

# ANNUAL REPORT TO OUR COMMUNITY\*ANNUAL REPORT

## BIJOU – 2009-10

### OUR SCHOOL

Bijou Community School attendance boundaries encompass the areas between Stateline and the “Y” of South Lake Tahoe. Our student body is composed of 494 Hispanic, White, Filipino, Black, and Asian students. We serve grades kindergarten through fifth and also have a state preschool and a Head Start program on campus. Additional support services and interventions for our students are provided through out Reading Intervention program, NeverStreaming for our SDC students, intensive ESL, speech and language, and RSP. English Language Development programs are provided for all English Language Learners. Primary language support is also provided for many of our Limited English Proficient students. “Preppie” kindergarten classes have been added to our programs providing the “Gift of Time” for some kindergarten students. The majority of our parents are employed by the gaming and tourist industry and work a variety of shifts in this 24-hour community.

Low-income housing projects are located nearby, and many of our students reside there. Next door is a government-supported child care center, serving a number of our students both before and after school. Many of our student body attend the South Tahoe Boys and Girls Club housed on site.

Bijou Community School is a community-oriented school. On site is the Family Resource Center, a grant-funded multiservice center for our local community. The Family Resource Center offers an extensive array of services ranging from those provided by the El Dorado County Health Department to parenting classes sponsored by other community agencies. Lake Tahoe Community College provides an off-campus site for evening adult credit and non-credit ESL classes.

Our mission is to provide and teach a rigorous academic curriculum and improve student achievement, to be accepting of each other and to become self-reliant in order to become well-rounded world citizens.

Our school was awarded QEIA (Quality Education Investment Act) dollars beginning in September 2007. With the dollars received this year, a Reading Intervention teacher was hired, a 4<sup>th</sup> grade teacher was hired, and intensive professional development has been provided.

In September 2007, Bijou Community School implemented a Two Way Immersion (TWI) program. The program expanded in 2009 with an additional class. The classes are composed of ten English speakers and ten Spanish speaking

students. The mission of the TWI program is to prepare kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade students to attain high academic achievement in Spanish and English and become bilingual, bi-literate and develop positive cross-cultural attitudes.

### SUPPORT SERVICES

Bijou has been assigned a district-funded psychologist for two and a half days a week, who also does bilingual assessments district-wide. The majority of the psychologist’s time is spent assessing students for academic placement; however, there is also time for counseling of students and parents. The English Learner Coordinator provides additional support services for staff and students.

We have one day of district nursing time available for our students. The district nurse works on an as-needed basis when a crisis arises, coordinates hearing and vision screenings, and serves as a resource in the area of health. We have two speech and language specialists who provide services for our students.

### INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

The district has established a regular procedure for review of current district curricula and resources; selection and piloting of new materials; adoption of textbooks and related materials; and an ongoing monitoring program for use of adopted materials. These steps are carried out for each curricular area, paralleling the state textbook adoption cycle. Each step takes about a year to complete depending on curricular area, and care is taken in the selection process to ensure the highest quality possible. Different steps of the cycle will be occurring at the same time for different curricular areas. We have adopted materials in both language arts and math in the 2003 and 2008 school years.

Increasing technological resources and student access to resources is an integral part of our program. We have trained all teachers and some of our classified employees in the use of technology for multimedia approaches to instruction. Every K-2 class has three Waterford Early Reading Program computers. Bijou has two laptop carts for use with the Read Naturally and FASTT Math programs.

\*Y-H-ZC3300 RCO 0H-TROPMA FACZZA\*Y-H-ZC3300 RCO 0H-TROPMA FACZZA\*Y-H-ZC3300 RCO 0H-TROPMA FACZZA

H-OH-00E2-H-Y-ZC3300 RCO 0H-TROPMA FACZZA\*Y-H-ZC3300 RCO 0H-TROPMA FACZZA\*Y-H-ZC3300 RCO 0H-TROPMA FACZZA

# CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT

A Site Leadership Governance team meets monthly to analyze and improve programs and curriculum in English Language Arts, Math, and English Language Development. Training continues to be provided in computer literacy, English Language Development, Language Arts, Math, and other curricular areas.

# INSTRUCTION

Bijou’s instructional program is fully aligned to the State Frameworks in the core curricular areas.

Bijou School has two major focus areas in assessment. We have strategically analyzed past performance in the STAR testing and have collaboratively revised instruction to include required areas of learning. Secondly, we have site-based ongoing assessments at each grade level. Every six weeks grade level teachers collaborate, reviewing Language Arts assessment data, goals are developed, and teaching strategies are designed to meet these goals. Program revisions and interventions are determined from the student progress reported. Continual progress school wide and for our numerically significant subgroups has been an ongoing focus.

We are fortunate to provide a bilingual and English Immersion program with primary language support, ESL pullout, NeverStreaming/Special Day Class, an RSP program, literacy intervention, and Title I services. We continue to develop and support our Language Arts and Math intervention programs. Staff from our special education programs work closely with general education staff to meet the needs of all students. Program staff meets together on a regular basis to plan, coordinate and monitor student progress. Most students move to a less restrictive environment as their educational goals are met. Many special needs students are mainstreamed in regular classes for part of their day as applicable.

All students, parents and staff are treated equitably. Our staff and administration have an increased awareness of the special needs of our students and parents, making equal treatment and access to all educational programs of the utmost importance.

# LEARNING CLIMATE

Creating a positive learning environment is critical to student success. Monthly Good Citizen Awards assemblies are held to honor students for academic and behavioral achievements. There is a focus on different aspects of various cultures for our multi-cultural student body.

Students are taught to be proud of their individual abilities and heritage, and to respect each other.

Almost all staff has received training in Classroom Management. Students are taught to be self-disciplined and independent learners. This method supports all district discipline policies and creates a smooth flowing, effective learning environment.

In 2008-09, the suspension rate was 2.1% and the expulsion rate was 0. In 2007-08, the suspension rate was 1.2% and the expulsion rate was 0. In 2006-07, the rate of suspensions 2.9% and the expulsion rate 0.

The site Safe School Committee meets every trimester to address concerns and issues. Monthly drills are conducted on site.

Questions regarding the information presented in this report may be directed to your principal, Karen Gillis-Tinlin at (530) 543-2337.

Statistical data regarding student performance, teachers, school facilities, textbooks, class size and enrollment, and school finances may be found on the following pages.

# STUDENT PERFORMANCE

## Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

The Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program consists of several key components, including the California Standards Tests (CSTs); the California Modified Assessment (CMA), and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). The CSTs show how well students are doing in relation to the state content standards. The CSTs include English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics in grades two through eleven; science in grades five, eight, and nine through eleven; and history-social science in grades eight, and ten through eleven. The CAPA includes ELA, mathematics, and science in grades two through eleven, and for science for grades five, eight, and ten. The CAPA is given to those students with significant cognitive disabilities whose disabilities prevent them from taking either the CSTs with accommodations or modifications or the CMA with accommodations. The CMA includes ELA and mathematics for grades three through eight and science in grade five and is an alternate assessment that is based on modified achievement standards. The CMA is designed to assess those students whose disabilities preclude them from achieving grade-level proficiency on an assessment of the California content standards with or without accommodations. Student scores are reported as performance levels. Detailed information regarding the STAR Program results for each grade and performance level, including the percent of students not tested, can be found on the CDE [Standardized Testing and Reporting \(STAR\) Results](#) Web site. Program information regarding the STAR Program can be found in the [Explaining 2008 STAR Program Summary Results to the Public guide](#). Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

## Standardized Testing and Reporting Results for All Students – Three-Year Comparison

This table displays the percent of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards).

Subject	School			District			State		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
English-Language Arts	22	23	29	45	45	50	43	46	50
Mathematics	25	30	44	38	42	49	40	43	46
Science	15	10	15	48	50	54	38	46	50
History-Social Science	0	0	0	27	26	34	33	36	41

*Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or less because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or privacy protection. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.*

## Standardized Testing and Reporting Results by Student Group (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays the percent of students, by group, achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards) for the most recent testing period.

Group	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced			
	English-Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	History-Social Science
African American	*	*	*	
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*		
Filipino	*	*	*	
Hispanic or Latino	24	38	10	
Pacific Islander				
White (not Hispanic)	51	63	31	
Male	25	45	23	
Female	34	42	3	
Economically Disadvantaged	25	42	11	
English Learners	20	37	9	
Students with Disabilities	27	41	33	

Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is 10 or less because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or privacy protection. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

## California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2008-09)

The California Physical Fitness Test is administered to students in grades five, seven, and nine only. This table displays by grade level the percent of students meeting fitness standards for the most recent testing period. Detailed information regarding this test, and comparisons of a school's test results to the district and state levels, may be found on the CDE [Physical Fitness Testing \(PFT\)](#) Web page. Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or privacy protection. In no case shall any group score be reported that would deliberately or inadvertently make public the score or performance of any individual student.

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Healthy Fitness Zones		
	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards
5	16.9	32.3	27.7

## National Assessment of Educational Progress

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

Note: Only a sample group of California's schools and districts participate in the NAEP testing cycle. Therefore, students in any particular school or district may not be included in these results. The NAEP reflects state test results and is not reflective of either the LEA or the individual school. Comparisons of student performance on the NAEP and student performance on the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program assessments cannot be made without an understanding of the key differences between the two assessment programs. For example, the NAEP only assesses grades four, eight and twelve and for long-term trends assesses grades nine, thirteen, and seventeen. Additionally, the NAEP only provides state test results for grades four and eight. The California Standards Tests (CSTs) are based on a different set of standards than the NAEP assessments. For example, the NAEP is not aligned with California academic content and achievement standards and, therefore, does not necessarily reflect the curriculum and instruction to which students are exposed in the classroom. The NAEP assesses reading and writing separately, while the CSTs assess English-language arts (ELA), encompassing reading as well as writing conventions, spelling, and grammar. Scores on the CSTs and other assessments are not directly comparable to those on NAEP. The averages and percentages presented are estimates based on samples of students rather than on entire populations. Finally, the questions students respond to are only a sample of the knowledge and skills covered by the NAEP frameworks. Information on the differences between NAEP and CST can be found on the CDE [National Assessment of Educational Progress \(NAEP\)](#) Web page.

## National Assessment of Educational Progress Reading and Mathematics Results by Grade Level – Aggregated

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

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

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

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

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

## ACCOUNTABILITY

### Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of the academic performance and progress of schools in California. API scores range from 200 to 1,000, with a statewide target of 800. Detailed information about the API can be found on the [CDE Academic Performance Index \(API\) Web page](#).

### Academic Performance Index Ranks – Three-Year Comparison

This table displays the school's statewide and similar schools API ranks. The statewide API rank ranges from one to ten. A statewide rank of one means that the school has an API score in the lowest ten percent of all schools in the state, while a statewide rank of ten means that the school has an API score in the highest ten percent of all schools in the state. The similar schools API rank reflects how a school compares to 100 statistically matched "similar schools." A similar schools rank of one means that the school's academic performance is comparable to the lowest performing ten schools of the 100 similar schools, while a similar schools rank of ten means that the school's academic performance is better than at least 90 of the 100 similar schools.

API Rank	2006	2007	2008
Statewide	1	1	1
Similar Schools	1	1	1

"N/A" means a number is not applicable or not available due to missing data.

"B" means this is either an LEA or an Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) school. Schools participating in the ASAM do not currently receive growth, target information, or statewide or similar schools rankings on this report in recognition of their markedly different educational missions and populations served. ASAM schools are covered under the Alternative Accountability system as required by Education Code Section 52052 and not the API accountability system. However, API information is needed to comply with the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law. Growth, target and rank information are not applicable to LEAs.

"C" means this is a special education school. Statewide and similar schools ranks are not applicable to special education schools.

" \* " means this API is calculated for a small school or a small LEA, defined as having between 11 and 99 valid STAR Program test scores included in the API. APIs based on small numbers of students are less reliable and therefore should be carefully interpreted. Similar schools ranks are not calculated for small schools.

### Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group – Three-Year Comparison

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

Group	Actual API Change			Growth API Score
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009
All Students at the School	-26	10	64	689
Hispanic or Latino	-34	11	76	667
White (not Hispanic)	28			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-25	20	59	679
English Learners	-27	4	75	647
Students with Disabilities		-25	157	656

"N/A" means a number is not applicable or not available due to missing data.

\*\*\* means this API is calculated for a small school, defined as having between 11 and 99 valid Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program test scores included in the API. The API is asterisked if the school was small either in 2008 or 2009. APIs based on small numbers of students are less reliable and therefore should be carefully interpreted.

## Adequate Yearly Progress

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

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

Detailed information about AYP, including participation rates and percent proficient results by student group, can be found on the CDE [Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\) Web page](#).

## Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2008-09)

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

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

"Yes" Met 2009 AYP Criteria

"No" Did not Meet 2009 AYP Criteria

## Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2009-10)

Schools and 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 (ELA or mathematics) or on the same indicator (API or graduation rate). After entering PI, schools and districts advance to the next level of intervention with each additional year that they do not make AYP. Detailed information about PI identification can be found on the CDE [Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\) Web page](#).

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status	In PI	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement	2003-2004	2007-2008
Year in Program Improvement	Year 5	Year 3
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	5
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	62.5

## FACILITIES AND SAFETY

Site custodians maintain our school in a clean and safe condition. A Modernization Project in September 2000 provided significant changes to our core building facilities. During the project some of the existing teaching/learning workspaces were revised. Our design allowed the staff to better adapt the space available to the changes in our site programs, especially in our intervention programs and in adult workspace. The Modernization Project completely reconditioned our restrooms, floors, walls, plumbing, electrical, and data delivery systems.

Our site takes pride in keeping the buildings and grounds free of litter and graffiti. All efforts to ensure building safety, cleanliness, and orderliness are carefully monitored to assist in the promotion of a safe and positive learning environment. The school is well maintained, clean and safe and provides a positive atmosphere for learning to take place. Regular school safety, evacuation, shelter-in-place, and lockdown drills reinforce our safety preparedness procedures that are reviewed with all students and staff. Campus supervision is provided by teachers and classified personnel.

The unit ventilators/fan coils in the classrooms are in good working condition and will remain. They were replaced in the 2000 modernization project. The hot water heaters are in good condition. A new control system is recommended at new buildings. Electrical power and natural gas service does not have the capacity to accommodate for expansion or new loads. Areas that have been modernized have upgraded to T8 lighting. Fire alarm and PA/intercom/master clock system is recommended to be upgraded with future expansion.

The site houses 13 relocatable classrooms, some 19 years of age that would benefit from replacement with a permanent classroom facility in the future. Implementation of the Two-way Bilingual Immersion Program has created a need for six additional classrooms. Since the site has only two kindergarten rooms that meet state classroom size requirements, the District would like to construct six new kindergarten rooms and convert two existing kindergarten spaces into a new library center to accommodate the 500 students. In addition, provide internal connection to the existing building, construct a new 20-foot wide fire access lane, and develop hard-court area for kindergarten students. Improve circulation for safety for students who ride the bus and students who walk to school which includes curbs and gutters.

### School Facility Good Repair Status (School Year 2009-10)

This table displays the results of the most recently completed school site inspection to determine the school facility's good repair status.

Item Inspected	Repair Status				Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor	
<b>Systems:</b> Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	✓				
<b>Interior:</b> Interior Surfaces		✓			
<b>Cleanliness:</b> Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	✓				
<b>Electrical:</b> Electrical	✓				
<b>Restrooms/Fountains:</b> Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains		✓			
<b>Safety:</b> Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	✓				
<b>Structural:</b> Structural Damage, Roofs		✓			
<b>External:</b> Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences		✓			
<b>Overall Rating</b>		✓			

# TEACHERS

## Teacher Credentials

This table displays the number of teachers assigned to the school with a full credential, without a full credential, and those teaching outside of their subject area of competence. Detailed information about teacher qualifications can be found on the CDE [DataQuest](#) Web page.

Teachers	School			District
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09
With Full Credential	31	30	31	207
Without Full Credential	0	1	0	4
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	--	--	--	N/A

## Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

This table displays the number of teacher misassignments (teachers assigned without proper legal authorization) and the number of vacant teacher positions (not filled by a single designated teacher assigned to teach the entire course at the beginning of the school year or semester). Note: Total Teacher Misassignments includes the number of Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners.

Indicator	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

## Core Academic Classes Taught by No Child Left Behind Compliant Teachers (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays the percent of classes in core academic subjects taught by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) compliant and non-NCLB compliant teachers in the school, in all schools in the district, in high-poverty schools in the district, and in low-poverty schools in the district. High poverty schools are defined as those schools with student participation of approximately 75 percent or more in the free and reduced price meals program. Low poverty schools are those with student participation of approximately 25 percent or less in the free and reduced price meals program. More information on teacher qualifications required under NCLB can be found on the CDE [Improving Teacher and Principal Quality](#) Web page.

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by NCLB Compliant Teachers	Taught by Non-NCLB Compliant Teachers
This School	100.0	0.0
All Schools in District	97.0	3.0
High-Poverty Schools in District	100.0	0.0
Low-Poverty Schools in District	94.1	5.9

# CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

## Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2009-10)

This table displays information about the quality, currency, and availability of the standards-aligned textbooks and other instructional materials used at the school, and information about the school's use of any supplemental curriculum or non-adopted textbooks or instructional materials.

Core Curriculum Area	Quality, Currency, and Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials	Percent of Pupils Who Lack Their Own Assigned Textbooks and Instructional Materials
Reading/Language Arts	Houghton Mifflin (2003), grades 1-5, ratio 1:1; Big Books (K-1).	0
Mathematics	MacMillan/McGraw-Hill: California Triumphs and Intervention (2008/09): K-2 workbooks; Grades 3-5, ratio 1:1.	0
Science	McMillan/McGraw Hill (2007/08); California Science: K-1: one Big Book set per class; grade 2: ratio 1:1 or one Big Book set per class; grades 3-5: ratio 1:1.	0
History-Social Science	McMillan/McGraw Hill (2006-07); K-2: one Big Book set per class; grades 3-5: ratio 1:1.	0
Health	Included in Science	Included in Science
Visual and Performing Arts	Instrumental Music – grades 4-6: Standards of Excellence Comprehensive Band Method Book 1; Mueller Rausch String Method, Book 1. Instrumental Music –grades 6-8: Standards of Excellence Comprehensive Band Method Book 2 and 3; Essentials of Music Theory, Alfred Books 1-3; Mueller Rausch String Method, Books 1-3. All Levels: Various band and orchestral arrangements of band and orchestral literature.	NA

## CLASS SIZE AND ENROLLMENT

### Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)

This table displays by grade level the average class size and the number of classrooms that fall into each size category (a range of total students per classroom).

Grade Level	2006-07			2007-08			2008-09					
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms		
		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+
K	19.5	4	2		19.7	6			20.3	5	1	
1	19.3	3			19.8	4			19.6	5		
2	18.2	5			19.5	4			19.5	4		
3	19.0	3			19.8	4			18.3	4		
4	23.5	1	3		22.3		3		21.0		4	
5	27.3		3		23.7		3		22.3		3	
K-3	18.0	1										

### Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays the number of students enrolled in each grade level at the school.

Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	122
Grade 1	98
Grade 2	78
Grade 3	74
Grade 4	85
Grade 5	67
Total Enrollment	524

### Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2008-09)

This table displays the percent of students enrolled at the school who are identified as being in a particular group.

Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
African American	0.95 %
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.19 %
Filipino	1.53 %
Hispanic or Latino	75.38 %
White (not Hispanic)	18.51 %
Multiple or No Response	3.44 %
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	93.00 %
English Learners	69.00 %
Students with Disabilities	18.00 %

## SCHOOL FINANCES

Transportation is provided for 80% of our students. We have a bilingual school psychologist and PIP aide.

### Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2007-08)

This table displays a comparison of the school's per pupil expenditures from unrestricted (basic) sources with other schools in the district and throughout the state, and a comparison of the average teacher salary at the school site with average teacher salaries at the district and state levels. Detailed information regarding school expenditures can be found on the CDE [Current Expense of Education & Per-pupil Spending](#) Web page and teacher salaries can be found on the CDE [Certificated Salaries & Benefits](#) Web page.

Level	Total Expenditures Per Pupil	Expenditures Per Pupil (Supplemental / Restricted)	Expenditures Per Pupil (Basic / Unrestricted)	Average Teacher Salary
School Site	\$10,363	\$3,582	\$6,781	\$66,365
District	\$9,280	\$2,961	\$6,319	\$65,238
Percent Difference – School Site and District	12%	21%	7%	2%
State	N/A	N/A	\$5,512	\$60,994
Percent Difference – School Site and State	N/A	N/A	23%	9%

### Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2007-08)

This table displays district salaries for teachers, principals, and superintendents, and compares these figures to the state averages for districts of the same type and size. The table also displays teacher and administrative salaries as a percent of a district's budget, and compares these figures to the state averages for districts of the same type and size based on the salary schedule. Detailed information regarding salaries may be found on the CDE [Certificated Salaries & Benefits](#) Web page.

Category	District Amount	State Average For Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$39,803	\$38,941
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$60,829	\$59,686
Highest Teacher Salary	\$84,772	\$77,828
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	\$112,141	\$94,258
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$117,762	\$98,271
Average Principal Salary (High)	\$107,069	\$104,869
Superintendent Salary	\$159,973	\$142,247
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	41.30 %	38.20 %
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	4.60 %	5.90 %