Lone Tree Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2009–2010
Wheatland Elementary School District

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

Lone Tree Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2009–2010
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 2009–2010 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.

If you are reading a printed version of this report, note that words that appear in a smaller, bold typeface are links in the online version of this report to even more information. You can find a master list of those linked words, and the Web page addresses they are connected to, at:

http://www.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/ links_2010_en.html

Reports about other schools are available on the **California Department of Education Web site.** Internet access is available in local libraries.

How to Contact Our School

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

How to Contact Our District

711 West Olive
Wheatland, CA 95692
Phone: (530) 633-3130
http://www.wheatland.k12.ca.us

›› Contents

Lone Tree Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2009–2010
Wheatland Elementary School District

» Principal's Message

We were 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 achieved an Academic Performance Index (API) of 858. Our staff believes that this is due to ongoing training in effective instructional strategies, our careful program planning and sequencing in both language arts and math, and our academic programs that support students who are struggling. The computer-based programs Accelerated Math, Accelerated Reader, and Math Facts in a Flash have also contributed to our students' success. Each trimester, we hold Renaissance Rallies 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
858
County Average: N/A
State Average: 800

Student enrollment
356
County Average: N/A
State Average: N/A

Teachers
17
County Average: N/A
State Average: N/A

Students per teacher
21
County Average: N/A
State Average: N/A

PLEASE NOTE: Comparative data (county average and state averages) in some sections of this report are unavailable due to problems the Department of Education had with data collection last year.

School Expenditures

Much of our site and state money is spent maintaining programs. Portions of the money are spent on staff training programs, such as Essential Skills of Instruction and Step Up to Writing. We also fund our first grade and Life Skills classroom assistants. Dollars are spent to ensure software upgrades, purchase Accelerated Reader books for continual student use, keep student-centered materials up to date and in ample supply, and create a media room to house schoolwide virtual field trips. Technology plays a vital role on our campus, and funds are continuously set aside for technology maintenance. Finally, Lone Tree supports several incentive programs that have been crucial to our students' continued success. These programs are 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. For 2010, we will be working 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 include a parking lot renovation and updating outdoor water fountains. 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 restroom facilities the highest priority on a daily basis to ensure the health and safety of students and staff. Three 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 planes that fly out of Beale Air Force Base. Over the past three years, we have fully renovated three of our five playgrounds.

Parent Involvement

Our school's annual site plan and some site budget approvals are made by our School Site Council, which always includes parent members. Our District English Language Advisory Committee helps students learning English feel welcome at our school. Our parents are active volunteers who have, in the past, helped to renovate playgrounds, create a mural in our cafeteria, and work in our Life Lab. We are always in need of volunteers to assist in the classrooms with reading and math and work in our Art Docent program. Our grant programs on campus support a mentoring program that is successful due to volunteers. Classroom and campus volunteers are always 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.

Lone Tree's API was 858 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 9 points compared with last year's API. About 99 percent of our students took the test. You can find three years of detailed API results in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

API RANKINGS: Based on our 2008–2009 test results, we started the 2009–2010 school year with a base API of 849. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared with all elementary schools in California, our school ranked 8 out of 10.

SIMILAR SCHOOL RANKINGS: We also received a second ranking that compared us with the 100 schools with the most similar students, teachers, and class sizes. Compared with these schools, our school ranked 9 out of 10. The CDE recalculates this factor every year. To read more about the specific elements included in this calculation, refer to the **CDE Web site**.

API GROWTH TARGETS: Each year the CDE sets specific API "growth targets" for every school. It assigns one growth target for the entire school, and it sets additional targets for ethnic groups, English Learners, special education students, or socioeconomic subgroups of students that make up a significant portion of the student body. Schools are required to meet all of their growth targets. If they do, they may be eligible to apply for awards through the California School Recognition Program and the Title I Achieving Schools Program.

We met our assigned growth targets during the 2009–2010 school year. Just for reference, 64 percent of elementary schools statewide met their growth targets.

CALIFORNIA **API** ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
Met schoolwide growth target	**Yes**
Met growth target for prior school year	**Yes**
API score	**858**
Growth attained from prior year	**+9**
Met subgroup* growth targets	**Yes**

SOURCE: API based on spring 2010 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of December 2010.

*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.
R/P - Results pending due to challenge by school.
N/A - Results not available.

API, Spring 2010

ALL STUDENTS IN THIS SCHOOL	858
STATE AVERAGE	800
STUDENT SUBGROUPS	
White/Other	849

SOURCE: API based on spring 2010 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 all nine criteria for yearly progress. As a result, we succeeded at making 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): 56.8 percent on the English/language arts test and 58 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 680 or increase the API by one point from the prior year. Third, 95 percent of the student body must take the required standardized tests.

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

FEDERAL **AYP** ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS	
Met AYP	**Yes**
Met schoolwide participation rate	**Yes**
Met schoolwide test score goals	**Yes**
Met subgroup* participation rate	**Yes**
Met subgroup* test score goals	**Yes**
Met schoolwide API for AYP	**Yes**
Program Improvement school in 2010	**No**

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of December 2010. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students' test results in the 2009–2010 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. R/P - Results pending due to challenge by school. 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?	DID 56.8% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST?	DID 58% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST?
SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY **White/Other**	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢

SOURCE: AYP release of October 2010, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2009–2010 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

TESTED SUBJECT	2009–2010 LOW SCORES	2009–2010 HIGH SCORES	2008–2009 LOW SCORES	2008–2009 HIGH SCORES	2007–2008 LOW SCORES	2007–2008 HIGH SCORES
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher		61%		66%		62%
Average elementary school Percent Proficient or higher		55%		53%		47%
MATH						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher		67%		73%		70%
Average elementary school Percent Proficient or higher		61%		59%		55%
SCIENCE						
Our school Percent Proficient or higher		75%		60%		67%
Average elementary school Percent Proficient or higher		56%		49%		47%

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2010 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

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 55 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 61 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		61%	99%	**SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:** About six percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY		46%	99%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA		55%	95%	

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		59%	124	**GENDER:** About six percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls		65%	80	
English proficient		63%	198	**ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	NO DATA AVAILABLE	N/A	6	
Low income	NO DATA AVAILABLE	N/A	3	**INCOME:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income		61%	201	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE	N/A	22	**LEARNING DISABILITIES:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled		62%	182	
Hispanic/Latino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	29	**ETHNICITY:** Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
White/Other		62%	130	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2010 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.

Three-Year Trend: English/Language Arts

■ Advanced
■ Proficient
■ Basic
■ Below Basic
■ Far Below Basic

Percentage of students who took the test:
2008: 99%
2009: 100%
2010: 99%

SOURCE: CDE STAR research file: 2008, 2009, and 2010.

Math

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

█ FAR BELOW BASIC █ BELOW BASIC ░ BASIC ░ PROFICIENT █ ADVANCED

GROUP	LOW SCORES HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE		67%	99%	**SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:** About six percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY		54%	92%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA		61%	92%	

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		68%	124	**GENDER:** About two percent more boys than girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
Girls		66%	80	
English proficient		68%	198	**ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	NO DATA AVAILABLE	N/A	6	
Low income	NO DATA AVAILABLE	N/A	3	**INCOME:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income		68%	201	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE	N/A	22	**LEARNING DISABILITIES:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled		68%	182	
Hispanic/Latino	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE	N/S	29	**ETHNICITY:** Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
White/Other		65%	130	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2010 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.

Three-Year Trend: Math

Percentage of students who took the test:
2008: 99%
2009: 100%
2010: 99%

SOURCE: CDE STAR research file: 2008, 2009, and 2010.

Science

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

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

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE			75%	98%	**SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:** About 19 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY			44%	97%	
AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA			56%	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	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	26	**GENDER:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested was too small to be statistically significant.
Girls	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	14	
English proficient			75%	40	**ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
English Learners	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	N/A	
Low income	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	1	**INCOME:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not low income			74%	39	
Learning disabled	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	4	**LEARNING DISABILITIES:** We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
Not learning disabled			75%	36	
White/Other	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	28	**ETHNICITY:** Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2010 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.

Three-Year Trend: Science

Legend: ■ Advanced ■ Proficient ■ Basic ■ Below Basic ■ Far Below Basic

Percentage of students who took the test:

2008: 100%

2009: 100%

2010: 98%

SOURCE: CDE STAR research file: 2008, 2009, and 2010.

STUDENTS

Ethnicity

Most students at Lone Tree identify themselves as White/European American/Other. In fact, there are about four times as many White/ European American/Other 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 "multiethnic" 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	10%	5%	6%
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	9%	9%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	17%	32%	51%
White/European American/ Other	64%	54%	31%

SOURCE: CBEDS census of October 2009. 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 $40,793 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2009-2010 school year. At Lone Tree, 40 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 56 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	40%	N/A	56%
Parents with some college	66%	53%	56%
Parents with college degree	34%	19%	32%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2009–2010 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 66 percent of the students at Lone Tree have attended college and 34 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 51 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.

Complete average class size data for this school was unavailable when we created this report. For more information on our average class sizes, please contact the school directly.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY GRADE	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Kindergarten	25	N/A	N/A
First grade	26	N/A	N/A
Second grade	29	N/A	N/A
Third grade	25	N/A	N/A
Fourth grade	26	N/A	N/A
Fifth grade	23	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: This information is provided by the school district.

LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

Indicators of Teachers Who May Be Underprepared

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

SOURCE: 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) from some of the data reported in the SARC is unavailable due to problems the California Department of Education had with data collection last year.

"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.

Districtwide Distribution of Teachers Who Are Not "Highly Qualified"

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

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

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

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

The average percentage of courses in our district not taught by a "highly qualified" teacher is zero percent, compared with one percent statewide.

Specialized Resource Staff

Our school may employ social workers, speech and hearing specialists, school psychologists, nurses, and technology specialists. These specialists often work part time at our school and some may work at more than one school in our district. Their schedules will change as our students' needs change. For these reasons, the staffing counts you see here may differ from the staffing provided today in this school. 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)
Counselors	1.0
Librarians and media staff	1.0
Psychologists	0.5
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.5
Speech/language/ hearing specialists	1.0
Resource specialists	1.0

SOURCE: Data provided by the school district.

TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY: All data is the most current available as of December 2010. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2009–2010 school year after the publication date of this report. We rely on the following sources of information from the California Department of Education: California Basic Education Data System (CBEDS) (October 2009 census); Language Census (March 2010); California Standards Tests (spring 2010 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (November 2010 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (October 2010).

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.

rev20100216_58-72751-6056832e/25422

» Adequacy of Key Resources

Here you'll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2010–2011. Please note that these facts are based on evaluations our staff conducted in accordance with the Williams legislation.

This section also contains information about 2009–2010 staff development days, and, for high schools, percentages of seniors who met our district's graduation requirements.

TEACHERS

Teacher Vacancies

KEY FACTOR	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	20	17	17
Number of classes which lacked a permanently assigned teacher within the first 20 days of school	0	0	0
TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR			
Number of classes where the permanently assigned teacher left during the year	0	0	0
Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher	0	0	0

NOTES:

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	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011
Teacher Misassignments	Total number of classes taught by teachers without a legally recognized certificate or credential	0	0	0
Teacher Misassignments in Classes that Include English Learners	Total number of classes that include English learners and are taught by teachers without CLAD/BCLAD authorization, ELD or SDAIE training, or equivalent authorization from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing	0	0	0
Other Employee Misassignments	Total number of service area placements of employees without the required credentials	0	0	0

NOTES:.

Staff Development

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

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
2009–2010	3.00
2008–2009	3.00
2007–2008	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 10/22/2010.

NOTES:

TAUGHT AT OUR SCHOOL?	SUBJECT	ARE THERE TEXTBOOKS OR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN USE?		ARE THERE ENOUGH BOOKS FOR EACH STUDENT?	
		STANDARDS ALIGNED?	OFFICIALLY ADOPTED?	FOR USE IN CLASS?	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS HAVING BOOKS TO TAKE HOME?
☒	English	☒	☒	☒	100%
☒	Math	☒	☒	☒	100%
☒	Science	☒	☒	☒	100%
☒	Social Science	☒	☒	☒	100%
☐	Foreign Languages	☐	☐	☐	
☐	Health	☐	☐	☐	
☐	Visual/Performing Arts	☐	☐	☐	

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 10/22/2010 by Gary Hawk.
The most recent facilities inspection occurred on 12/01/2008.

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

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

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

SCHOOL FINANCES, 2008–2009

We are required to report financial data from the 2008–2009 school year by the California Dept. of Education. 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) for the 2008-2009 school year.

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
Unrestricted funds ($/student)	$6,831	$8,445	-19.11%	$5,653	20.84%
Restricted funds ($/student)	$1,613	$2,932	-45.00%	$3,083	-47.69%
Total ($/student)	$8,444	$11,377	-25.78%	$8,736	-3.34%

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
Salary ($/certificated staff)	$77,990	$72,493	7.58%	$72,020	8.29%
Benefits ($/certificated staff)	$16,310	$15,725	3.72%	$15,548	4.90%
Total ($/certificated staff)	$94,300	$88,217	6.89%	$87,568	7.69%

* 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 more-detailed information than the School Accountability Report Card as well as data that covers a period of more than one year. It presents the facts and statistics in tables without narrative text.

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	356
Black/African American	10%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3%
Asian	3%
Filipino	5%
Hispanic or Latino	17%
Pacific Islander	0%
White (not Hispanic)	60%
Two or more races	1%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	N/A
English Learners	3%
Students with disabilities	11%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CBEDS, October 2009. 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	75
Grade 1	65
Grade 2	70
Grade 3	50
Grade 4	50
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: CBEDS, October 2009.

Average Class Size by Grade Level

GRADE LEVEL	2007–2008	2008–2009	2009–2010
Kindergarten	22	20	25
Grade 1	21	20	26
Grade 2	17	21	29
Grade 3	19	21	25
Grade 4	34	26	26
Grade 5	31	27	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	23
Combined 3–4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 4–8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2009. Information
for 2009-2010 provided by the school district.

Average Class Size by Grade Level, Detail

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

GRADE LEVEL	2007–2008			2008–2009			2009–2010		
	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+
Kindergarten	0	5	0	4	0	0	0	3	0
Grade 1	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	2	0
Grade 2	4	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	0
Grade 3	4	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	0
Grade 4	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	2	0
Grade 5	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	0
Grade 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Combined K–3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Combined 3–4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Combined 4–8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2009. Information for 2009-2010 provided by the school district.

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.

	SCHOOL			DISTRICT
TEACHERS	**2007–2008**	**2008–2009**	**2009–2010**	**2009–2010**
With full credential	20	20	N/A	N/A
Without full credential	1	0	N/A	N/A

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.

	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING HEALTHY FITNESS ZONES		
GRADE LEVEL	**FOUR OF SIX STANDARDS**	**FIVE OF SIX STANDARDS**	**SIX OF SIX STANDARDS**
Grade 5	18%	36%	22%
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Physical fitness test data is produced annually as schools test their students on the six Fitnessgram Standards. This information was the most recent available, for the 2008–2009 school year. Data is reported by Educational Data Systems.

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.

During the 2009–2010 school year, we had ten 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.

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Suspensions per 100 students			
2009–2010	3	2	6
2008–2009	3	2	5
2007–2008	4	7	6
Expulsions per 100 students			
2009–2010	0	0	0
2008–2009	0	0	0
2007–2008	0	0	0

SOURCE: Data is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file. Data represents the number of incidents reported, not the number of students involved. District and state averages represent elementary schools only.

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.

	SCHOOL PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			DISTRICT PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			STATE PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
SUBJECT	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
English/ language arts	62%	66%	61%	54%	58%	59%	46%	50%	52%
Mathematics	70%	73%	67%	56%	59%	59%	43%	46%	48%
Science	67%	60%	75%	57%	57%	69%	46%	50%	54%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2010 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.

	STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
STUDENT GROUP	**ENGLISH/ LANGUAGE ARTS 2009–2010**	**MATHEMATICS 2009–2010**	**SCIENCE 2009–2010**
African American	35%	55%	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	66%	69%	N/A
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	61%	66%	75%
Two or more Races	N/A	N/A	N/A
Boys	58%	68%	65%
Girls	65%	66%	93%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students with disabilities	52%	61%	N/A
Receives migrant education services	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2010 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

<div style="background:blue;color:white;text-align:center">ACCOUNTABILITY</div>

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	2007–2008	2008–2009	2009–2010
Statewide rank	9	8	8
Similar-schools rank	10	9	9

SOURCE: The API Base Report from December 2010.

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.

	ACTUAL API CHANGE			API
SUBGROUP	2007–2008	2008–2009	2009–2010	2009–2010
All students at the school	-8	+11	+9	858
Black/African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	-26	+35	+8	849
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	+0	+10	N/A	N/A
English Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in December 2010.

API Scores by Subgroup

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

SUBGROUP	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	STATE
All students	858	823	767
Black/African American	N/A	N/A	686
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	728
Asian	N/A	N/A	890
Filipino	N/A	N/A	851
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	813	715
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	753
White (non Hispanic)	849	832	838
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	712
English Learners	N/A	N/A	692
Students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	580
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	807

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in December 2010.

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 680 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	Yes
Percent Proficient in mathematics	No
Met Academic Performance Index (API)	Yes

SOURCE: The AYP Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in December 2010.

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	0
Percentage of schools currently in PI	0%

SOURCE: The Program Improvement Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in
December 2010.

According to the CDE's SARC Data Definitions, "State certification/release dates for fiscal data occur in middle to late spring, precluding the inclusion of 2009–10 data in most cases. Therefore, 2008–09 data are used for report cards prepared during 2010–11."

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

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	OUR DISTRICT	SIMILAR DISTRICTS	ALL DISTRICTS
FISCAL YEAR 2008–2009			
Total expenses	$12,990,219	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	$11,160	$8,275	$8,736
FISCAL YEAR 2007–2008			
Total expenses	$14,274,363	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	$11,577	$8,267	$8,594

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

District Salaries, 2008–2009

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2008–2009 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	$37,565	$41,154
Midrange teacher's salary	$68,070	$63,517
Highest-paid teacher's salary	$80,284	$80,951
Average principal's salary (elementary school)	$117,490	$102,080
Superintendent's salary	$141,206	$150,626
Percentage of budget for teachers' salaries	37%	41%
Percentage of budget for administrators' salaries	8%	6%

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