An annual report to the community about teaching, learning, test results, resources, and measures of progress in our school.
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 2008–2009 school year, not the current school year. In most cases, this is the most recent data available. We present our school’s results next to those of the average middle school in the county and state to provide the most meaningful and fair comparisons. To find additional facts about our school online, please use the DataQuest tool offered by the California Department of Education.

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:


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, please contact the school office.

How to Contact Our School
4725 Rosemont Ave.
La Crescenta, CA 91214
Principal: Dr. Michele Doll
Phone: (818) 248-4224

How to Contact Our District
223 North Jackson St.
Glendale, CA 91206
Phone: (818) 241-3111
http://gusd.net/
Principal’s Message

Rosemont Middle School is well known as a high-performing school and has established itself as a school that meets the needs of students academically and emotionally. The school for the sixth time in 2006/2007 was recognized as a California Distinguished School. Students, parents, teachers, staff, and administration work together to ensure that the school exemplifies its motto: Honor, Excellence and Pride.

Dr. Michele Doll, principal
School Expenditures

A combination of state and federal funding is used to cover all aspects of our instructional program. Strong PTA and school foundation support is evident in many of our schools’ supplemental activities. All Glendale Unified schools benefit from the support of the Glendale Educational Foundation, which offers enhanced programs in visual and performing arts, science and technology, and health and fitness.

Safety

Staff and parent volunteers monitor the school grounds before and after school, at recesses, and during lunch time. Teachers regularly review the rules for safe, responsible behavior. We have a fully fenced, closed campus. Visitors must enter the school through the main door and sign in at the front desk in the office. They are given a visitor’s badge and required to wear it while on campus.

We revise our School Safety Plan annually; it was revised and approved by our School Site Council in January of 2009. The plan includes procedures for emergencies, exit routes, and inventories of emergency supplies. We make the plan available on our school Web site (www.rosemontweb.org) and in the school office. We share the plan with all staff during a school wide staff meeting. We practice fire drills each month and earthquake drills three times a year, plus we hold workshops for staff on emergency preparedness annually.

Buildings

Rosemont was originally constructed in 1954 and recently underwent a major renovation. We upgraded the main building, made the campus fully accessible for the handicapped, retrofitted it for earthquakes, installed computer and technology access, installed new plumbing and electricity, and built a new six-classroom building. There are three large outside athletic areas plus a gymnasium.

The facility is maintained by two custodians during the day and five and a half custodians at night. It is immaculate and is the pride of the community. Every classroom is cleaned daily and rest rooms are sanitized. The students, staff, and custodial crew keep the campus free from litter. Ongoing maintenance is prompt and efficient, and the grounds are maintained weekly.

Parent Involvement

Parents are active members of our School Site Council, which works with administration to help make financial decisions. Parents of English learners are vital to our ELAC and are active participants in our workshops to build parenting skills that support their children’s learning. Parents chaperone on field trips and dances, hold bake sales, work in the library, volunteer to supervise at lunch and snack, maintain our Web site, publish our monthly parent newsletter, and support teachers in a variety ways. The PTA sponsors parent-information workshops and supports student learning through field trips and assemblies. We ask all parents to attend Back-to-School Night in the fall and Open House in the spring. We always need new volunteers!
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. A school’s API determines whether it receives recognition or sanctions. 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.

Rosemont’s API was 917 (out of 1000). This is an increase of 5 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.

API RANKINGS: Based on our 2007–2008 test results, we started the 2008–2009 school year with a base API of 912. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared with all middle schools in California, our school ranked 10 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 2008–2009 school year. Just for reference, 50 percent of middle schools statewide met their growth targets.

API, Spring 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT SUBGRUP</th>
<th>API 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Other</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: API based on spring 2009 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of December 2009.

*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

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 different goals: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

We met all 25 criteria for yearly progress. As a result, we succeeded at making AYP.

To meet AYP, middle schools must meet three criteria. First, a certain percentage of students must score at or above Proficient levels on the California Standards Tests (CST): 46 percent on the English/language arts test and 47.5 percent on the math test. All ethnic and socioeconomic subgroups of students also must meet these goals. Second, the schools must achieve an API of at least 650 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.

Adequate Yearly Progress, Detail by Subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MET GOAL</th>
<th>DID NOT MEET GOAL</th>
<th>NOT ENOUGH STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>Did 95% of students take the CST?</td>
<td>Did 46% of students score proficient or advanced on the CST?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Did 95% of students take the CST?</td>
<td>Did 47.5% of students score proficient or advanced on the CST?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2008–2009 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.
Here you'll find a three-year summary of our students’ scores on the California Standards Tests (CST) in selected subjects. We compare our students’ test scores with the results for students in the average middle school in California. On the following pages we provide more detail for each test, including the scores for different subgroups of students. In addition, we provide links to the California Content Standards on which these tests are based. If you’d like more information about the CST, please contact our principal or our teaching staff. To find grade-level-specific scores, you can refer to the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Web site. Other tests in the STAR program can be found on the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site.

**California Standards Tests**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOW SCORES</td>
<td>HIGH SCORES</td>
<td>LOW SCORES</td>
<td>HIGH SCORES</td>
<td>LOW SCORES</td>
<td>HIGH SCORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Proficient or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average middle school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Proficient or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATH (excluding algebra)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Proficient or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average middle school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Proficient or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALGEBRA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Proficient or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average middle school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Proficient or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISTORY/SOCIAL SCIENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Proficient or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average middle school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Proficient or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCIENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Proficient or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average middle school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Proficient or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** The scores for the CST are from the spring 2009 test cycle. State average represents middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.
Frequently Asked Questions About Standardized Tests

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

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

HOW HARD ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS? Experts consider California’s standards to be among the most clear and rigorous in the country. Just 53 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 59 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)
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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.

SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE

SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 31 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California.

AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY

AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA

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

GROUP LOW SCORES HIGH SCORES PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED STUDENTS TESTED COMMENTS

SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE

AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY

AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA

Subgroup Test Scores

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):
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- PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED

GROUP LOW SCORES HIGH SCORES PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED STUDENTS TESTED COMMENTS

Boys

Girls

English proficient

English Learners

Low income

Not low income

Learning disabled

Not learning disabled

Asian American

Filipino

Hispanic/Latino

White/Other

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2009 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.

N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.

N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.
Rosemont Middle School School Accountability Report Card for 2008–2009

Math (Excluding Algebra)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>LOW SCORES</th>
<th>HIGH SCORES</th>
<th>PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED</th>
<th>STUDENTS TESTED</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subgroup Test Scores

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>LOW SCORES</th>
<th>HIGH SCORES</th>
<th>PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED</th>
<th>STUDENTS TESTED</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English proficient</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not low income</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disabled</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not learning disabled</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Other</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2009 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores. N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade. N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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

You can read the math standards on the CDE’s Web site.
Algebra I
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>LOW SCORES</th>
<th>HIGH SCORES</th>
<th>PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED</th>
<th>STUDENTS TESTED</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE: About 54 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average middle school in California. About six percent fewer students took algebra than did students in the average middle school in the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subgroup Test Scores
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>LOW SCORES</th>
<th>HIGH SCORES</th>
<th>PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED</th>
<th>STUDENTS TESTED</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>GENDER: The same percentage of boys and girls at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English proficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from English Learners tested was too small to be statistically significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>INCOME: We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from low/income families was too small to be statistically significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not low income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disabled</td>
<td>NO DATA AVAILABLE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not learning disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2009 test cycle. County and state averages represent middle schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores. N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy, the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade. N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

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

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

About 24 percent of our seventh and eighth grade students took the algebra CST, compared with 30 percent of all middle school students statewide. You can review the math standards on the CDE’s Web site.
The graph to the right shows how our eighth grade students' scores have changed over the years. We present each year's results in a vertical bar, with students' scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that progress can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

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

Although we teach science at all grade levels, only our eighth graders took the California Standards Test in this subject. You can read the science standards on the CDE’s Web site.
### Students’ English Language Skills

At Rosemont, 91 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared with 81 percent of middle school students in California overall.

### Languages Spoken at Home by English Learners

Please note that this table describes the home languages of just the 124 students classified as English Learners. At Rosemont, the language these students most often speak at home is Korean. 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.

### Ethnicity

Most students at Rosemont identify themselves as White/European American/Other. 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.

### Family Income and Education

The **free or reduced-price meal** subsidy goes to students whose families earned less than $39,220 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2008–2009 school year. At Rosemont, 11 percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 55 percent of students in California.

The parents of 82 percent of the students at Rosemont have attended college and 65 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 92 percent of our students provided this information.
Average Class Sizes

The table at the right shows average class sizes for core courses. The average class size of all courses at Rosemont varies from a low of 27 students to a high of 31. Our average class size schoolwide is 31 students. The average class size for middle schools in the state is 27 students.

Discipline

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 2008–2009 school year, we had 240 suspension incidents. We had four 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.
### LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF

#### Teacher Experience and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY FACTOR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>OUR SCHOOL</th>
<th>COUNTY AVERAGE</th>
<th>STATE AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td>Average years of teaching experience</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newer teachers</td>
<td>Percentage of teachers with one or two years of teaching experience</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers holding an MA degree or higher</td>
<td>Percentage of teachers with an MA or higher from a graduate school</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers holding a BA degree alone</td>
<td>Percentage of teachers whose highest degree is a BA degree from a four-year college</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF), October 2008, completed by teachers during the CBEDS census. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

About four percent of our teachers have fewer than three years of teaching experience, which is below the average for new teachers in other middle schools in California. Our teachers have, on average, 14 years of experience. About 54 percent of our teachers hold only a bachelor’s degree from a four-year college or university. About 46 percent have completed a master’s degree or higher.

#### Credentials Held by Our Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY FACTOR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>OUR SCHOOL</th>
<th>COUNTY AVERAGE</th>
<th>STATE AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully credentialed teachers</td>
<td>Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee credential holders</td>
<td>Percentage of staff holding an internship credential</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency permit holders</td>
<td>Percentage of staff holding an emergency permit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers with waivers</td>
<td>Lowest level of accreditation, used by districts when they have no other option</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** PAIF, October 2008. This is completed by teachers during the CBEDS census. County and state averages represent middle schools only. A teacher may have earned more than one credential. For this reason, it is likely that the sum of all credentials will exceed 100 percent.

About 96 percent of the faculty at Rosemont hold a full credential. This number is close to the average for all middle schools in the state. About four percent of the faculty at Rosemont hold a trainee credential, which is reserved for those teachers who are in the process of completing their teacher training. In comparison, four percent of middle school teachers throughout the state hold trainee credentials. None of our faculty holds an emergency permit. Very few middle school teachers hold this authorization statewide (just two percent). All of the faculty at Rosemont hold the secondary (single-subject) credential. This number is above the average for middle schools in California, which is 82 percent. You can find three years of data about teachers’ credentials in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.
"HIGHLY QUALIFIED" TEACHERS: The federal law known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requires districts to report the number of teachers considered to be “highly qualified.” These “highly qualified” teachers must have a full credential, a bachelor’s degree, and, if they are teaching a core subject (such as reading, math, science, or social studies), they must also demonstrate expertise in that field. The table above shows the percentage of core courses taught by teachers who are considered to be less than “highly qualified.” There are exceptions, known as the High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) rules, that allow some veteran teachers to meet the “highly qualified” test who wouldn’t otherwise do so.

TEACHING OUT OF FIELD: When a teacher lacks a subject area authorization for a course she is teaching, that course is counted as out-of-field. The students who take that course are also counted. For example, if an unexpected vacancy in a biology class occurs, and a teacher who normally teaches English literature (and who lacks a subject area authorization in science) fills in to teach for the rest of the year, that teacher would be teaching out of field. See the detail for algebra and science in the Out-of-Field Teaching table. About 31 percent of our core courses were taught by teachers who were teaching out of their field of expertise, compared with 30 percent of core courses taught by such middle school teachers statewide.

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. About four percent of our teachers were working without full credentials, compared with five percent of teachers in middle schools statewide.
Out-of-Field Teaching, Detail by Selected Subject Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE COURSE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>OUR SCHOOL</th>
<th>COUNTY AVERAGE</th>
<th>STATE AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algebra</td>
<td>Percentage of algebra courses taught by a teacher lacking the appropriate subject area authorization</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Percentage of science courses taught by a teacher lacking the appropriate subject area authorization</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: PAIF, October 2008. This is completed by teachers during the CBEDS census. County and state averages represent middle schools only.

In this more detailed analysis, you’ll find the percentage of algebra courses taught by teachers who lack subject-area authorization in math. While algebra teachers in some middle schools might not formally be required to hold this math subject-area authorization, it is better if they do. We have applied the same criteria to science courses taught at all middle school grade levels. Note that school board policy determines which grade levels are secondary grade levels and require teachers to hold a secondary (single-subject) credential, and which are primary grade levels requiring an elementary (multiple-subject) credential.

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.

The CDE has divided schools in the state into four groups (quartiles), based on the percentage of families who qualify and apply for free or reduced-price lunches. The one-fourth of schools with the most students receiving subsidized lunches are assigned to the first group. The one-fourth of schools with the fewest students receiving subsidized lunches are assigned to the fourth group. We compare the courses and teachers assigned to each of these groups of schools to see how they differ in “highly qualified” teacher assignments.

The average percentage of courses in our district not taught by a “highly qualified” teacher is six percent, compared with one percent statewide. For schools with the highest percentage of low-income students, this factor is 13 percent, compared with zero percent statewide. For schools with the lowest percentage of low-income students, this factor is five percent, compared with zero 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 state wide ratios of counselors, psychologists, or other pupil services staff to students, see the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site. Library facts and frequently asked questions are also available there.

ACADEMIC GUIDANCE COUNSELORS: Our school has five full-time equivalent academic counselors, which is equivalent to one counselor for every 306 students. Just for reference, California districts employed about one academic counselor for every 608 middle school students in the state. More information about counseling and student support is available on the CDE Web site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF POSITION</th>
<th>STAFF (FTE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologists</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/language/hearing specialists</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource specialists</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY: All data is the most current available as of December 2009. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2008–2009 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 2008 census); Language Census (March 2009); California Achievement Test and California Standards Tests (spring 2009 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (September 2009 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (September 2009).

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

Here you’ll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2009–2010. Please note that these facts are based on evaluations our staff conducted in accordance with the Williams legislation.

This section also contains information about 2008–2009 staff development days, and, for high schools, percentages of seniors who met our district’s graduation requirements.
Teacher Vacancies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of classes at the start of the year</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classes which lacked a permanently assigned teacher within the first 20 days of school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classes where the permanently assigned teacher left during the year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Misassignments</td>
<td>Total number of classes taught by teachers without a legally recognized certificate or credential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Misassignments in Classes that Include English Learners</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Employee Misassignments</td>
<td>Total number of service area placements of employees without the required credentials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008–2009</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2008</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–2007</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 11/30/2009.

**NOTES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Taught at Our School?</th>
<th>Standards Aligned?</th>
<th>Officially Adopted?</th>
<th>For Use in Class?</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Having Books to Take Home?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual/Performing Arts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Textbooks in Use
Here are some of the textbooks we use for our core courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT AND TITLE</th>
<th>PUBLISHER</th>
<th>YEAR ADOPTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Language of Literature</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math, Course 2</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra Readiness</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCIENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Life Science</td>
<td>Prentice Hall</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Physical Science</td>
<td>Prentice Hall</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL SCIENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History: Medieval to Early Modern Times</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating America: Beginnings to WW I</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 01/04/2010 by Richard Carroll. The most recent facilities inspection occurred on 02/27/2009.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Systems</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gas</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mechanical/HVAC</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sewer</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Interior Surfaces</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Interior Surfaces</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cleanliness</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall cleanliness</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pest/Vermin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Electrical Components</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Electrical Components</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Restrooms/Fountains</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Restrooms</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Drinking Fountains</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Safety</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Fire Safety</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>RATING</td>
<td>REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Structural</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Structural Damage</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Roofs/Gutters</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. External</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Playgrounds/School Grounds</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No apparent problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOOL FINANCES, 2007–2008

We are required to report financial data from the 2007–2008 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 2007-2008 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:

\[
\frac{\text{SCHOOL AMOUNT} - \text{DISTRICT AVERAGE}}{\text{DISTRICT AVERAGE}}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF FUNDS</th>
<th>OUR SCHOOL</th>
<th>DISTRICT AVERAGE</th>
<th>SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE</th>
<th>STATE AVERAGE</th>
<th>SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted funds ($/student)</td>
<td>$4,424.00</td>
<td>$5,492.00</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>$5,495</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted funds ($/student)</td>
<td>$233.00</td>
<td>$3,411.00</td>
<td>932%</td>
<td>$3,099</td>
<td>924%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ($/student)</td>
<td>$4,656.00</td>
<td>$8,903.00</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$8,594</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compensation per Teacher

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTIFICATED STAFF*</th>
<th>OUR SCHOOL</th>
<th>DISTRICT AVERAGE</th>
<th>SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE</th>
<th>STATE AVERAGE</th>
<th>SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary ($/certificated staff)</td>
<td>$63,642.00</td>
<td>$68,293.00</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$72,020</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits ($/certificated staff)</td>
<td>$19,583.00</td>
<td>$21,115.00</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$15,548</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ($/certificated staff)</td>
<td>$83,225.00</td>
<td>$89,408.00</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$87,568</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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.

Glendale Unified School District
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>ENROLLMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>1,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not Hispanic)</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple or no response</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically disadvantaged</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CBEDS, October 2008. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE LEVEL</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Average Class Size by Core Course
The average class size by core courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Average Class Size by Core Course, Detail
The number of classrooms that fall into each range of class sizes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1–22</td>
<td>23–32</td>
<td>33+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Credentials

The number of teachers assigned to the school with a full credential and without a full credential, for both our school and the district. We also present three years’ of data about the number of teachers who lacked the appropriate subject-area authorization for one or more classes they taught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Full Credential</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Full Credential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching out of field</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: CBEDS, October 2008, Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF) section.

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 below 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE LEVEL</th>
<th>FOUR OF SIX STANDARDS</th>
<th>FIVE OF SIX STANDARDS</th>
<th>SIX OF SIX STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Physical fitness test data is produced annually as schools test their students on the six Fitnessgram Standards. Data is reported by Educational Data Systems.
STUDENT PERFORMANCE

California Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

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

STAR Test Results for All Students: Three-Year Comparison

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>SCHOOL PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED</th>
<th>DISTRICT PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED</th>
<th>STATE PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/language arts</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/social science</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: California Standards Tests (CST) results, spring 2009 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not Hispanic)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students receiving migrant education services</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: California Standards Tests (CST) results, spring 2009 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.
NAEP: California’s 4th and 8th Graders Compared to Students Nationally

Federal education officials want parents to understand how their state’s students compare to students nationally. For this purpose, they created the test called the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). It is sometimes called the Nation’s Report Card. Students in grades four, eight, and twelve take this test in nine subject areas. The NAEP test results are not valid for schools or districts. For that reason, you only see results below for students statewide.

Reading and Math Results

This table shows the average NAEP score (scores range from zero to 500) for the state and the nation, and the percentage of California students grouped into each of three achievement levels (Basic, Proficient, and Advanced). We compare our state’s fourth and eighth graders with their peers in the U.S. in reading and math.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT AND GRADE LEVEL</th>
<th>AVERAGE SCALE SCORE</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF CA STUDENTS AT EACH ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>NATIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 2007, Grade 4</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 2007, Grade 8</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics 2007, Grade 4</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics 2007, Grade 8</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Participation Rates for Students with Disabilities and English Learners

This table shows the percentage of the nation’s and California’s students with disabilities and English Learners who took the test called the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT AND GRADE LEVEL</th>
<th>STATE PARTICIPATION RATE</th>
<th>NATIONAL PARTICIPATION RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES</td>
<td>ENGLISH LEARNERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 2007, Grade 4</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 2007, Grade 8</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics 2007, Grade 4</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics 2007, Grade 8</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

For further information, you can read what the California Department of Education says about the differences between the California Standards Tests and the National Assessment of Educational Progress. The NAEP Web site includes background information for parents about the Nation’s Report Card. Educators can learn more by going to the NAEP Web site.
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/](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/).

**API Ranks: Three-Year Comparison**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide rank</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar-schools rank</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBGROUP</th>
<th>ACTUAL API CHANGE</th>
<th>API</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students at the school</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>+25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (non Hispanic)</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 590 or growth of at least one point

AYP for the District

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYP CRITERIA</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate in English/language arts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate in mathematics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Proficient in English/language arts</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Proficient in mathematics</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Academic Performance Index (API)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI stage</td>
<td>Not in PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The year the district entered PI</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools currently in PI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of schools currently in PI</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISTRICT EXPENDITURES**

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 2008–09 data in most cases. Therefore, 2007–08 data are used for report cards prepared during 2009–10.”

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY OF EXPENSE</th>
<th>OUR DISTRICT</th>
<th>SIMILAR DISTRICTS</th>
<th>ALL DISTRICTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FISCAL YEAR 2007–2008</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses</td>
<td>$225,716,392</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses per student</td>
<td>$8,270</td>
<td>$8,680</td>
<td>$8,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FISCAL YEAR 2006–2007</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses</td>
<td>$208,246,634</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses per student</td>
<td>$7,548</td>
<td>$8,193</td>
<td>$8,117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

**District Salaries, 2007–2008**

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2007–2008 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SALARY INFORMATION</th>
<th>DISTRICT AVERAGE</th>
<th>STATE AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning teacher's salary</td>
<td>$42,451</td>
<td>$42,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midrange teacher's salary</td>
<td>$65,170</td>
<td>$67,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest-paid teacher's salary</td>
<td>$88,157</td>
<td>$86,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average principal's salary (middle school)</td>
<td>$118,692</td>
<td>$112,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent's salary</td>
<td>$245,220</td>
<td>$216,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of budget for teachers' salaries</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of budget for administrators' salaries</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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