

# Shackelford

## School Accountability Report Card

### Reported Using Data from the 2015-16 School Year

### Published During 2016-17

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 and 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 and the county. 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 (School Year 2016-17)**

<b>School Contact Information</b>	
<b>School Name</b>	Shackelford
<b>Street</b>	100 School Ave.
<b>City, State, Zip</b>	Modesto, CA 95351-5398
<b>Phone Number</b>	(209) 574-8422
<b>Principal</b>	Ignacio Cantu
<b>E-mail Address</b>	cantu.i@monet.k12.ca.us
<b>Web Site</b>	<a href="https://shackelford.mcs4kids.com/">https://shackelford.mcs4kids.com/</a>
<b>CDS Code</b>	50 711676052823

District Contact Information	
District Name	Modesto City Elementary School District
Phone Number	(209) 574-1500
Superintendent	Pam Able
E-mail Address	fortuna.b@monet.k12.ca.us
Web Site	www.mcs4kids.com

#### School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2016-17)

Develop goal-oriented, life-long learners who embrace positive school culture and focus on academic achievement and interpersonal skills.

#### Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2015-16)

Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	96
Grade 1	69
Grade 2	66
Grade 3	74
Grade 4	80
Grade 5	77
Grade 6	69
<b>Total Enrollment</b>	<b>531</b>

#### Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2015-16)

Student Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	0.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2
Asian	1.3
Filipino	0
Hispanic or Latino	86.8
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.2
White	6.4
Two or More Races	1.9
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	98.3
English Learners	70.4
Students with Disabilities	16.6
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
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2016-17
With Full Credential	28	25	27	1342
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	46
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence (with full credential)	1	0	0	0

### Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

Indicator	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
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.

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

### Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (School Year 2015-16)

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
This School	95.5	4.6
All Schools in District	96.2	3.8
High-Poverty Schools in District	96.2	3.8
Low-Poverty Schools in District	94.1	5.9

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 2016-17)

Year and month in which data were collected: December 2015

Subject	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
Reading/Language Arts	MacMillan/McGraw-Hill, 2009	Yes	0
Mathematics	Grade TK: Little Treasures MacMillan/McGraw-Hill 2008; Grade K: Early Learning Mathematics; Grades 1-6: EngageNY	Yes	0
Science	McGraw-Hill Science, 2008	Yes	0
History-Social Science	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt 2007	Yes	0

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

### General Information

The district takes great efforts to ensure that all schools are clean, safe, and functional. To assist in this effort, the district uses a facility survey instrument developed by the State of California Office of Public School Construction. The results of this survey are included within this report. The results of this survey are available at the district office and on the internet at [mcs4kids.com](http://mcs4kids.com).

The district takes great efforts to ensure that all schools are clean, safe, and functional. To assist in this effort, the district uses a facility survey instrument developed by the State of California Office of Public School Construction. Buildings and grounds are inspected on a daily basis every morning by the Head Custodian, and any safety and or hazard concerns are addressed immediately. An annual facility safety inspection is held and reviewed by site administration. Shackelford has 25 classrooms, a cafeteria, library, Head-Start, Family Center and an administration office. The main campus was built in 1945. Additions were constructed in 1984 and in 1985. Nine portable classrooms were constructed over the periods of 1984, 1985, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1998, 2000, and 2001. The school opened in 1945.

Below is more specific information on the condition of the school and the efforts made to ensure that students are provided with a clean, safe, and functional learning environment.

### Age of School/Buildings:

This school has 25 classrooms, a cafeteria, library, head-start, family learning center and an administration office. The main campus was built in 1945. Additions were constructed in 1984 and in 1985. Nine portable classrooms were constructed over the periods of 1984, 1985, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1998, 2000 and 2001. The school opened in 1945.

### Maintenance and Repair:

District maintenance staff ensures that the repairs necessary to keep the school in good repair and working order are completed in a timely manner. A work order process is used to ensure efficient service. Emergency repairs are given the highest priority. The school facility is in overall good repair.

### Cleaning Process and Schedule:

The district governing board has adopted cleaning standards for all schools in the district. A summary of these standards are available at the school office, or at the district office. The Principal works continually with the custodial staff to develop cleaning schedules to ensure a clean and safe school.

### Deferred Maintenance Budget:

The District participated in the State School Deferred Maintenance Program, which provided flexible state matching funds to assist school districts with expenditures for major repair or replacement of existing school facilities components. State contributions to this Program ended in the 2012-13 school year. Deferred Maintenance typically includes paving, roofing, plumbing, heating, air conditioning, electrical systems, interior or exterior painting and floor systems. For the 2015-16 school year, the district has budgeted \$1.35 million out of the District General Fund carry-over funds for deferred maintenance projects throughout the District. The District also has 1.26 million of carry-over funds in Fund 14 Deferred Maintenance Fund available for deferred maintenance projects throughout the District. Identified needed repairs are weighed against all other District site repairs and the most urgent repairs are addressed first.

Data provided by LEA. Additional information about the condition of the school's facilities may be obtained by speaking with the school principal.

### School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)				
Year and month of the most recent FIT report: 8/29/2016				
System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
<b>Systems:</b> Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	X			
<b>Interior:</b> Interior Surfaces	X			#4 Interior Surfaces--Paint peel is visible along the window sills.

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)				
Year and month of the most recent FIT report: 8/29/2016				
System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
<b>Cleanliness:</b> Overall Cleanliness, Pest/Vermin Infestation	X			
<b>Electrical:</b> Electrical	X			
<b>Restrooms/Fountains:</b> Restrooms, Sinks/Fountains	X			
<b>Safety:</b> Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	X			#11 Hazardous Materials--Paint peel is visible on the outside window trim. #11 Hazardous Materials--Large pieces of paint peel are visible on the underside of the overhang.
<b>Structural:</b> Structural Damage, Roofs	X			
<b>External:</b> Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	X			

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

Year and month of the most recent FIT report: 8/29/2016				
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] System, which includes the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for students in the general education population and the California Alternate Assessments [CAAs] for English language arts/literacy [ELA] and mathematics given in grades three through eight and grade eleven. The CAAs have replaced the California Alternate Performance Assessment [CAPA] for ELA and mathematics, which were eliminated in 2015. Only eligible students may participate in the administration of the CAAs. CAA items are aligned with alternate achievement standards, which are linked with the Common Core State Standards [CCSS] for students with significant cognitive disabilities); and
- The percentage of students 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

**CAASPP Test Results in English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA) and Mathematics for All Students**

Subject	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standards (grades 3-8 and 11)					
	School		District		State	
	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16
<b>English Language Arts/Literacy</b>	14	12	25	27	44	48
<b>Mathematics</b>	3	4	16	17	34	36

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 Test Results in ELA by Student Group  
Grades Three through Eight and Grade Eleven (School Year 2015-16)**

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
<b>All Students</b>	3	75	74	98.7	6.8
	4	81	79	97.5	15.2
	5	80	77	96.3	10.4
	6	72	70	97.2	14.3
<b>Male</b>	3	36	36	100.0	
	4	39	38	97.4	5.3
	5	43	40	93.0	10.0
	6	37	36	97.3	13.9
<b>Female</b>	3	39	38	97.4	13.2
	4	42	41	97.6	24.4
	5	37	37	100.0	10.8
	6	35	34	97.1	14.7
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	3	66	65	98.5	6.2
	4	76	75	98.7	13.3
	5	72	69	95.8	10.1
	6	62	60	96.8	11.7
<b>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</b>	3	74	73	98.7	6.8
	4	79	77	97.5	15.6
	5	77	74	96.1	9.5
	6	70	68	97.1	13.2
<b>English Learners</b>	3	51	50	98.0	4.0
	4	53	52	98.1	1.9
	5	47	44	93.6	2.3
	6	37	36	97.3	
<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	4	19	19	100.0	
	5	21	21	100.0	
	6	16	16	100.0	

Note: ELA test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The "Percent Met or Exceeded" is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

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 all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; 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 only students who received scores.

**CAASPP Test Results in Mathematics by Student Group  
Grades Three through Eight and Grade Eleven (School Year 2015-16)**

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
<b>All Students</b>	3	75	74	98.7	5.4
	4	81	80	98.8	5.0
	5	81	80	98.8	1.3
	6	72	71	98.6	2.8
<b>Male</b>	3	36	36	100.0	5.6
	4	39	39	100.0	
	5	44	43	97.7	
	6	37	36	97.3	2.8
<b>Female</b>	3	39	38	97.4	5.3
	4	42	41	97.6	9.8
	5	37	37	100.0	2.7
	6	35	35	100.0	2.9
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	3	66	65	98.5	3.1
	4	76	75	98.7	2.7
	5	72	71	98.6	1.4
	6	62	61	98.4	1.6
<b>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</b>	3	74	73	98.7	5.5
	4	79	78	98.7	5.1
	5	78	77	98.7	1.3
	6	70	69	98.6	2.9
<b>English Learners</b>	3	51	50	98.0	2.0
	4	53	53	100.0	
	5	47	46	97.9	
	6	37	37	100.0	
<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	4	19	19	100.0	
	5	21	21	100.0	
	6	16	16	100.0	

Note: Mathematics test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The "Percent Met or Exceeded" is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

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 all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; 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 only students who received scores.

### CAASPP Test Results in Science for All Students

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
<b>Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)</b>	30	19	14	47	45	41	60	56	54

Note: Science test results include California Standards Tests (CSTs), California Modified Assessment (CMA), and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) in grades five, eight, and ten.

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.

### CAASPP Test Results in Science by Student Group Grades Five, Eight, and Ten (School Year 2015-16)

Student Group	Total Enrollment	# of Students with Valid Scores	% of Students with Valid Scores	% of Students Proficient or Advanced
<b>All Students</b>	81	80	98.8	13.8
<b>Male</b>	44	43	97.7	11.6
<b>Female</b>	37	37	100.0	16.2
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	72	71	98.6	15.5
<b>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</b>	78	77	98.7	14.3
<b>English Learners</b>	47	46	97.9	4.4
<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	21	21	100.0	9.5

Note: Science test results include CSTs, CMA, and CAPA in grades five, eight, and ten. The "Proficient or Advanced" is calculated by taking the total number of students who scored at Proficient or Advanced on the science assessment divided by the total number of students with valid scores.

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.

### State Priority: Other Pupil Outcomes

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Other Pupil Outcomes State Priority (Priority 8):

- Pupil outcomes in the subject areas of physical education.

### California Physical Fitness Test Results (School Year 2015-16)

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards
5	19.5	16.9	22.1

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 (School Year 2016-17)

---

Contact Person: Ignacio Cantu Jr. @ (209) 576-4831



Shackelford has many opportunities for parent involvement through the following: Second Cup of Coffee, English Learner Parent Partnership (ELPP), SSC, Volunteering, and our Parent Involvement/Engagement Committee. The Second Cup of Coffee has parent participation with the parents asking for topics such as gang awareness, nutrition classes, CPR and other topics they request through the community aid. Parents also have the ability to come to all ELPP and SSC meetings to hear and be part of the School's plan and give input. Our Parent Involvement/Engagement Committee is another avenue for parents to get involved and help with parent participation. There is also an option for parents to come and volunteer in the classroom and many parents participate by assisting teachers in the classroom.

### 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		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
<b>Suspensions</b>	9.8	2.6	3.8	7.4	4.6	3.9	4.4	3.8	3.7
<b>Expulsions</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1

### School Safety Plan (School Year 2016-17)

The Shackelford School Safety Plan includes the following components: Introduction-Emergency Phone Lists, Immediate Action Response, Student and Parent Reunification, Maps, Evacuation Routes and Procedures, Students Speaking Out and Safety Hotline Information, Dress Code, Personal Characteristics of students and staff, and our School's Physical, Cultural, and Social Environments. The plan is reviewed annually by staff and Safety Committee members, and Safety Committee meetings are held two times per year. Student safety is a priority at Shackelford School. Safety begins with adequate adult supervision. Teachers and staff are responsible for student safety each day before school, during recess periods, and after school. In addition, the Administrator of Pupil and Staff Services, K6, custodians, and yard duty staff monitor school entrances and hallways before, during and after school. Six part-time crowd control/noon duty supervisors have been hired to supervise noon recess activities and recess. One part-time adult supervisor serves as a crossing guard before and after school. To ensure that students are safe throughout the day, a variety of safety procedures have been established. A comprehensive School Safety Plan that describes these procedures has been developed and is evaluated regularly by the site Safety Committee. Safety procedures are in place to monitor adults entering the campus. All gates to the campus are locked during school hours except the main gate located near the main office. This main gate is to remain closed at all times for safety. All adults who enter the school must register in the school office and wear a visitor badge including substitute teachers. Signs are present at entry points to notify parents and adults of this requirement. Safety /lockdown drills and fire drills occur regularly to provide on-going training in the event of an emergency.

### 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.

### Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2016-17)

Indicator	School	District
<b>Program Improvement Status</b>	In PI	In PI
<b>First Year of Program Improvement</b>	2003-2004	2004-2005
<b>Year in Program Improvement*</b>	Year 5	Year 3
<b>Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement</b>	N/A	19
<b>Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement</b>	N/A	95.0

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

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

Grade Level	2013-14				2014-15				2015-16			
	Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes			Avg. Class Size	Number of Classes		
		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+		1-20	21-32	33+
<b>K</b>	24		3		23		4		24		4	
<b>1</b>	24		4		23		3		23		3	
<b>2</b>	22	1	3		24		3		22		3	
<b>3</b>	21	1	3		22	1	4		19	1	3	
<b>4</b>	33		1	1	34			2	20	2		2
<b>5</b>	33		1	1	26	1	2		19	2	1	2
<b>6</b>	24	1	2		25	1	2		23	1	2	
<b>Other</b>	13	1										

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 2015-16)**

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
<b>Academic Counselor</b>		
<b>Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)</b>		N/A
<b>Library Media Teacher (Librarian)</b>		N/A
<b>Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)</b>		N/A
<b>Psychologist</b>	0.3	N/A
<b>Social Worker</b>		N/A
<b>Nurse</b>	0.3	N/A
<b>Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist</b>	1.4	N/A
<b>Resource Specialist</b>	1.0	N/A
<b>Other</b>		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 2014-15)**

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Supplemental/ Restricted	Basic/ Unrestricted	
<b>School Site</b>	\$10,198.15	\$3,495.21	\$6,702.94	\$90,880.15
<b>District</b>	N/A	N/A	\$7,423.86	\$82,285.00
<b>Percent Difference: School Site and District</b>	N/A	N/A	-9.7	10.4
<b>State</b>	N/A	N/A	\$5,677	\$75,687.00
<b>Percent Difference: School Site and State</b>	N/A	N/A	18.1	20.1

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

## Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2015-16)

---

The Modesto City Schools Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) provides detailed information on actions, services, and expenditures that support and assist students. Actions, services, and expenditures funded through the 2015-16 LCAP can be found here: [https://www.mcs4kids.com/documents/BoardApprovedLCAP\\_withMETRICS.pdf](https://www.mcs4kids.com/documents/BoardApprovedLCAP_withMETRICS.pdf). The most recent LCAP can be found here: <https://www.mcs4kids.com/img/files/2016-2017%20Board%20Approved%20LCAP%20Plan.pdf>. While the LCAP is designed to support the educational progress of all students, there are specific actions and services principally directed toward meeting the needs of our unduplicated students in closing the achievement gap. Actions focused on improving achievement for specific student groups can be found here: <https://www.mcs4kids.com/img/files/Actions%20003.pdf>.

## Professional Development (Most Recent Three Years)

---

### 13-14:

Close Reading Research and Strategies with Dr. Tim Shanahan – 1 Day  
Data Works Effective Instructional Strategies – 2 Days  
Teaching Common Core to English Learners by DataWORKs for targeted K-6 Schools – 1 Day (optional)  
Next Generation Science Standards PD for 7-12 Educators – 2 days (optional)  
Cruise in to Common Core for K-6 educators – 3 Days (optional)  
DIBELS for K-1 educators – 2 Days  
Effective Classroom Management – 2 Days (optional)  
Lesson Study for Math and Science Educators – 2 Days (optional)  
UC Davis History Project – 2 Days (Social Science)  
Math 180 – 2 Days (Math 180 teachers)

### 14-15:

Effective Instructional Strategies and Curriculum & Lesson Development – 3 Days  
Common Core Standards Based Instruction for K-6 Educators – 1 Day  
Next Generation Science Standards PD for 7-12 Educators – 2 days (optional)  
Big Idea Workshop Series – Optional after school PD for K-6 Educators  
Lesson Study for Math and Science Educators – 2 Days (optional)  
Positive Behavior Intervention and Support – 2 Days  
College and Career Guidance with Naviance for Counselors and Work Experience Coordinators – 1 Day  
Effective Classroom Management – 2 Days (optional)  
Restorative Justice – 4 Days  
Chemical Safety Training – 1 Day  
Teaching with Poverty in Mind – ½ Day (optional)  
Anita Archer – K-6 Literacy Skills – 2 Days (optional)  
Frank Smith – K-12 Academic Vocabulary – ½ Day (optional)  
SS 7-12 DBQ / UC Davis History Project 2 days  
ELA 7-12 Effective Instructional Practices/ELA/ELD literacy 2 days  
7-12 Electives Literacy for content areas  
Read 180 training 2 days

### 15-16:

Leverage Learning – PLC Leadership Teams – 5 Days (leadership teams)  
Anita Archer K-8 Writing and Literacy – 3 Days (optional)  
Step Up to Writing K-6 – 1 Day (optional)  
Number Talks K-6 – 1 Day (optional)  
Mindset Works 7-12 – 1 Day  
Utah Math 7-8 – 1 Day  
Math Vision Project 9-12 – 1 Day; additional optional PD Days through SCOE  
NGSS: Modeling in Science/Science and Engineering Practices 7-12 – 2 Days