

# Lone Tree Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013

Wheatland 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**

# Lone Tree Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013  
Wheatland Elementary School District

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

The information in this report represents the 2012–2013 school year, not the current school year. In most cases, this is the most recent data available. We present our school's results next to those of the average elementary school in the county and state to provide the most meaningful and fair comparisons. To find additional facts about our school online, please use the [DataQuest](#) tool offered by the California Department of Education.

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

[http://pub.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links\\_2013\\_en.html](http://pub.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links_2013_en.html)

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

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

## How to Contact Our School

123 Beale Hwy.  
Beale AFB, CA 95903  
Principal: Jodie Jacklett  
Phone: (530) 788-0248

## How to Contact Our District

111 Main Street  
Wheatland, CA 95692  
Phone: (530) 633-3130  
<http://www.wheatland.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](#)  
[Adequacy of Key Resources 2013–2014](#)  
[Data Almanac](#)



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

©2013 Publishing 20/20

# Lone Tree Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2012–2013  
Wheatland Elementary School District

## » Principal's Message

Our school has been a three-time Title I Academic Achievement Award winner and a California Distinguished School.

Despite declining enrollment across the district and continued budget reductions, we consistently achieve an Academic Performance Index (API) of 840+. Our staff believes that our API is due to ongoing collaboration with effective instructional strategies, careful program planning and sequencing in both language arts and math, Response to Intervention (RTI) academic programs, and our social/school skills supports in place for students. The computer-based programs Accelerated Math, Accelerated Reader, and Math Facts in a Flash have also contributed to our students' success. This was year one of a three year Department of Defense Education Activity Grant that affords us additional staff and supplemental activities for the support of reading development. We hold student rallies and recess activities to recognize student achievement with academics, social growth, and behavior elements that, together, help us to encourage and support the growth and success of the whole child.

Lone Tree welcomes parents and community volunteers on our campus. It is our goal to team with families to create the best educational environment possible for our students.

Jodie Jacklett, PRINCIPAL

### Grade range and calendar

**K-5**

TRADITIONAL

### Academic Performance Index

**853**

County Average: 794

State Average: 810

### Student enrollment

**333**

County Average: 325

State Average: 534

## School Expenditures

Funds are expended to maintain our evolving student-success centered programs. Portions of the money are spent on staff training programs, such as Essential Skills of Instruction, DataWise, and Step Up to Writing. We also place classroom teaching assistants in lower grades and continue our LifeSkills student support program. Dollars are spent to ensure student progress software upgrades, purchase Accelerated Reader books for continual student use, keep student-centered materials up to date and in ample supply, and maintain a media room to house school wide virtual field trips. Technology plays a vital role on our campus, and funds are continuously set aside for technology maintenance and upgrades. Classroom technology that incorporates student participation, such as Mimeo, is in place. Finally, Lone Tree supports several incentive programs that have been crucial to our students' continued success. These programs include Accelerated Reader, Accelerated Math, and Math Facts in a Flash.

## Safety

Our classrooms are open 15 minutes before school begins. Staff members monitor the parking lot immediately after dismissal. We have a closed campus, and all visitors must register with the office. We hold monthly fire drills and have an earthquake and disaster drill once a year. Our safety plan is updated annually and we have worked with Rapid Responder, a county services program, and a military base liaison to coordinate the plan with outside agencies. All administrators completed a disaster safety course with DPREP and staff training is conducted at the site. We continue to work with Beale Air Force Base to practice elements within our safety plan.

## Buildings

Lone Tree School was built in 1948. In 2002, all roofs and heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning systems were replaced. In 2007, all electrical transformers were replaced and major electrical work was conducted under critical hardship funds. Projects for 2010–2011 included a parking lot renovation, further playground updates, replaced all outdoor water fountains, installed campus cabling for technology, overhaul of classroom electrical supply and sources, and a kitchen upgrade with flooring and equipment. We work hard to ensure that our school is clean, safe, and functional within the available resources. Our site has established cleaning standards. A summary of these standards is available through the site administrator. We give food service and rest room facilities the highest priority on a daily basis to ensure the health and safety of students and staff. Five years ago, Lone Tree was lucky enough to have a parent volunteer completely make over our cafeteria with a mural project. This mural depicts the aircraft assigned to Beale Air Force Base.

## Parent Involvement

Our school's annual site plan and required site budget approvals are made by our School Site Council, which always includes parent members. Our District English Language Advisory Committee is a collaborative opportunity to have input for school programs to support English Learners while encouraging family and student connectivity to school. We encourage parent attendance at back-to-school night, student progress conferences, music programs, the art/science/literature/social science shows, fall carnival, and student celebration rallies. Our parents are active volunteers and we enjoy the positive support with reading and math tutoring for students, Art Docents to extend curricular vision, parking lot and sidewalk to school monitors, classroom helpers, fund-raiser assistance, Jump Rope for Heart, field trip chaperones, and more! Our school network of volunteers is centrally managed through a parent-led Team Lone Tree Volunteer network. We have a grant program on campus to provide a mentoring program that is a successful student support due to volunteers. Classroom and campus volunteers are always welcome and needed. To find out how you can volunteer at our school, please contact Mrs. Jacklett, campus administrator, at (530)788-0248.

**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 <b>API</b> ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
<b>Met schoolwide growth target</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met growth target for prior school year</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>API score</b>	<b>853</b>
<b>Growth attained from prior year</b>	<b>+13</b>
<b>Met subgroup* growth targets</b>	<b>Yes</b>

Lone Tree’s API was 853 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 13 points compared with last year’s API. All students took the test. You can find three years of detailed API results in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

SOURCE: API based on spring 2013 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of December 2013.

**API RANKINGS:** Based on our 2011–2012 test results, we started the 2012–2013 school year with a base API of 840. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared with all elementary schools in California, our school ranked 7 out of 10.


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

**SIMILAR SCHOOL RANKINGS:** We also received a second ranking that compared us with the 100 schools with the most similar students, teachers, and class sizes. Compared with these schools, our school ranked 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 met our assigned growth targets during the 2012–2013 school year. Just for reference, 48 percent of elementary schools statewide met their growth targets.

**API, Spring 2013**



SOURCE: API based on spring 2013 test cycle. State average represents elementary schools only.  
NOTE: Only groups of students that represent at least 15 percent of total enrollment are calculated and displayed as student subgroups.

### Adequate Yearly Progress

In addition to California’s accountability system, which measures student achievement using the API, schools must also meet requirements set by the federal education law known as **No Child Left Behind** (NCLB). This law requires all schools to meet a different goal: **Adequate Yearly Progress** (AYP).

We met seven out of nine criteria for yearly progress. Because we fell short in two areas, we did not make AYP.

To meet AYP, elementary schools must meet three criteria. First, a certain percentage of students must score at or above Proficient levels on the California Standards Tests (CST), the California Modified Assessment (CMA), and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA): 89.2 percent on the English/language arts test and 89.5 percent on the math test. All ethnic, English Learners, special education, and socioeconomic subgroups of students also must meet these goals. Second, the schools must achieve an API of at least 770 or increase the API by one point from the prior year. Third, 95 percent of the student body must take the required standardized tests.

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

FEDERAL <b>AYP</b> ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS	
<b>Met AYP</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Met schoolwide participation rate</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met schoolwide test score goals</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met subgroup* participation rate</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met subgroup* test score goals</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Met schoolwide API for AYP</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Program Improvement school in 2013</b>	<b>No</b>

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of September 2013. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students’ test results in the 2012–2013 school year or earlier.

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

### Adequate Yearly Progress, Detail by Subgroup

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

	English/Language Arts		Math	
	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 89.2% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 89.5% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?
<b>SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS</b>	●	●	●	●
<b>STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY</b>				
White/Other	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of September 2013, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2012–2013 school year. The green dots represent goals we met; red dots indicate goals we missed. Just one red dot means that we failed to meet AYP.

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


## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Here you'll find a three-year summary of our students' scores on the California Standards Tests (CST) in selected subjects. We compare our students' test scores with the results for students in the average elementary school in California. On the following pages we provide more detail for each test, including the scores for different subgroups of students. In addition, we provide links to the California Content Standards on which these tests are based. If you'd like more information about the CST, please contact our principal or our teaching staff. To find [grade-level-specific scores](#), you can refer to the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Web site. Other tests in the [STAR program](#) can be found on the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site.

### California Standards Tests

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

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



SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 test cycle. State average represents elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.

## Frequently Asked Questions About Standardized Tests

**HAVE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS KEPT UP WITH THE CHANGES IN WHAT WE TEACH?** In two subjects, the answer is “yes,” and in two more the answer is “no.” The Common Core transition is the reason for this. The test questions in math and English/language arts in 2012-13 were likely to be less well aligned with the official standards for California curriculum than they were three years ago. But the test questions in social studies and science were just as well aligned in 2012-13 as they were in the past.

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

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

**HOW HARD ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS?** Experts consider California’s standards to be among the most clear and rigorous in the country. Just 57 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 63 percent scored Proficient or Advanced in math. You can review the [California Content Standards](#) on the CDE Web site.

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

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

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



### English/Language Arts (Reading and Writing)

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			69%	99%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About 12 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			52%	98%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			57%	94%	

### Subgroup Test Scores

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


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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
Boys			65%	93	<b>GENDER:</b> About eight percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls			73%	83	
English proficient			69%	168	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> 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	8	
Low income			54%	41	<b>INCOME:</b> About 20 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
Not low income			74%	135	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	25	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> 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			77%	151	
Hispanic/Latino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	28	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
White/Other			69%	112	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.  
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.  
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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



**Math**

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

**FAR BELOW BASIC** **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			73%	99%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About ten percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			58%	91%	
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			63%	91%	

**Subgroup Test Scores**


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

**FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC** **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>Boys</b>			76%	93	<b>GENDER:</b> About six percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
<b>Girls</b>			70%	83	
<b>English proficient</b>			72%	168	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> 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.
<b>English Learners</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	8	
<b>Low income</b>			68%	41	<b>INCOME:</b> About eight percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
<b>Not low income</b>			76%	135	
<b>Learning disabled</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	25	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> 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.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			82%	151	
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	28	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> 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.
<b>White/Other</b>			73%	112	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.  
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.  
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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



**Science**

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

**FAR BELOW BASIC** **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			69%	100%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About 12 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			51%	97%	
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			57%	93%	

**Subgroup Test Scores**

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


**FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC** **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>Boys</b>	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	23	<b>GENDER:</b> We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested was too small to be statistically significant.
<b>Girls</b>	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	19	
<b>English proficient</b>			71%	41	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> 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.
<b>English Learners</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	1	
<b>Low income</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	9	<b>INCOME:</b> We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
<b>Not low income</b>			73%	33	
<b>Learning disabled</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	5	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> 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.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			78%	37	
<b>White/Other</b>	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	29	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2013 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.  
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.  
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

The science standards test was administered only to fifth graders. Of course, students in all grade levels study science in these areas: physical science, life science, earth science, and investigation and experimentation. For background, you can review the [science standards](#) by going to the CDE’s Web site.



**STUDENTS**

**Students’ English Language Skills**

At Lone Tree, 97 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared with 70 percent of elementary school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	97%	79%	70%
English Learners	3%	21%	30%

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

**Languages Spoken at Home by English Learners**

Please note that this table describes the home languages of just the ten students classified as English Learners. At Lone Tree, 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	40%	77%	84%
Vietnamese	0%	0%	3%
Cantonese	20%	0%	1%
Hmong	0%	17%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	10%	0%	1%
Korean	0%	0%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	1%	0%
All other	30%	5%	9%

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

**Ethnicity**

Most students at Lone Tree identify themselves as White. In fact, there are about four times as many White students as Hispanic/Latino students, the second-largest ethnic group at Lone Tree. 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	11%	3%	6%
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	7%	8%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	16%	34%	54%
White	62%	47%	25%

SOURCE: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), October 2012. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

**Family Income and Education**

The **free or reduced-price meal** subsidy goes to students whose families earned less than \$42,643 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2012–2013 school year. At Lone Tree, 35 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 61 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	35%	64%	61%
Parents with some college	91%	58%	58%
Parents with college degree	43%	23%	34%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2012–2013 school year. Parents’ education level is collected in the spring at the start of testing. Rarely do all students answer these questions.

The parents of 91 percent of the students at Lone Tree have attended college and 43 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 52 percent of our students provided this information.

**CLIMATE FOR LEARNING**

**Average Class Sizes**

Because funding for class-size reduction was focused on the early grade levels, our school’s class sizes, like those of most elementary schools, differ across grade levels.

The average class size at Lone Tree varies across grade levels from a low of 15 students to a high of 23. Our average class size schoolwide is 19 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY GRADE	OUR SCHOOL	OUR DISTRICT
<b>Kindergarten</b>	20	18
<b>First grade</b>	21	22
<b>Second grade</b>	17	19
<b>Third grade</b>	16	19
<b>Fourth grade</b>	15	11
<b>Fifth grade</b>	23	18

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

**LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF**

**Indicators of Teachers Who May Be Underprepared**

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
<b>Core courses taught by a teacher not meeting NCLB standards</b>	Percentage of core courses not taught by a “highly qualified” teacher according to federal standards in NCLB	0%	N/A	0%
<b>Fully credentialed teachers</b>	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	100%	N/A	N/A
<b>Teachers lacking a full credential</b>	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	0%	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Data on NCLB standards is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file. Information on teachers lacking a full credential provided by the school district.

**PLEASE NOTE:** Comparative data (county average and state averages) for some of the data reported in the SARC is unavailable as of December 2013.

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

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

### Districtwide Distribution of Teachers Who Are Not “Highly Qualified”

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

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

DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT
<b>Districtwide</b>	Percentage of core courses not taught by “highly qualified” teachers (HQT)	2%
<b>Schools with more than 40% of students from lower-income homes</b>	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	2%
<b>Schools with less than 25% of students from lower-income homes</b>	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	0%

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

### Specialized Resource Staff

The table to the right lists the number of full-time equivalent qualified support personnel who provide counseling and other pupil support services in our school. These specialists often work part time at our school and some may work at more than one school in our district. For more details on [statewide ratios of counselors, psychologists, or other pupil services](#) staff to students, see the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site. [Library facts](#) and frequently asked questions are also available there.

STAFF POSITION	STAFF (FTE)
<b>Academic counselors</b>	0.0
<b>Behavioral/career counselors</b>	0.8
<b>Librarians and media staff</b>	0.0
<b>Psychologists</b>	0.0
<b>Social workers</b>	0.0
<b>Nurses</b>	0.0
<b>Speech/language/hearing specialists</b>	0.0
<b>Resource specialists</b>	1.5

SOURCE: Data provided by the school district.

**TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY:** All data is the most current available as of December 2013. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2012–2013 school year after the publication date of this report. We rely on the following sources of information from the California Department of Education: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) (October 2012); Language Census (March 2013); California Standards Tests (spring 2013 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (September 2013 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (September 2013).

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

rev20140107\_58-72751-6056832e/25422





## » Adequacy of Key Resources 2013–2014

Here you'll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2013–2014. Please note that these facts are based on evaluations our staff conducted in accordance with the Williams legislation.

This section also contains information about 2012–2013 staff development days, and, for high schools, percentages of seniors who met our district's graduation requirements.



**TEACHERS**

Teacher Vacancies

KEY FACTOR	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	16	17	16
Number of classes that 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:**

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.

### Teacher Misassignments

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

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
<b>Teacher Misassignments</b>	Total number of classes taught by teachers without a legally recognized certificate or credential	0	0	0
<b>Teacher Misassignments in Classes that Include English Learners</b>	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
<b>Other Employee Misassignments</b>	Total number of service area placements of employees without the required credentials	0	0	0

**NOTES:**

### Staff Development

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

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
<b>2012–2013</b>	8.00
<b>2011–2012</b>	12.00
<b>2010–2011</b>	3.00

**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 call for.

This information was collected on 10/22/13

**NOTES:**

TAUGHT AT OUR SCHOOL?	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?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>English</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Math</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Science</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Social Science</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Foreign Languages</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Health</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Visual/Performing Arts</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

## Textbooks in Use

Here are some of the textbooks we use for our core courses.

SUBJECT AND TITLE	PUBLISHER	YEAR ADOPTED
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS		
McGraw-Hill Open Court		2002
MATH		
Harcourt Brace		2002
SCIENCE		
Houghton Mifflin		2007
SOCIAL SCIENCE		
Pearson Scott Foresman		2005

**FACILITIES**

To determine the condition of our facilities, our district sent experts from our facilities team to perform an inspection using a survey called the Facilities Inspection Tool, which is 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.

**INSPECTORS AND ADVISORS:** This report was completed on 8/29/13 by Gary Hawk Maintenance. The most recent facilities inspection occurred on August 29, 2013 .

**ADDITIONAL INSPECTORS:** There were no other inspectors used in the completion of this form.

AREA	RATING	REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Good</b>	No apparent problems
<b>A. Systems</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Gas</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Mechanical/HVAC</b>		No apparent problems
<b>3. Sewer</b>		No apparent problems
<b>B. Interior Surfaces</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Interior Surfaces</b>		No apparent problems
<b>C. Cleanliness</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Overall cleanliness</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Pest/Vermin</b>		No apparent problems
<b>D. Electrical Components</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Electrical Components</b>		No apparent problems
<b>E. Rest Rooms/Fountains</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Rest Rooms</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Drinking Fountains</b>		No apparent problems
<b>F. Safety</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Fire Safety</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Hazardous Materials</b>		No apparent problems

AREA	RATING	REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED
<b>G. Structural</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Structural Damage</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Roofs/Gutters</b>		No apparent problems
<b>H. External</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Playgrounds/School Grounds</b>		No apparent problems

**SCHOOL FINANCES, 2011–2012**

We are required by the California Dept. of Education to report financial data from the 2011–2012 school year. More recent financial data is available on request from the district office.

**Spending per Student**

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).

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.

Next to the figures for the district and state averages, we show the percentage by which the school’s spending varies from the district and state averages. For example, we calculate the school’s variance from the district average using this formula:

$$\frac{(\text{SCHOOL AMOUNT} - \text{DISTRICT AVERAGE})}{\text{DISTRICT AVERAGE}}$$

TYPE OF FUNDS	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE
<b>Unrestricted funds (\$/student)</b>	\$5,772	\$5,771	0%	\$5,596	3%
<b>Restricted funds (\$/student)</b>	\$1,226	\$1,096	12%	\$2,786	-56%
<b>Total (\$/student)</b>	\$6,997	\$6,867	2%	\$8,382	-17%

**Compensation for Staff with Teaching Credentials**

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we report our compensation per full-time equivalent (FTE) certificated staff.\* 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.

CERTIFICATED STAFF*	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE
<b>Salary (\$/certificated staff)</b>	\$82,397	\$74,270	11%	\$71,848	15%
<b>Benefits (\$/certificated staff)</b>	\$18,885	\$18,056	5%	\$16,999	11%
<b>Total (\$/certificated staff)</b>	\$101,283	\$92,326	10%	\$88,847	14%

\* 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.



## » 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	333
Black/African American	11%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3%
Asian	2%
Filipino	4%
Hispanic or Latino	16%
Pacific Islander	1%
White (not Hispanic)	62%
Two or more races	1%
Ethnicity not reported	0%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	35%
English Learners	3%
Students with disabilities	13%

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

**Student Enrollment by Grade Level**

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

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS
Kindergarten	79
Grade 1	64
Grade 2	52
Grade 3	47
Grade 4	45
Grade 5	46
Grade 6	0
Grade 7	0
Grade 8	0
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012.

### Average Class Size by Grade Level

GRADE LEVEL	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
Kindergarten	25	21	20
Grade 1	23	21	21
Grade 2	18	27	17
Grade 3	17	29	16
Grade 4	24	25	15
Grade 5	25	22	23
Grade 6	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined K–3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 3–4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 4–8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	20	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012.

### Average Class Size by Grade Level, Detail

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

GRADE LEVEL	2010–2011			2011–2012			2012–2013		
	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+
Kindergarten	0	3	0	1	3	0	2	2	0
Grade 1	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	3	0
Grade 2	1	2	0	0	2	0	1	2	0
Grade 3	1	2	0	0	2	0	2	1	0
Grade 4	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	2	0
Grade 5	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	0
Grade 6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined K–3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 3–4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 4–8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2012.

### Teacher Credentials

The number of teachers assigned to the school with a full credential and without a full credential, for both our school and the district.

TEACHERS	SCHOOL			DISTRICT
	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013	2012–2013
<b>With Full Credential</b>	17	17	17	62
<b>Without Full Credential</b>	0	0	0	3

SOURCE: Information provided by school district.

### Physical Fitness

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

GRADE LEVEL	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING HEALTHY FITNESS ZONES		
	MET FOUR OR MORE STANDARDS	MET FIVE OR MORE STANDARDS	MET ALL SIX STANDARDS
<b>Grade 5</b>	95%	80%	59%
<b>Grade 7</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Grade 9</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Physical fitness test data is produced annually as schools test their students on the six Fitnessgram Standards. This information is from the 2012–2013 school year.

### Suspensions and Expulsions

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

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
<b>Suspensions per 100 students</b>			
<b>2012–2013</b>	3	5	N/A
<b>2011–2012</b>	1	6	N/A
<b>2010–2011</b>	1	6	5
<b>Expulsions per 100 students</b>			
<b>2012–2013</b>	0	0	N/A
<b>2011–2012</b>	0	0	N/A
<b>2010–2011</b>	0	0	0

SOURCE: Information for the two most recent years provided by the school district. Prior data is from the Consolidated Application published by the California Department of Education. The numbers above are a ratio of suspension or expulsion events, per 100 students enrolled. District and state averages represent elementary schools only.

During the 2012–2013 school year, we had 11 suspension incidents. We had no incidents of expulsion. To make it easy to compare our suspensions and expulsions to those of other schools, we represent these events as a ratio (incidents per 100 students) in this report. Please note that multiple incidents may involve the same student.

**STUDENT PERFORMANCE**

**California Standardized Testing and Reporting Program**

The California Standards Tests (CST) show how well students are learning what the state content standards require. The CST include English/language arts and mathematics in grades two through five and science in grade five. We also include results from the California Modified Assessment and California Alternative Performance Assessment (CAPA).

**STAR Test Results for All Students: Three-Year Comparison**

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

SUBJECT	SCHOOL PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			DISTRICT PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			STATE PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
English/ language arts	60%	66%	68%	61%	64%	61%	54%	56%	55%
Mathematics	68%	71%	73%	63%	66%	67%	49%	50%	50%
Science	67%	86%	69%	70%	77%	69%	57%	60%	59%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2013 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

**STAR Test Results by Student Subgroup: Most Recent Year**

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

STUDENT GROUP	STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	ENGLISH/ LANGUAGE ARTS 2012–2013	MATHEMATICS 2012–2013	SCIENCE 2012–2013
African American	50%	67%	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	71%	79%	N/A
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	69%	73%	83%
Two or more Races	N/A	N/A	N/A
Boys	65%	76%	70%
Girls	72%	69%	68%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	50%	66%	N/A
English Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students with disabilities	15%	19%	N/A
Receives migrant education services	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2013 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

**California Academic Performance Index (API)**

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

**API Ranks: Three-Year Comparison**

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

API RANK	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013
Statewide rank	8	7	7
Similar-schools rank	7	7	5

SOURCE: The API Base Report from May 2013.

**API Changes by Subgroup: Three-Year Comparison**

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

SUBGROUP	ACTUAL API CHANGE			API
	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013	2012–2013
All students at the school	-23	+4	+13	853
Black/African American	+20	-57	+20	771
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	-76	-20	+72	873
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	-7	+28	-14	856
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	N/A	+54	-22	794
English Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students with disabilities	-89	-10	-114	547

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013. Students from all elementary, middle and high schools are included in the district and state columns for comparison.

**API Scores by Subgroup**

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

SUBGROUP	SCHOOL		DISTRICT		STATE	
	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API
<b>All students</b>	161	853	809	836	4,655,989	790
<b>Black/African American</b>	11	771	43	813	296,463	708
<b>American Indian or Alaska Native</b>	7	N/A	20	765	30,394	743
<b>Asian</b>	7	N/A	33	829	406,527	906
<b>Filipino</b>	7	N/A	15	895	121,054	867
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	25	873	154	822	2,438,951	744
<b>Pacific Islander</b>	0	N/A	5	N/A	25,351	774
<b>White (non Hispanic)</b>	102	856	511	843	1,200,127	853
<b>Two or more races</b>	2	N/A	28	843	125,025	824
<b>Socioeconomically disadvantaged</b>	41	794	337	804	2,774,640	743
<b>English Learners</b>	9	N/A	75	770	1,482,316	721
<b>Students with disabilities</b>	28	547	89	601	527,476	615

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013. Students from all elementary, middle and high schools are included in the district and state columns for comparison.

### Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Intervention Programs

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

- (a) a 95-percent participation rate on the state’s tests
- (b) a CDE-mandated percentage of students scoring Proficient or higher on the state’s English/language arts and mathematics tests
- (c) an API of at least 770 or growth of at least one point.

#### AYP for the District

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

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

SOURCE: The AYP Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013.

#### Intervention Program: District Program Improvement (PI)

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

INDICATOR	DISTRICT
PI stage	Not in PI
The year the district entered PI	N/A
Number of schools currently in PI	2
Percentage of schools currently in PI	50%

SOURCE: The Program Improvement Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in September 2013.



**DISTRICT EXPENDITURES**

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

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	OUR DISTRICT	SIMILAR DISTRICTS	ALL DISTRICTS
<b>FISCAL YEAR 2011–2012</b>			
Total expenses	\$12,120,072	\$8,575,019,725	\$46,420,178,248
Expenses per student	\$10,899	\$7,846	\$8,382
<b>FISCAL YEAR 2010–2011</b>			
Total expenses	\$11,116,237	\$8,497,573,732	\$46,278,595,991
Expenses per student	\$10,096	\$7,789	\$8,323

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

**District Salaries, 2011–2012**

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2011–2012 school year. This table compares our average salaries with those in districts like ours, based on both enrollment and the grade level of our students. In addition, we report the percentage of our district’s total budget dedicated to teachers’ and administrators’ salaries. The costs of health insurance, pensions, and other indirect compensation are not included.

SALARY INFORMATION	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Beginning teacher’s salary	\$38,320	\$41,327
Midrange teacher’s salary	\$69,439	\$63,903
Highest-paid teacher’s salary	\$81,898	\$81,573
Average principal’s salary (elementary school)	\$121,450	\$103,887
Superintendent’s salary	\$137,008	\$155,551
Percentage of budget for teachers’ salaries	35%	41%
Percentage of budget for administrators’ salaries	7%	6%

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