# Lake Mathews Elementary School School Accountability Report Card Reported Using Data from the 2014-15 School Year Published During 2015-16

By February 1 of each year, every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC). The SARC contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school. Under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) all local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to prepare a Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP), which describes how they intend to meet annual school-specific goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities. Additionally, data reported in an LCAP is to be consistent with data reported in the SARC.

- For more information about SARC requirements, see the California Department of Education (CDE) SARC Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/.
- For more information about the LCFF or LCAP, see the CDE LCFF Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/.
- For additional information about the school, parents/guardians and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.

#### **DataQuest**

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE DataQuest Web page at http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district, the county, and the state. Specifically, DataQuest is a dynamic system that provides reports for accountability (e.g., test data, enrollment, high school graduates, dropouts, course enrollments, staffing, and data regarding English learners.

#### **Internet Access**

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

# **About This School**

#### **Contact Information (Most Recent Year)**

School Contact Info	School Contact Information				
School Name	Lake Mathews Elementary School				
Street	12252 Blackburn Road				
City, State, Zip	Riverside, CA 92503-7083				
Phone Number	951-352-5520 ext.43550				
Principal	Pamela Williams				
E-mail Address	pwilliams@rusd.k12.ca.us				
Web Site	rusd.k12.ca.us (Schools, Lake Mathews)				
<b>Grades Served</b>	K-6				
CDS Code	33-67215-0100545				

District Contact Info	District Contact Information				
District Name	Riverside Unified				
Phone Number	(951) 788-7135				
Superintendent	David C. Hansen, Ed.D.				
E-mail Address	dchansen@rusd.k12.ca.us				
Web Site	www.rusd.k12.ca.us				

#### School Description and Mission Statement (Most Recent Year)

Lake Mathews Elementary School is a professional learning community with high expectations for all of its members. We are committed to implementing best practices in instruction so students attain the goal of being proficient or advanced in all academic areas according to common core standards. Students have demonstrated excellence in their achievement as shown by the state API of 918 and attainment of all AYP goals. The school is one of nine schools in Riverside County to be ranked in the top 10 percent of the state .In 2014-15, Lake Mathews was one of 33 schools in the state to be nominated to apply for 2015 National Blue Ribbon status as an Exemplary High Performing School.

## Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2014-15)

Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	119
Grade 1	130
Grade 2	127
Grade 3	124
Grade 4	135
Grade 5	139
Grade 6	133
Total Enrollment	907

# Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2014-15)

Student Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	4.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2
Asian	9.4
Filipino	5.2
Hispanic or Latino	27.3
White	47.4
Two or More Races	4.3
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	29.1
English Learners	6.7
Students with Disabilities	7.3
Foster Youth	0.1

# A. Conditions of Learning

## **State Priority: Basic**

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Basic State Priority (Priority 1):

- Degree to which teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject area and for the pupils they are teaching;
- Pupils have access to standards-aligned instructional materials; and
- School facilities are maintained in good repair.

#### **Teacher Credentials**

		District		
Teachers	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2015-16
With Full Credential	33	36	36	1855
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	1
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence (with full credential)	0	0	0	0

#### **Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions**

Indicator	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments *	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

Note: "Misassignments" refers to the number of positions filled by teachers who lack legal authorization to teach that grade level, subject area, student group, etc.

#### Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (School Year 2014-15)

	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects					
Location of Classes	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers				
This School	100.0	0.0				
All Schools in District	93.6	6.4				
High-Poverty Schools in District	93.3	6.7				
Low-Poverty Schools in District	95.0	5.0				

Note: High-poverty schools are defined as those schools with student eligibility of approximately 40 percent or more in the free and reduced price meals program. Low-poverty schools are those with student eligibility of approximately 39 percent or less in the free and reduced price meals program.

## Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2015-16)

Year and month in which data were collected: 10/2015

Materials Sufficiency Board Meeting Date: October 5, 2015

The table displays information collected in October 5, 2015 about the quality, currency, and availability of the standards-aligned textbooks and other instructional materials used at the school. It was determined that each RUSD school had sufficient and good quality textbooks, instructional materials, or science lab equipment, where appropriate, pursuant to the settlement of Williams vs. the State of California. All students, including English learners, are given their own individual standards-aligned textbooks or instructional materials, or both, in core subjects for use in the classroom and to take home. Textbooks and supplementary materials are adopted according to a 6-year cycle developed by the California Department of Education, making the textbooks used in the school the most current available. Materials approved for use by the State are reviewed by all teachers and a recommendation is made to the School Board by a selection committee composed of teachers and administrators. All recommended materials are available for parent examination at the district office prior to adoption.

Riverside Unified School District adopts instructional materials on a regular schedule based on State adoptions. All students receive appropriate, up-to-date instructional materials for use in the classroom and at home. All materials currently in use have been

<sup>\*</sup> Total Teacher Misassignments includes the number of Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners.

selected by the staff with parent input, and approved by the Board of Education according to state adoption requirements. Teachers are provided training in the use of new materials.

Comprehensive curriculum (ELA, Math, Science, History-Social Science) Pearson: Opening the World of Learning (OWL) adopted in 2015.

Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy	
Reading/Language Arts	Macmillan McGraw-Hill: California Treasures, K-2 (Adopted in 2013) Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy, 3-6 (Adopted in 2002) Scholastic - Read 180/System 44 (Adopted in 2010)	Yes	0%	
Mathematics	Pearson Education: enVision Math California Common Core 2015, K-6	Yes	0%	
Science	McGraw Hill: California Science, K-6 (Adopted in 2007)	Yes	0%	
History-Social Science	Harcourt: Reflections, K-6 (Adopted in 2006)	Yes	0%	
Foreign Language	N/A		N/A	
Health	N/A		N/A	
Visual and Performing Arts	Elementary Music Program and Standards-based Arts Lessons	Yes	0%	
Science Laboratory Equipment (grades 9-12)	N/A		N/A	

#### School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

Year Constructed: 2003 Lot Size: 10 acres

25 Permanent Classrooms

10 Portables

Resource/Psychologist Room Speech & Language Room Library and Multi-Purpose Room Indoor and Outdoor Cafeteria Completely Air Conditioned

"Riverside Unified School District maintains both 5 and 15 year major maintenance plans for all schools. These plans are located at the District's Maintenance and Operations Office and are available for review."

Riverside Unified School District has instituted a formal school facility inspection system based on State of California School Facility Condition Criteria. The State criteria consist of 13 building components typically found in school facilities. Lake Mathews Elementary School completed their school site inspection on 03/26/2016.

Lake Mathews has a full time and a part-time custodial staff who along with other district personnel maintain the grounds and facilities.

Riverside Unified School District has allocated funds for the sole purpose of school maintenance pursuant to Education Code sections 17002(d), 17014, 17032.5, 17070.75(a), and 17089(b). The information below displays the number of individual maintenance work orders completed in the last 12 months and the assessed value of the work completed.

# of Work Orders = 390 Labor Hours = 1,115.84 Assessed Value of Work = \$48,064.96

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year) Year and month in which data were collected: 03/23/2016						
Contain language	Repair Status			Repair Needed and		
System Inspected	Good Fair Poor		Poor	Action Taken or Planned		
<b>Systems:</b> Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	X					
Interior: Interior Surfaces	Х					
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	Х					
Electrical: Electrical	Х					
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	Х					
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	Х					
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	Х					
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	Х					

# **Overall Facility Rating (Most Recent Year)**

Year and month in which data were collected: 03/23/2016								
	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor				
Overall Rating	Х							

# **B. Pupil Outcomes**

# **State Priority: Pupil Achievement**

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Pupil Achievement (Priority 4):

- Statewide assessments (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress [CAASPP], Science California Standards Tests); and
- The percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and the California State University, or career technical education sequences or programs of study

#### California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress Results for All Students (School Year 2014-15)

Subject	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standards (grades 3-8 and 11)				
	School	School District			
English Language Arts/Literacy	63	43	44		
Mathematics	56	33	33		

Note: Percentages are not calculated 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.

## **CAASPP Assessment Results - English Language Arts (ELA)**

Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven (School Year 2014-15)

Disaggregated by Student Groups, C		Number o			Percent of Students				
Student Group	Grade	Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Not Met	Standard Nearly Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded	
All Students	3	126	124	98.4	20	26	21	33	
	4	138	137	99.3	17	12	33	39	
	5	139	136	97.8	24	16	36	24	
	6	139	138	99.3	9	27	43	20	
Male	3		58	46.0	29	21	24	26	
	4		69	50.0	20	14	35	30	
	5		69	49.6	28	10	43	19	
	6		77	55.4	13	27	42	18	
Female	3		66	52.4	12	30	18	39	
	4		68	49.3	13	9	31	47	
	5		67	48.2	19	22	28	30	
	6		61	43.9	5	26	46	23	
Black or African American	3		7	5.6					
	4		4	2.9					
	5		8	5.8					
	6		7	5.0					
American Indian or Alaska Native	4		1	0.7					
	6		1	0.7					
Asian	3		14	11.1	14	29	14	43	
	4		13	9.4	15	15	31	38	
	5		15	10.8	7	13	47	33	
	6		9	6.5					
Filipino	3		7	5.6					
	4		10	7.2					
	5		8	5.8					
	6		7	5.0					
Hispanic or Latino	3		32	25.4	22	34	13	31	
	4		35	25.4	17	17	40	26	
	5		40	28.8	35	20	28	18	

		Number o	f Students		Pei	cent of Stude	nts	
Student Group	Grade	Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Not Met	Standard Nearly Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	6		42	30.2	17	19	43	21
White	3		58	46.0	22	22	26	29
	4		67	48.6	16	9	28	46
	5		55	39.6	25	15	35	25
	6		65	46.8	9	26	45	20
Two or More Races	3		5	4.0				
	4		3	2.2				
	5		5	3.6				
	6		5	3.6				
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	3		33	26.2	30	30	21	18
	4		39	28.3	18	21	26	36
	5		43	30.9	44	12	28	16
	6		52	37.4	13	33	44	10
Students with Disabilities	3		9	7.1				
	4		10	7.2				
	5		15	10.8	87	0	7	7
	6		13	9.4	46	31	23	0
Foster Youth	3							
	4							
	5							
	6							

Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Note: The number of students tested includes students that did not receive a score; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using students with scores.

## **CAASPP Assessment Results - Mathematics**

Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven (School Year 2014-15)

		Number o	f Students		Per	cent of Stude	nts	
Student Group	Grade	Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Not Met	Standard Nearly Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
All Students	3	126	124	98.4	14	22	35	29
	4	138	137	99.3	7	30	34	30
	5	139	136	97.8	29	30	18	24
	6	139	138	99.3	14	30	25	30
Male	3		58	46.0	16	21	33	31
	4		69	50.0	10	23	35	32
	5		69	49.6	19	39	20	22
	6		77	55.4	19	27	21	32
Female	3		66	52.4	12	23	38	27

		Number of Students			Per	cent of Stude	nts	
Student Group	Grade	Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard	Standard	Standard	Standard
		Linonea	resteu	resteu	Not Met	Nearly Met	Met	Exceeded
	4		68	49.3	3	37	32	28
	5		67	48.2	39	21	15	25
	6		61	43.9	8	33	31	28
Black or African American	3		7	5.6				
	4		4	2.9				
	5		8	5.8				
	6		7	5.0				
American Indian or Alaska Native	4		1	0.7				
	6		1	0.7				
Asian	3		14	11.1	7	14	36	43
	4		13	9.4	0	15	46	38
	5		15	10.8	7	20	33	40
	6		9	6.5				
Filipino	3		7	5.6				
	4		10	7.2				
	5		8	5.8				
	6		7	5.0				
Hispanic or Latino	3		32	25.4	16	34	25	25
	4		35	25.4	11	34	43	11
	5		40	28.8	35	45	8	13
	6		42	30.2	21	26	24	29
White	3		58	46.0	14	17	38	31
	4		67	48.6	4	34	25	36
	5		55	39.6	27	22	22	29
	6		65	46.8	15	22	31	32
Two or More Races	3		5	4.0				
	4		3	2.2				
	5		5	3.6				
	6		5	3.6				
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	3		33	26.2	21	30	33	15
	4		39	28.3	8	23	49	21
	5		43	30.9	40	35	12	14
	6		52	37.4	21	35	27	17
Students with Disabilities	3		9	7.1				
	4		10	7.2				
	5		15	10.8	80	7	13	0
	6		13	9.4	62	23	15	0

		Number of Students		Percent of Students					
Student Group	Grade	Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Not Met	Standard Nearly Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded	
Foster Youth	3								
	4								
	5								
	6								

Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Note: The number of students tested includes students that did not receive a score; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using students with scores.

# California Standards Tests for All Students in Science (Three-Year Comparison)

		Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)									
Subject		School		District			State				
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15		
Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)	78	78	78	56	60	58	59	60	56		

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.

#### California Standards Tests Results by Student Group in Science (School Year 2014-15)

Student Group	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced
All Students in the LEA	58
All Students at the School	78
Male	82
Female	73
Black or African American	
Asian	86
Filipino	
Hispanic or Latino	67
White	84
Two or More Races	
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	
English Learners	
Students with Disabilities	62
Foster Youth	

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.

#### California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2014-15)

Grade	Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards								
Level	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards						
5	15.30	24.10	46.70						

Note: Percentages are not calculated 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.

# C. Engagement

## **State Priority: Parental Involvement**

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Parental Involvement State Priority (Priority 3):

Efforts the school district makes to seek parent input in making decisions for the school district and each schoolsite.

#### **Opportunities for Parental Involvement (Most Recent Year)**

Parent involvement is encouraged and valued at Lake Mathews School. Parents are involved through assisting in classrooms, joining our Parent Teacher Association, serving on School Site Council (SSC), serving on the English Learners Advisory Committee (ELAC) and participating in many special projects which enrich our school program, such as jog-a-thon, book fair, carnival, basket auctions, field trips, Bobcats Bolts running club, and family activity nights such as those at local restaurants and the local skating rink.

Parents are encouraged to attend all parent meetings, parent workshops and are welcomed volunteers in their child's classroom. All parents are encouraged to take an active role in their child's education through homework and ongoing communication with the school in person, through phone calls, and with e-mail. Our success is due, in large part, to the outstanding parental support and involvement in our students' learning. Parents may contact Mrs. Nicole DeAnda, PTA President at 951-352-5520 and leave a message for more information about volunteer opportunities or contact Pamela Williams, principal, at 951-352-5520 ext. 43550.

#### **State Priority: School Climate**

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the School Climate State Priority (Priority 6):

- Pupil suspension rates;
- · Pupil expulsion rates; and
- Other local measures on the sense of safety.

#### **Suspensions and Expulsions**

Doto		School			District		State		
Rate	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Suspensions	0.68	0.54	1.04	4.82	4.50	4.37	5.07	4.36	3.80
Expulsions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.18	0.22	0.13	0.10	0.09

# **School Safety Plan (Most Recent Year)**

The School Site Council or its delegate is responsible for the development and updating of the school's Comprehensive Safety Plan. A Site Comprehensive Safety Plan Checklist is provided by the Assistant Superintendent of Operations to give guidance on what should be included in the School's Safety Plan. The Safety Plan is discussed with staff, evaluated, amended/reviewed/updated by March 1 of each year. The school's safety committee makes monthly safety inspections. A school Disaster Preparedness Plan that deals with a wide variety of emergency situations is incorporated into the School Safety Plan. Earthquakes, fire, and lockdown drills are conducted as required. The key elements of the Comprehensive School Safety Plan include an assessment of current status of school crime; provisions of any schoolwide dress code including the definition of "gang related apparel"; safe movement of pupils, parents and school employees to and from school; strategies in maintaining a safe and orderly school environment; child abuse reporting procedures; disaster procedures, routine and emergency; policies related to suspensions, expulsion or mandatory expulsion and other school designated serious acts which would lead to suspension or expulsion, notification to teachers, anti-bullying policy and school discipline rules and procedures pursuant to EC 35291 and EC 35291.5. The school also has an assigned School Resource Officer (SRO).

# **D. Other SARC Information**

The information in this section is required to be in the SARC but is not included in the state priorities for LCFF.

# Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2014-15)

AYP Criteria	School	District	State
Made AYP Overall	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Participation Rate: English-Language Arts	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Participation Rate: Mathematics	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient: English-Language Arts	N/A	N/A	N/A
Met Percent Proficient: Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
Met Attendance Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met Graduation Rate	N/A	Yes	Yes

## Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2015-16)

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status		In PI
First Year of Program Improvement		2007-2008
Year in Program Improvement*		Year 3
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	22
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	73.3

Note: Cells with N/A values do not require data.

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

		201	2-13	,	,,	2013-14			2014-15			
Grade	Avg.	Avg. Number of Classes		Avg.	Nun	ber of Cla	sses	Avg.	Avg. Number of Classes			
Level	Class Size	1-20	21-32	33+	Class Size	1-20	21-32	33+	Class Size	1-20	21-32	33+
К	28		4		27		5		24		5	
1	32		4		26		4		26		5	
2	32		4		27		5		28		4	
3	30		4		28		5		28		5	
4	33		2	2	34			4	31		4	
5	28		4		31		4		29		5	
6	33			3	30		4		33		1	3
Other									5	1		

Note: Number of classes indicates how many classes fall into each size category (a range of total students per class).

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2014-15)

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor	0	0
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	0	N/A
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	0	N/A
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0.8	N/A
Psychologist	0.4	N/A
Social Worker	0	N/A
Nurse	0.23	N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	1	N/A
Resource Specialist	1	N/A
Other	0	N/A

Note: Cells with N/A values do not require data. One Full Time Equivalent (FTE) equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time.

#### Expenditures per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2013-14)

	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average
Level	Total	Supplemental/ Restricted	Basic/ Unrestricted	Teacher Salary
School Site	4,533	416	4,117	76,360
District	N/A	N/A	\$4,709	\$79,035
Percent Difference: School Site and District	N/A	N/A	-12.6	-3.4
State	N/A	N/A	\$5,348	\$72,971
Percent Difference: School Site and State	N/A	N/A	-23.0	4.6

Note: Cells with N/A values do not require data.

#### Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2014-15)

Lake Matthews Elementary School received the following Categorical Program/Supplemental funds which can be used to provide the following services:

\$20,664 Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF): for increased or improved services for Low Income Students, English Learners, or Foster Youth for site goals in alignment with the RUSD Local Control Accountability Plan

## Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2013-14)

Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$49,695	\$43,165
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$73,295	\$68,574
Highest Teacher Salary	\$95,855	\$89,146
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	\$119,572	\$111,129
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$126,482	\$116,569
Average Principal Salary (High)	\$137,354	\$127,448
Superintendent Salary	\$239,574	\$234,382
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	41%	38%
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	6%	5%

For detailed information on salaries, see the CDE Certificated Salaries & Benefits Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/.

#### **Professional Development (Most Recent Three Years)**

During the 2013-14 school year, all staff members at Lake Mathews have participated in staff development training. Many staff members participated in other professional growth opportunities sponsored by the school, district, or through special projects that were appropriate for their individual needs. The major topics covered during the workshops were:

- 1. Developing Grade Level Common Assessments and Interventions.
- 2. Student Data Analysis and its use in planning focused instruction.
- 3. Strategies to improve writing and the use of common graphic organizers
- 4. G.A.T.E. Training.
- 5. BTSA Support for new teachers.
- 6. Training to support mathematical achievement.
- 7. K-2 Institute training for all K-2nd grade teachers
- 8. Training for Instructional Technology.
- 9. Training in the Student Success Team (SST) process.
- 10. Training in Multi-tiered Intervention Strategies

Through staff training, the faculty currently has 100% of the teachers with CLAD certificates and 61% of the teachers with GATE certificates or in training for the certificate.

Professional development needs are evaluated each year and the school plan reflects the focus for implementing the training.