

University Heights Middle 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 Information	
School Name	University Heights Middle School
Street	1155 Massachusetts Avenue
City, State, Zip	Riverside, CA 92507-2897
Phone Number	(951) 788-7388
Principal	Coleman Kells
E-mail Address	ckells@rusd.k12.ca.us
Web Site	www.rusdlink.org/uni
Grades Served	7-8
CDS Code	33-67215-6059158

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)

University Heights Middle School is a 7-8 school with approximately 850 total students. We have a variety of activities and clubs to ensure that students have an opportunity to do what they do best each and every day at University. At UHMS, we strive to ensure not only academic success, but also outstanding character for all of our students. We have a strong character education program built into our Common Core State Standards aligned curriculum to ensure that all students have the tools they need to be successful here and when they leave to go to high school.

At University Middle School, we will inspire students to take advantage of life's opportunities in a global society by preparing them academically. We believe this is best accomplished when students influence the pace, pathways, purpose, and assessment of their learning.

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

Grade Level	Number of Students
Grade 7	432
Grade 8	392
Total Enrollment	824

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2014-15)

Student Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	9.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2
Asian	1.7
Filipino	0.6
Hispanic or Latino	77.3
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.4
White	8.7
Two or More Races	1
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	86.7
English Learners	21.2
Students with Disabilities	14.8
Foster Youth	0.8

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

Teachers	School			District
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2015-16
With Full Credential	37	39	39	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	1	1	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.

* Total Teacher Misassignments includes the number of Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners.

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

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
This School	98.8	1.2
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 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.

Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
Reading/Language Arts	Language Arts 7 (Adopted in 2002): Holt Literature and Language Arts, Course 1; Holt, Rinehart & Winston Supplemental: Holt Handbook, Course 1 ; Holt, Rinehart & Winston Language Arts 8 (Adopted in 2002): Holt Literature and Language Arts, Course 2; Holt, Rinehart & Winston Supplemental: Holt Handbook, Course 2; Holt, Rinehart & Winston Language! (Adopted in 2002) ELD 1, 2, 3 (Adopted in 2009) Scholastic: READ 180/ System 44, Intensive Reading Intervention Program, Adopted September, 2010	Yes	0%
Mathematics	Introduction to Algebra / Introduction to Algebra Concepts (Adopted in 2008) California Mathematics Course 2 – Pre-Algebra; Holt, Rinehart & Winston Pre-Algebra 8 / Pre-Algebra 8 Concepts (Adopted in 2008) California Algebra Readiness – Volumes 1-4; Holt, Rinehart & Winston Algebra 1 / Algebra 1 Concepts / Algebra 1B (Adopted in 2008) California Algebra 1; Holt, Rinehart & Winston Geometry (Adopted in 2008) California Geometry; Holt, Rinehart & Winston	Yes	0%
Science	Life Science, Grade 7 (Adopted in 2007) Life Science; Holt Reinhart & Winston Physical Science, Grade 8 (Adopted in 2007) Focus on Physical Science; McDougal Littell	Yes	0%
History-Social Science	World History, Grade 7 (Adopted in 2006) World History: Medieval to Modern Times: Holt CA Social Studies; Holt, Reinhart & Winston United States History, Grade 8 (Adopted in 2006) United States History: Independence to 1914: Holt CA Social Studies; Holt, Reinhart & Winston	Yes	0%
Foreign Language	Spanish 1 (Adopted in 2004): Ven Conmigo! Holt Spanish Level 1, Holt Reinhart & Winston Pre-AP Spanish (Adopted 2009) Ven Conmigo! Nuevas Vistas Uno; Holt Reinhart & Winston.	Yes	0%

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

Year Constructed: 1972
 Last Modernized: 2006
 Lot Size: 18.4 Acres
 22 Permanent Classrooms
 21 Portable Classrooms
 Completely Air Conditioned
 Library
 Computer Lab
 Outdoor Cafeteria
 School Multi-Purpose Room

“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. University Middle School completed their school site inspection on 02/09/15.

University has a plant supervisor 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 = 562
 Labor Hours = 1,650.37
 Assessed Value of Work = \$78,857.84

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year) Year and month in which data were collected: 02/09/15				
System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	X			
Interior: Interior Surfaces			X	Stained ceiling tiles. Graffiti inside handicap stall. Holes on the north wall. Two large holes in wall in the toilet area. large cracks in ceiling. Plate that secures the carpet is missing, front door entry way.
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/Vermin Infestation	X			
Electrical: Electrical			X	sets of burned out lights,
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/Fountains	X			
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	X			
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	X			

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year) Year and month in which data were collected: 02/09/15				
System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	X			

Overall Facility Rating (Most Recent Year)

Year and month in which data were collected: 02/09/15				
Overall Rating	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
	X			

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	District	State
English Language Arts/Literacy	23	43	44
Mathematics	12	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)

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students				
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Not Met	Standard Nearly Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
All Students	7	424	415	97.9	44	31	22	2
	8	381	369	96.9	41	36	19	3
Male	7		196	46.2	49	30	18	3
	8		170	44.6	48	34	15	2
Female	7		219	51.7	39	32	26	2
	8		199	52.2	36	39	22	3
Black or African American	7		35	8.3	49	23	26	3
	8		38	10.0	47	39	13	0
American Indian or Alaska Native	8		1	0.3	--	--	--	--
Asian	7		7	1.7	--	--	--	--
	8		4	1.0	--	--	--	--

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students				
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Not Met	Standard Nearly Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
Filipino	7		2	0.5	--	--	--	--
	8		2	0.5	--	--	--	--
Hispanic or Latino	7		323	76.2	46	32	20	1
	8		287	75.3	41	37	19	2
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	7		3	0.7	--	--	--	--
	8		1	0.3	--	--	--	--
White	7		36	8.5	22	31	36	11
	8		33	8.7	36	27	27	9
Two or More Races	7		4	0.9	--	--	--	--
	8		1	0.3	--	--	--	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	7		366	86.3	45	33	20	1
	8		324	85.0	44	36	18	2
Students with Disabilities	7		42	9.9	86	10	5	0
	8		50	13.1	74	22	2	2
Foster Youth	7		--	--	--	--	--	--
	8		--	--	--	--	--	--

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)

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students				
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Not Met	Standard Nearly Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
All Students	7	424	413	97.4	56	31	9	3
	8	381	369	96.9	61	27	8	3
Male	7		196	46.2	56	29	11	4
	8		171	44.9	62	25	11	2
Female	7		217	51.2	57	32	8	3
	8		198	52.0	60	29	7	4
Black or African American	7		35	8.3	69	29	3	0
	8		38	10.0	68	29	3	0
American Indian or Alaska Native	8		1	0.3	--	--	--	--
Asian	7		7	1.7	--	--	--	--
	8		4	1.0	--	--	--	--
Filipino	7		2	0.5	--	--	--	--

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students				
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Not Met	Standard Nearly Met	Standard Met	Standard Exceeded
	8		2	0.5	--	--	--	--
Hispanic or Latino	7		321	75.7	59	29	9	2
	8		287	75.3	61	26	10	3
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	7		3	0.7	--	--	--	--
	8		1	0.3	--	--	--	--
White	7		36	8.5	33	39	19	8
	8		33	8.7	55	33	6	6
Two or More Races	7		4	0.9	--	--	--	--
	8		1	0.3	--	--	--	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	7		364	85.8	59	29	8	3
	8		324	85.0	64	26	7	2
Students with Disabilities	7		42	9.9	90	7	0	0
	8		50	13.1	88	6	4	0
Foster Youth	7		--	--	--	--	--	--
	8		--	--	--	--	--	--

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)

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	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)	51	37	39	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	39
Male	43
Female	34
Black or African American	27
American Indian or Alaska Native	--
Asian	--
Filipino	--
Hispanic or Latino	37
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	--
White	60
Two or More Races	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	12
English Learners	10
Students with Disabilities	35
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 Level	Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards
7	17.70	22.30	17.90

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)

The parental involvement contact at this school is Mr. Coleman Kells, principal, and can be contacted at 951-788-7388.

Because we are a professional learning community, we are committed to the belief that parent involvement is a vital component to student success. So, we encourage involvement in our PTA, School Site Council, and English Learner Advisory Committee. Because increasing parent and community participation has been a focus at University Heights, our parent involvement has continued to increase significantly. Each year parent participation in our school-wide programs, such as our Back-to-School Night and Open House has increased. These evenings provide parents with critical information they need regarding our school-wide academic focus and student expectations for learning. It is with parent involvement in mind that University Heights continues to host its annual Family Fun Night. This is a night when parents and community members come to Uni to indulge in free food and fun. Because we realize the importance of parent support, we encourage our parents to visit our campus at any time.

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

Rate	School			District			State		
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Suspensions	13.03	13.69	12.31	4.82	4.50	4.37	5.07	4.36	3.80
Expulsions	0.30	0.22	1.22	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	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	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 (Secondary)

Subject	2012-13				2013-14				2014-15			
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classrooms		
		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+		1-22	23-32	33+
English	19	29	10	5	18	26	12	8	16	43	7	6
Mathematics	25	9	23	4	23	17	14	4	21	20	11	7
Science	29	6	5	17	30	5	1	20	28	6	4	19
Social Science	28	5	14	10	30	5	4	18	28	6	6	17

Note: Number of classes indicates how many classrooms fall into each size category (a range of total students per classroom). At the secondary school level, this information is reported by subject area rather than grade level.

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	2	0
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	0	N/A
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	0	N/A
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0.9	N/A
Psychologist	0.4	N/A
Social Worker	0	N/A
Nurse	0.25	N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	0	N/A
Resource Specialist	2	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)

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Supplemental/Restricted	Basic/Unrestricted	
School Site	6,832	1,997	4,835	72,775
District	N/A	N/A	\$4,709	\$79,035
Percent Difference: School Site and District	N/A	N/A	2.7	-7.9
State	N/A	N/A	\$5,348	\$72,971
Percent Difference: School Site and State	N/A	N/A	-9.6	-0.3

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

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2014-15)

University Heights Middle School received the following Categorical Program/Supplemental funds which can be used to provide the following services:

\$94,758 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

\$211,765 Title I: supplemental services and materials to assist students at risk of not meeting state academic standards

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)

UNI's school site leadership team met at the beginning of the 2012-13 school year to provide input regarding site staff development/training needs. Prior to developing a site staff development plan, the leadership team first considered pertinent academic assessment data, International Baccalaureate/Middle Years' requirements for candidate schools, research-based best instructional practices, district requirements, and the specific needs of our teachers. With this in mind, our 2012-2013 site staff development plan consisted of the following:

- Continued focus on integrating student use of technology
- 24/7 instruction and learning
- International Baccalaureate/Middle Years' staff development focusing on inquiry-based learning
- Authorized International Baccalaureate/Middle Years' teacher trainings - Level 2
- Development of IB units using the IB/Middle Years' Unit Planner
- Continued focus on increasing academic rigor, checking for students' understanding at increasing levels of rigor and student use of academic language

UNI's school site leadership team identified key areas for professional development for the 2014-2015 school year. These topics were selected based on data from department common assessments, screening measures, and other data such as discipline and attendance. Throughout the year, these topics will be addressed through on campus PD provided by University staff members and district personnel, off campus conferences and trainings, and teacher inservices. The topics below were the focus of 2014-15.

- Incorporating student technology into instruction
- Personalized learning
- Positive Behavior Supports and Interventions
- Development of Common Core Units of study
- Continued focus on increasing academic rigor, checking for students' understanding at increasing levels of rigor and student use of academic language

UNI's school site leadership team has identified key areas for professional development for the 2015-2016 school year. These topics were selected based on data from department common assessments, screening measures, and other data such as discipline and attendance. Throughout the year, these topics will be addressed through on campus PD provided by University staff members and district personnel, off campus conferences and trainings, and teacher inservices. The topics below are those that will be our focus throughout this year.

- Incorporating student technology into instruction
- Personalized learning
- Positive Behavior Supports and Interventions
- Restorative Justice
- Development of Common Core Units of study
- Continued focus on increasing academic rigor, checking for students' understanding at increasing levels of rigor and student use of academic language