
5	55.0	—	*	50.0	—	—	—	78.3
6	90.9	*	*	91.7	—	*	—	100.0
7	*	—	*	66.7	—	*	—	85.7
8	*	*	*	66.7	—	—	*	95.8

* = 10 or fewer students tested; — = no data available for this field.

2008–09 STAR Racial/Ethnic Groups – Mathematics

Grade Level	African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic	Indochinese	Native American	Pacific Islander	White (Not Hispanic)
2	42.9	*	*	69.0	—	—	—	78.0
3	56.3	—	—	75.0	—	—	—	79.1
4	40.9	—	*	66.7	—	*	—	87.0
5	40.0	—	*	18.8	—	—	—	60.9
6	81.8	*	*	83.3	—	*	—	92.9
7	*	—	*	66.7	—	*	—	92.9
8	*	*	*	80.0	—	—	*	91.7

* = 10 or fewer students tested; — = no data available for this field.

2008–09 STAR Racial/Ethnic Groups – Grade-Level Science

Grade Level	African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic	Indochinese	Native American	Pacific Islander	White (Not Hispanic)
5	25.0	—	*	43.8	—	—	—	65.2
8	*	*	*	66.7	—	—	*	91.7

* = 10 or fewer students tested; — = no data available for this field.

2008–09 STAR Racial/Ethnic Groups – History–Social Science

Grade Level	African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic	Indochinese	Native American	Pacific Islander	White (Not Hispanic)
8	*	*	*	46.7	—	—	*	83.3

* = 10 or fewer students tested; — = no data available for this field.

California Physical Fitness Test Results (2008–09)

The California Physical Fitness Test is administered to students in grades 5, 7, and 9 only. This table displays by grade level the percentage of students meeting fitness standards for the most recent testing period. Detailed information regarding this test, and comparisons of a school’s test results to the district and state levels, may be found at the CDE website at www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/pf/.

Grade Level	Percentage of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards
5	30.0	31.7	28.3
7	13.5	29.7	35.1

National Assessment of Educational Progress

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is a nationally representative assessment of what America's students know and can do in various subject areas. Assessments are conducted periodically in mathematics, reading, science, writing, the arts, civics, economics, geography, and U.S. history. Student scores for reading and mathematics are reported as performance levels (basic, proficient, and advanced). The participation of students with disabilities and English language learners is reported based on three levels (identified, excluded, and assessed). Detailed information regarding the NAEP results for each grade, performance level, and participation rate can be found on the National Assessment of Educational Progress website at nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/.

Only a sample group of California's schools and districts participate in the NAEP testing cycle. Therefore, students in any particular school or district may not be included in these results. The NAEP reflects statewide test results and is not reflective of either the district or this school. Comparisons of student performance on the NAEP and student performance on the STAR Program assessments cannot be made without an understanding of the key differences between the two assessment programs. For example, the NAEP only assesses grades 4, 8 and 12. (The NAEP assesses grades 9, 13, and 17 for long-term trends.) In addition, the NAEP only provides statewide test results for grades 4 and 8. The California Standards Tests (CST) are based on a different set of standards from those of the NAEP. For example, the NAEP is not aligned with California academic content and achievement standards and, therefore, does not necessarily reflect the curriculum and instruction to which students are exposed in the classroom. The NAEP assesses reading and writing separately, while the CSTs assess English-language arts as a whole, encompassing reading as well as writing conventions, spelling, and grammar. Scores on the CSTs and other assessments are not directly comparable to those on NAEP. The averages and percentages presented are estimates based on samples of students rather than on entire populations. Finally, the questions students respond to are only a sample of the knowledge and skills covered by the NAEP frameworks. Information on the differences between NAEP and CST can be found on the CDE's NAEP website at www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/nr/.

National Assessment of Educational Progress Reading and Mathematics Results by Grade—All Students

This table displays the scale scores and achievement levels on the National Assessment of Educational Progress Results for reading (2007) and mathematics (2009) for grades 4 and 8.

Subject and Grade Level	Average Scale Score			Statewide Percentage at Achievement Level		
	District	State	National	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Reading 2007, Grade 4	210	209	220	30	18	5
Reading 2007, Grade 8	250	251	261	41	20	2
Mathematics 2009, Grade 4	236	232	239	41	25	5
Mathematics 2009, Grade 8	280	270	282	36	18	5

National Assessment of Educational Progress Reading and Mathematics Results for Students with Disabilities and/or English Language Learners by Grade Level—All Students

This table displays the district, state, and national participation rates on the National Assessment of Educational Progress for reading (2007) and mathematics (2009) for students with disabilities and/or English language learners for grades 4 and 8.

Subject and Grade Level	Students with Disabilities Participation Rate (%)			English Language Learners Participation Rate (%)		
	District	State	National	District	State	National
Reading 2007, Grade 4	77	74	65	94	93	80
Reading 2007, Grade 8	72	78	66	93	92	77
Mathematics 2009, Grade 4	77	79	84	96	96	94
Mathematics 2009, Grade 8	61	85	78	93	96	92

Accountability

Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is a measure of the academic performance and progress of schools in California. API scores range from 200 to 1,000, with a statewide target of 800. Detailed information about the API can be found at the API website at www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/.

API Ranks—Three-Year Comparison

This table displays the school’s statewide and similar-schools API ranks. The statewide API rank ranges from 1 to 10. A statewide rank of 10 means that the school has an API score in the highest 10 percent of all schools in the state, while a statewide rank of 1 means that the school has an API score in the lowest 10 percent of all schools in the state. The similar-schools API rank reflects how a school compares to 100 statistically matched “similar schools.” A similar-schools rank of 1 means that the school’s academic performance is in the lowest 10 percent of the 100 similar schools, while a similar-schools rank of 10 means that the school’s academic performance is in the highest 10 percent of the 100 similar schools.

API Rank	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09
Statewide	6	5	7
Similar Schools	1	1	2

API Changes by Student Group—Three-Year Comparison

This table displays, by student group, the actual API changes (growth) in points added or lost for the past three years, and the most recent API score (growth).

Note: A dash (—) means that the student group is not numerically significant for the years shown, “B” means the school did not have a valid 2008 API Base and will not have any growth or target information, and “C” means the school had significant demographic changes and will not have any growth or target information. Gray areas indicate measures for which no data were collected.

Group	Actual API Change			API Score
	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2008–09
All Students at the School	-12	53	34	844
African American	-15	70	19	782
American Indian or Alaska Native	—	—	—	—
Asian	—	—	—	—
Filipino	—	—	—	—
Hispanic	-15	73	35	827
Indochinese	—	—	—	—
Pacific Islander	—	—	—	—
White	-7	20	36	883
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-9	72	28	782
English Learners			—	—
Students with Disabilities			—	—

Adequate Yearly Progress

The federal NCLB Act requires that all schools and districts meet the following Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) criteria:

- Participation rate on the state’s standards-based assessments in English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics
- Percent proficient on the state’s standards-based assessments in ELA and mathematics
- API as an additional indicator
- Graduation rate (for secondary schools)

Detailed information about AYP, including participation rates and percent proficient results by student group, can be found at the AYP website www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/.

AYP Overall and by Criteria (2008–09)

This table displays an indication of whether the school and the district made AYP overall and whether the school and the district met each of the AYP criteria.

AYP Criteria	School	District
Overall	No	No
Participation Rate—English—Language Arts	Yes	Yes
Participation Rate—Mathematics	Yes	Yes
Percentage Proficient—English—Language Arts	No	No
Percentage Proficient—Mathematics	Yes	No
API	Yes	Yes
Graduation Rate	N/A	Yes

Federal Intervention Program (2009–10)

Schools that receive Title I funding must enter federal Program Improvement (PI) if they do not make AYP for two consecutive years in the same content area (English language arts or mathematics) or on the same indicator (API or graduation rate). After entering PI, schools and districts advance to the next level of intervention with each additional year that they do not make AYP. Detailed information about PI identification can be found at the CDE website at www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/.

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status	Not in PI	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement		2009–10
Year in Program Improvement		1
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement		82
Percentage of Schools Currently in Program Improvement		39.6

School Completion and Postsecondary Preparation (Secondary Schools)

This section does not apply to this school.

Appendix: Adopted Texts and Instructional Materials

Subject Area	Grade Level	Instructional Material or Textbook	Adoption Year
English Language Arts	K–6	<i>A Legacy of Literacy</i> , Houghton Mifflin	2002–03
Health	K–6	<i>Harcourt Health and Fitness</i> , Harcourt School Publishers	2006–07
History–Social Science	K–5	<i>California Reflections</i> , Harcourt School Publishers	2007–08
History–Social Science	6	<i>Holt CA Social Studies: World History Ancient Civilizations</i> , Holt Rinehart and Winston	2007–08
Mathematics	K–5	<i>Harcourt Math</i> , Harcourt School Publishers	2002–03
Mathematics	6	<i>Prentice Hall Mathematics Grade 6, California Edition</i> , Prentice Hall	2009–10
Science	K–5	<i>Full Option Science System (FOSS)</i> , Delta Education	2008–09
Science	6	<i>California Focus on Earth Science</i> , Pearson Prentice Hall	2008–09