Forestville Academy School
School Accountability Report Card
Reported Using Data from the 2012-13 School Year
Published During 2013-14

Every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC), by February 1 of each year. The SARC contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school.

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

I. Data and Access

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., state Academic Performance Index [API], federal Adequate Yearly Progress [AYP]), 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.

Additional Information
For further information regarding the data elements and terms used in the SARC see the 2012–13 Academic Performance Index Reports Information Guide located on the CDE API Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/.

II. About This School

Contact Information (School Year 2013-14)

School Contact Information	
School Name	Forestville Academy School
Street	6321 Highway 116
City, State, Zip	Forestville, California 95436-9699
Phone Number	707-887-2279
Principal	Talin Tamzarian
E-mail Address	ttamzarian@forestvilleusd.org
CDS Code	49706800112987

District Contact Information	
District Name	Forestville Union School District
Phone Number	7078872279
Web Site	forestvilleusd.org
Superintendent	Phylllis Parisi
E-mail Address	pparisi@forestvilleusd.org

School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2012-13)
This section provides information about the school, its programs and its goals.

About this School:
Our goal in compiling this information is to make an account of ourselves available to you and to encourage your responses. To define and articulate our collective vision, the entire teaching staff met, along with representatives of the classified staff and the Governing Board, to analyze our district's goals. One important outcome of that process was a statement of philosophy and purpose -- a mission statement -- which is included below. Students submitted ideas to encapsulate the mission statement into a school motto. The chosen motto follows the mission statement.

FORESTVILLE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
MISSION STATEMENT

Our purpose is to enable students to become life-long learners - - knowing how to learn, how to make decisions, and how to relate positively as productive, responsible, and ethical citizens.

The Best Education for the Next Generation
Scholarship - Leadership – Friendship-Stewardship

Forestville School, a rural TK-8 school district, has been recognized twice as a California Distinguished School and twice received California Distinguished School Honorable Mention awards. In the 2006-07 academic year, FUSD district converted grades 4-8 into a charter school, Forestville Academy. The K-3 grades remained as Forestville Elementary school. In 2008- 2009 grade 3 became part of the charter school, and in 2009-2010 grade 2 was added. Although we continue to value all that comes with being a single-school (K-8) school district, we have indeed converted to two schools--Forestville Elementary (K-1) and Forestville Academy (Charter school 2-8.) Our staff meetings include all K-8 teachers; both schools have the same principal, superintendent, parents' association, and employee association, etc. We operate philosophically as one school and one district, but we are two separate schools. Our enrollment (using the count from the California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) for 2012-2013 for Forestville Elementary was 92 and the Academy had 283. In 2011-2012 attendance for Forestville Elementary was 72 students and the Academy had 303. For 2010-2011 for Forestville Elementary was 106 students and 344 students for Forestville Academy. For 2009-2010 for Forestville Elementary was 72 students and 359 for Forestville Academy. For 2008-09 for Forestville Elementary was 121 students and 329 students for Forestville Academy. In 2006-2007 our enrollment was 178 for Forestville Elementary and 358 for Forestville Academy.

As a staff, we strive to lead each student to maximize his or her potential by providing carefully planned and appropriately challenging instruction, support for the whole individual, reinforcement of the idea that all students can learn and be successful in school, and respect for individual differences and styles of learning. We strive to provide adequate facilities, which create a safe, and hospitable environment which is conducive to learning for all children, and which incorporates the full involvement of both parental and community resou rces to help children succeed.

As you read this report, please note that we are proud of the work we do for our Forestville "school community" and strive to continually improve upon it. We rely on you for the support and evaluative feedback to continue to change for the better. We cherish the trust you have placed in us and will always work hard to merit that trust.

Sincerely,
Bob Borbe, Superintendent

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2012-13)
This section provides information on how parents can become involved in school activities, including contact information pertaining to organized opportunities for parent involvement.

Parent involvement and participation is highly valued at Forestville School. There are numerous opportunities to assist in classrooms, and with special events such as the annual school musical, campus beautification efforts, Harvest Fair, Winter Craft Fair, Bingo, coaching sports and tournaments, serving on committees and advisory councils, etc. Please contact us for more information about how to volunteer at our school district or through our parent organization, the Forestville Education Foundation. Contact person: Fran Oliver, 707-887-2279.

III. Student Performance

The Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program consists of several key components, including:

- **California Standards Tests (CSTs)**, which 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 nine through eleven.

- **California Modified Assessment (CMA)**, an alternate assessment that is based on modified achievement standards in ELA for grades three through eleven; mathematics for grades three through seven, Algebra I, and Geometry; and science in grades five and eight, and Life Science in   grade ten. 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.

- **California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA)**, includes ELA and mathematics in grades two through eleven, and 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 assessments under the STAR Program show how well students are doing in relation to the state content standards. On each of these assessments, student scores are reported as performance levels.

For detailed information regarding the STAR Program results for each grade and performance level, including the percent of students not tested, see the CDE STAR Results Web site at http://star.cde.ca.gov.

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

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
English-Language Arts	59	68	68	59	68	67	54	56	55
Mathematics	61	61	62	61	61	62	49	50	50
Science	79	86	77	78	86	77	57	60	59
History-Social Science	77	79	67	76	79	67	48	49	49

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.

Standardized Testing and Reporting Results by Student Group - Most Recent Year

Group	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced			
	English-Language Arts	Mathematics	Science	History-Social Science
All Students in the LEA	67	62	76	67
All Student at the School	68	62	77	67
Male	63	67	73	69
Female	72	57	80	67
Black or African American				
American Indian or Alaska Native	42	25		
Asian				
Filipino				
Hispanic or Latino	41	39	63	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander				
White	78	71	81	70
Two or More Races				
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	50	49	71	64
English Learners	27	27		
Students with Disabilities	24	30		
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services				

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 2012-13)

The California Physical Fitness Test (PFT) is administered to students in grades five, seven, and nine only. This table displays by grade level the percent of students meeting the fitness standards for the most recent testing period. For detailed information regarding this test, and comparisons of a school's test results to the district and state, see the CDE PFT Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/pf/.

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards
5	16.7	21.4	45.2
7	10.2	20.4	49.0

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.

IV. Accountability

Academic Performance Index

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of state academic performance and progress of schools in California. API scores range from 200 to 1,000, with a statewide target of 800. For detailed information about the API, see the CDE API Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/.

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 1 to 10. A statewide rank of 1 means that the school has an API score in the lowest ten percent of all schools in the state, while a statewide rank of 10 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 1 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 10 means that the school's academic performance is better than at least 90 of the 100 similar schools.

API Rank	2010	2011	2012
Statewide	6	6	7
Similar Schools	5	6	8

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

Group	Actual API Change		
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
All Students at the School	6	28	-11
Black or African American			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Filipino			
Hispanic or Latino	-5	43	-34
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			
White	9	31	-2
Two or More Races			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	-30	32	-3
English Learners			
Students with Disabilities			

Note: "N/D" means that no data were available to the CDE or LEA to report. "B" means the school did not have a valid API Base and there is no Growth or target information. "C" means the school had significant demographic changes and there is no Growth or target information.

Academic Performance Index Growth by Student Group - 2013 Growth API Comparison

This table displays, by student group, the number of students included in the API and the 2013 Growth API at the school, LEA, and state level.

Group	2013 Growth API					
	School		District		State	
	# of Students	Growth API	# of Students	Growth API	# of Students	Growth API
All Students at the School	272	845	275	842	4,655,793	790
Black or African American	1		1		298,394	707
American Indian or Alaska Native	6		6		30,423	742
Asian	2		2		407,143	906
Filipino	1		1		121,235	867
Hispanic or Latino	58	743	59	737	2,446,249	743
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1		1		25,432	773
White	188	882	190	879	1,203,252	852
Two or More Races	15	764	15	764	112,819	845
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	134	773	134	773	2,842,931	742
English Learners	29	729	29	729	1,464,196	717
Students with Disabilities	38	637	40	627	557,080	616

Adequate Yearly Progress

The federal ESEA 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)

For detailed information about AYP, including participation rates and percent proficient results by student group, see the CDE AYP Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/.

Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria (School Year 2012-13)

AYP Criteria	School	District
Made AYP Overall	No	No
Met Participation Rate: English-Language Arts	Yes	Yes
Met Participation Rate: Mathematics	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient: English-Language Arts	No	No
Met Percent Proficient: Mathematics	No	No
Met API Criteria	Yes	Yes
Met Graduation Rate (if applicable)	N/A	N/A

Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2013-14)

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. For detailed information about PI identification, see the CDE PI Status Determinations Web page: http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/tidetermine.asp.

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status	In PI	Not In PI
First Year of Program Improvement	2011-2012	
Year in Program Improvement	Year 3	
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	---	2
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	---	100.0

V. School Climate

Student Enrollment by Grade Level (School Year 2012-13)

Grade Level	Number of Students
Grade 2	32
Grade 3	34
Grade 4	32
Grade 5	43
Grade 6	45
Grade 7	51
Grade 8	52
Total Enrollment	289

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2012-13)

Group	Percent of Total Enrollment	Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	0.3	**White**	68.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.4	**Two or More Races**	5.5
Asian	1.4	**Socioeconomically Disadvantaged**	48.8
Filipino	0.3	**English Learners**	11.1
Hispanic or Latino	20.8	**Students with Disabilities**	13.8
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.3		

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)

Grade Level	2010-11				2011-12				2012-13			
	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												
1												
2	17	2	0	0	19.5	2	0	0	16	2		
3	22	3	0	0	16.5	2	0	0	17	2		
4	23	0	2	0	18.5	2	0	0	14	22		
5	27.5	0	2	0	22.5	1	1	0	18	5	18	
6					15.2	4	2	0	18	6	14	
Other												

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

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)

Subject	2010-11				2011-12				2012-13			
	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	149	0	0	1	18.1	2	5	0				
Mathematics	0	0	0	0	17.3	5	3	0				
Science	98	0	0	1	25.5	0	4	0				
Social Science	0	0	0	0	24.2	1	4	0				

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.

School Safety Plan (School Year 2012-13)

This section provides information about the school's comprehensive safety plan, including the dates on which the safety plan was last reviewed, updated, and discussed with faculty; as well as a brief description of the key elements of the plan.

School safety, campus cleanliness, and maintenance of facilities are a high priority at Forestville Union School District. We maintain a comprehensive and updated Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) that is reviewed and revised annually. The Emergency Operations Plan includes bi-monthly Fire Drills, Earthquake Drills, and Secure the Campus Drills. The EOP was developed with Redwood Empire Schools Insurance Group (RESIG). The District's School Safety Committee meets on a regular basis to address day-to-day safety concerns as well as focus on long range plans for campus safety. Pedestrian safety and traffic flow issues have been the central topics of concern the past few years as reflected in parent surveys. Major progress has been made to address safety issues. The District has added a third traffic exit lane on Travis Road and was instrumental in the process of realigning the crosswalks at the intersection of Highway 116 and Covey Road. Students' emotional safety and sense of security is also a priority. The District has continued its program to reduce incidents of teasing and bullying. Through an increased emphasis on reporting all incidents either directly to teachers and adult supervisors or anonymously in the offices' suggestion boxes, we continue to adhere to our Zero Tolerance policy of addressing all instances of teasing and bullying. The district will also address issues of bullying by increasing awareness of these issues through assemblies and classroom discussions. We will continue to implement the Building Effective Schools Together (BEST) program. BEST emphasizes positive behavior by recognizing and rewarding good choices. Additionally, the district utilizes the Toolbox program which helps students cope with daily challenges and difficult situations.

Suspensions and Expulsions

Rate	School			District		
	2010-11	**2011-12**	**2012-13**	**2010-11**	**2011-12**	**2012-13**
Suspensions	16.28			19.81		
Expulsions	0			0		

Note: The rate of suspensions and expulsions is calculated by dividing the total number of incidents by the total enrollment x 100.

VI. School Facilities

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (School Year 2013-14)
This section provides information from the most recent Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) data (or equivalent), including:

• Description of the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of the school facility
• Description of any planned or recently completed facility improvements
• Description of any needed maintenance to ensure good repair

Reviewed entire campus with the RESIG (Redwood Empire School Insurance Group). Results included removing amphitheater, which included eating and play area infested by wasps. Contracted with professional pest control company to remove and monitor wasp activity. Custodial staff updated safety requirements in classrooms by securing bookshelves and removing overhead boxes. Reviewed with staff compliance issues regarding products not approved at school. During the summer of 2014, all trees were inspected, trimmed, or removed. Tripping hazards were also addressed and repaired. New flag pole with internal rope mechanism was purchased and placed in front of school.

School Facility Good Repair Status (School Year 2013-14)

This section provides information from the most recent Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) data (or equivalent), including:

- Determination of repair status for systems listed
- Description of any needed maintenance to ensure good repair
- The year and month in which the data were collected
- The Overall Rating

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">School Facility Good Repair Status (School Year 2013-14)
Year and month in which data were collected: 11/11/13</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">System Inspected</td><td colspan="3">Repair Status</td><td rowspan="2">Repair Needed and
Action Taken or Planned</td></tr>
<tr><td>Good</td><td>Fair</td><td>Poor</td></tr>
<tr><td>Systems:
Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer</td><td>[X]</td><td>[ ]</td><td>[ ]</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Interior:
Interior Surfaces</td><td>[X]</td><td>[ ]</td><td>[ ]</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Cleanliness:
Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation</td><td>[X]</td><td>[ ]</td><td>[ ]</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Electrical:
Electrical</td><td>[X]</td><td>[ ]</td><td>[ ]</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Restrooms/Fountains:
Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains</td><td>[X]</td><td>[ ]</td><td>[ ]</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Safety:
Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials</td><td>[X]</td><td>[ ]</td><td>[ ]</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Structural:
Structural Damage, Roofs</td><td>[X]</td><td>[ ]</td><td>[ ]</td><td>District has one breezeway roof in need of repair. Work will be completed in summer 2013.</td></tr>
<tr><td>External:
Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences</td><td>[X]</td><td>[ ]</td><td>[ ]</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Overall Facility Rate

Overall Rating	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
	[ ]	[X]	[ ]	[ ]

VII. Teachers

Teacher Credentials

Teachers	School			District
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2012-13
With Full Credential	16	18	17	25
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	0
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence (with full credential)	0	0	0	---

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

Indicator	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
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 2012-13)

The federal ESEA, also known as NCLB, requires that core academic subjects be taught by Highly Qualified Teachers, defined as having at least a bachelor's degree, an appropriate California teaching credential, and demonstrated core academic subject area competence. For more information, see the CDE Improving Teacher and Principal Quality Web page at www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/tq/.

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	**Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers**
This School	100	
All Schools in District	100	
High-Poverty Schools in District	100	
Low-Poverty Schools in District		

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.

VIII. Support Staff

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2012-13)

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	---
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	0	---
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0.375	---
Psychologist	0.4	---
Social Worker	0	---
Nurse	0.2	---
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	0.4	---
Resource Specialist	0	---
Other	0	---

Note: 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.

IX. Curriculum and Instructional Materials

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2013-14)

This section describes whether the textbooks and instructional materials used at the school are from the most recent adoption; whether there are sufficient textbooks and instruction materials for each student; and information about the school's use of any supplemental curriculum or non-adopted textbooks or instructional materials.

Year and month in which data were collected: June 2009

Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
Reading/Language Arts	Grades K-6, Open Court Reading, published by SRA McGraw-Hill; Board Adopted 3 June 2002. Grades 7-8, California Literature, published by Holt McDougal, Board Adopted June 2009	Yes	0%
Mathematics	Grades K-5, California Math published by Houghton Mifflin; Board Adopted June 2009. Grades 6-8 California Math, published by McDougall Littell; Board Adopted June 2009	Yes	0%
Science	Grades K-3, Houghton-Mifflin; Board adopted 7 February, 2008. Grades 4-5, California Science, Harcourt, Board Adopted June 2009. Grades 6-8, California Science, Focus on Life Science, and Focus on Physical Science, published by Prentice Hall; Board Adopted 21June 2007.	Yes	0%
History-Social Science	Grades K-5- Houghton-Mifflin 2007 K-My World 1-School and Family , 2-Neighborhoods 3-Communities, 4-California Studies, 5-U.S. History, Early Years. Grade 6-Holt Reinhart & Wilson, 2007. Grades 7-8, Medieval to Early Modern Time and United States History Independence to 1914, published by Harcourt Education Company; Board Adopted 12 May 2006.	Yes	0%

X. School Finances

Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2011-12)

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	**Supplemental/ Restricted**	**Basic/ Unrestricted**	
School Site	$6,526	$102	$6,423	$58,570
District	---	---	$8,728	$59,113
Percent Difference: School Site and District	---	---	-26.4	-0.9
State	---	---	$5,537	$57,720
Percent Difference: School Site and State	---	---	16.0	1.5

Supplemental/Restricted expenditures come from money whose use is controlled by law or by a donor. Money that is designated for specific purposes by the district or governing board is not considered restricted.
Basic/Unrestricted expenditures are from money whose use, except for general guidelines, is not controlled by law or by a donor.

For detailed information on school expenditures for all districts in California, see the CDE Current Expense of Education & Per-pupil Spending Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/ec/. For information on teacher salaries for all districts in California, see the CDE Certificated Salaries & Benefits Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/. To look up expenditures and salaries for a specific school district, see the Ed-Data Web site at: http://www.ed-data.org.

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2012-13)
This section provides specific information about the types of programs and services available at the school that support and assist students. For example, this narrative may include information about supplemental educational services related to the school's federal Program Improvement (PI) status.

Services funded include resource specialist, special ed, intervention, art, drama, music, computer, enrichment, PE, after school sports, counseling, nursing, speech and language, instructional assistants, social skills aides/para professionals, English learner, fee-based before and after-school day care, fee-based pre school, departmentalized middle school, and library.

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2011-12)

Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	$45,775	$38,719
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	$59,040	$55,637
Highest Teacher Salary	$77,136	$70,797
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	$97,561	$90,284
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	$0	$94,675
Average Principal Salary (High)	$0	$85,183
Superintendent Salary	$104,396	$104,272
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	35.3%	35.5%
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	5.4%	6.5%

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

XI. Instructional Planning and Scheduling

Professional Development

This section provides information on the number of days provided for professional development and continuous professional growth in the most recent three year period. Questions that may be answered include:

- What are the primary/major areas of focus for staff development and specifically how were they selected? For example, were student achievement data used to determine the need for professional development in reading instruction?
- What are the methods by which professional development is delivered (e.g., after school workshops, conference attendance, individual mentoring, etc.)?
- How are teachers supported during implementation (e.g., through in-class coaching, teacher-principal meetings, student performance, and data reporting, etc.)?

Our school district has been working for the last seven years on meaningful staff meetings, planned and implemented by our teacher-leadership team. The district has taken advantage of a grant to participate in Building Effective Schools Together (BEST) training; we have continued to participate in the Sonoma Leadership Network (working with exemplary instructors like Doug Fischer). We have attended workshops from leading experts like Anita Archer. Our method of operation continues to be Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Teachers work collaboratively to analyze summative and formative data in order to improve instructional strategies, work on a cycle of inquiry, plan lesson units and assessments, etc. We completed an Academic Program Survey (APS) in order to identify our needs and work on continual improvement. For this academic year, we have put most of our efforts into adopting and implementing the common core standards. Our staff meetings have been dedicated to understanding the rationale and content of the standards and developing curriculum maps based on common core standards. We have also worked on TK-8 ELA articulation and curriculum maps, literacy in the content subjects of social sciences/sciences, the integration of the 8 mathematical practices into all subject areas and incorporating "Georgia Math" into our practice and working on classroom "math talks". Additionally, we have participated in professional development workshops to utilize our new data management system, Illuminate. We have also begun preparation for the new high stakes Smarter Balanced testing.