

Neal Dow Elementary

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	Neal Dow Elementary
Street	1420 Neal Dow Avenue
City, State, Zip	Chico, CA 95926
Phone Number	(530) 891-3110
Principal	Marilyn Rees
E-mail Address	mrees@chicousd.org
CDS Code	04-61424-6003040

District Contact Information	
District Name	Chico Unified School District
Phone Number	(530) 891-3000
Web Site	www.chicousd.org
Superintendent	Kelly Staley
E-mail Address	kstaley@chicousd.org

School Description and Mission Statement (School Year 2012-13)

This section provides information about the school, its programs and its goals.

Neal Dow is working with Renaissance Learning to become a School of Excellence by using data that is generated by the reports in Accelerated Math, Math Facts in a Flash, Accelerated Reading, English in a Flash, Key Words, and STAR Early Literacy. Through the use of these programs we are able to track student growth and achievement. Progress monitoring helps plot a student's progress toward goals set. Learning progressions assist in identifying skills needed in the next lessons.

Our curriculum focus has undergone some significant changes in recent years. Common Core State Standards have become the key ingredient of our teaching, while writing ties all of language arts together as stated in our belief that writing is a way of developing thinking skills, of generating ideas, and of helping one to survive in an increasingly dynamic and complicated society.

During the 2013-2014 school year, the Neal Dow staff continues to focus on a balanced and integrated K-6 Language Arts program with a focus on early literacy. Time for staff to assess curriculum and articulate across tracks and grade levels is accomplished through staff collaboration time. Staff efforts in developing a Professional Learning Community will continue, especially in the area of quick response to the needs of students through the implementation of Renaissance Learning programs for reading and math.

It is the mission of Neal Dow to engage the support of the staff, parents, students, and community partners to nurture the intellectual, emotional, moral, and physical development of all children, encouraging them to become lifelong learners. Also, our mission is to develop responsible adults supporting a global society with tolerance and respect for others. Our vision is to provide a balanced curriculum, and for all students to be reading and writing at grade level by the end of the third grade.

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 and community involvement is a hallmark of our school. A parent-friendly environment enables us to gather great enrichment resources for our students. Our PTA meets monthly and family friendly events enable all students to participate.

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	55	57	63	58	58	58	54	56	55
Mathematics	69	62	69	51	51	52	49	50	50
Science	64	53	52	67	68	67	57	60	59
History-Social Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	59	56	58	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	58	52	67	N/A
All Student at the School	63	69	52	N/A
Male	60	70	57	N/A
Female	66	68	44	N/A
Black or African American				N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native				N/A
Asian	67	58		N/A
Filipino				N/A
Hispanic or Latino	36	58		N/A
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander				N/A
White	68	72	51	N/A
Two or More Races	69	85		N/A
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	56	60	35	N/A
English Learners	38	50		N/A
Students with Disabilities	47	59		N/A
Students Receiving Migrant Education Services				N/A

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	9.0	10.4	68.7

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	4	6	5
Similar Schools	1	5	2

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	46	-14	25
Black or African American			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Filipino			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			
White	51	-12	15
Two or More Races			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	68	-27	42
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	285	836	8,818	807	4,655,989	790
Black or African American	11	802	315	718	296,463	708
American Indian or Alaska Native	8		151	747	30,394	743
Asian	20	839	547	786	406,527	906
Filipino	1		62	890	121,054	867
Hispanic or Latino	31	787	1,947	738	2,438,951	744
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	6		57	785	25,351	774
White	196	849	5,550	839	1,200,127	853
Two or More Races	2		107	756	125,025	824
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	169	805	4,561	745	2,774,640	743
English Learners	19	809	1,232	684	1,482,316	721
Students with Disabilities	41	725	1,063	626	527,476	615

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

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	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement	2010-2011	2004-2005
Year in Program Improvement	Year 2	Year 3
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	---	11
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	---	91.7

V. School Climate

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

Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	66
Grade 1	63
Grade 2	60
Grade 3	57
Grade 4	55
Grade 5	69
Grade 6	64
Total Enrollment	434

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2012-13)

Group	Percent of Total Enrollment	Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	3.5	White	66.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.0	Two or More Races	1.6
Asian	5.5	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	56.2
Filipino	1.2	English Learners	5.3
Hispanic or Latino	14.3	Students with Disabilities	13.6
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1.6		

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	28	0	2	0	21	1	2	0	17	2	2	
1	27.5	0	2	0	27.5	0	2	0	21	1	2	
2	29.5	0	2	0	27.5	0	2	0	20	1	2	
3	32	0	2	0	26.5	0	2	0	29		2	
4	34.5	0	0	2	34	0	0	2	28		2	
5	33.5	0	0	2	33.5	0	0	2	23	1		2
6	32	0	1	1	32.5	0	1	1	32		1	1
Other												

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

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.

The School Site Council has developed a Safe School Plan, which consists of four components: tolerance for diversity; well-maintained and attractive school site; appropriate behavior; and safe and nurturing environment. Our plan stresses prevention; our goal is to be prepared. Ongoing training and drills allow us to increase our ability to deal with conflict and other threats to safety. We have established a crisis response team, an emergency phone tree, and specific emergency plans.

A disaster plan includes emergency procedures in case of Traumatic Incidents, Imminent Danger--Code Red, Evacuation/Relocation, Civil Defense/Disorder, Bomb Threat/Bomb Emergency, Earthquake, Chemical Spill, Crime in Progress, and Fire/Explosion.

In an effort to ensure student safety while traveling to and from school, a crossing guard is located at the corner of Fifth Avenue and Downing. A walkway was constructed leading from the campus to the gate on Downing Avenue, and the gate is opened morning and afternoon to ease congestion at the front of the school. One-way traffic takes place in the school's parking lot, a crosswalk has been marked, and a drop-off zone for students has been established.

Suspensions and Expulsions

Rate	School			District		
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Suspensions	2.53	3.75	0.49	8.95	4.57	5.77
Expulsions	0	0	0	0.59	0.62	0.67

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

Neal Dow School was built in 1964. The school has 20 regular K-6 classrooms, A room for the SDC program and another for the RSP program along with a portable which houses the CUSD Elementary In-School Suspension Program, a multipurpose room. The office and staff work spaces were remodeled in 1990.

Teaching and learning are protected activities at Neal Dow. Our mission is to have every child reading by the end of third grade, and we provide interventions for students who are struggling academically. In addition to the regular classroom space, small group reading and workstations are available for individual or small group support. Adequate playground space, equipment, courts and fields are available for outside activities. Teachers have both a staff room and work room.

The school makes an effort to keep students safe on school grounds by offering a breakfast program, homework help and playground supervision before school; classroom instruction, supervised learning activities, and playground supervision during the school day; and bus and playground supervision after school. School personnel and volunteers wear identification badges, everyone visiting the school must check in at the office, and volunteers are required to fill out qualifying forms. During the school day, door lock blocks are used and gates to the campus are locked. During the 2013-14 school year, our school is able to offer four hours of supervised help with homework, academic instruction, recreation and enrichment.

Our campus is in good repair. It is attractive, clean, safe, and functional. Our custodians and district maintenance staff ensure that repairs necessary to keep the school in good working order are completed. Each building has adequate restroom facilities.

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

School Facility Good Repair Status (School Year 2013-14)				
Year and month in which data were collected: October 2013				
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]	[]	
Cleanliness: Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	[X]	[]	[]	
Electrical: Electrical	[X]	[]	[]	
Restrooms/Fountains: Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	[X]	[]	[]	
Safety: Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	[X]	[]	[]	
Structural: Structural Damage, Roofs	[]	[X]	[]	
External: Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	[X]	[]	[]	

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	17	18	20	599
Without Full Credential	0	0	0	2
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	100.0	0.0
All Schools in District	96.1	3.9
High-Poverty Schools in District	95.2	4.8
Low-Poverty Schools in District	97.9	2.1

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
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)		---
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)		---
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	1	---
Psychologist	0.25	---
Social Worker		---
Nurse	0.2	---
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	0.6	---
Resource Specialist		---
Other	1	---

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 instructional 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: October 2013

Updated and readily available resources are important if students are to perform at their best in class. The State of California adopts textbooks that meet quality standards established by the State Board of Education. The Chico Unified School District selects textbooks and other instructional materials from these state adoptions. All of the textbooks currently in use meet these standards. They were selected to match the needs of Chico students by a Task Force comprised of teachers and administrators and approved by the Board of Education. The CUSD convenes curricular task forces to review textbooks in core subject areas on the Kindergarten through 8th grade state adopted list concurrent with the adoption cycle. These standards aligned textbooks are in the hands of all students within two years of adoption.

Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
Reading/Language Arts	Treasures	Yes	0
Mathematics	McGraw Hill/Wright Group / Everyday Math - 2009	Yes	0
Science	K-5: McMillan/McGraw Hill / California Science - 2007 6-8: Prentice Hall / Focus on California Science - 2007	Yes	0
History-Social Science	Harcourt / Reflections - 2006	Yes	0
Foreign Language	Meets State Guidelines		0
Health	Meets State Guidelines		0
Visual and Performing Arts	Meets State Guidelines		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	\$9,006.44	\$3,329.59	\$5,676.85	\$65,601.00
District	---	---	\$5,648.82	\$63,409
Percent Difference: School Site and District	---	---	0.5	3.5
State	---	---	\$5,537	\$68,841
Percent Difference: School Site and State	---	---	2.5	-4.7

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.

Neal Dow receives the following funding:

- **Economic Impact Aid/Limited English Proficient (EIA/LEP)** funds to support programs and activities to assist English learners achieve proficiency in the English language as rapidly as practicable and to support programs and activities to improve the academic achievement of English learners.
- **Economic Impact Aid/State Compensatory Education (EIA/SCE)** funds to support programs and activities designed to assist educationally disadvantaged students achieve state standard proficiency.
- **Safe Schools** funds to provide training, resources, and technical assistance to establish a school/community environment which is physically and emotionally safe, well-disciplined, and conducive to learning.
- **Title II** federal funds to provide ongoing staff development for teachers and principals.
- **Title I** funds due to Free and Reduced Lunch qualifications. The intent of this funding is to meet the educational needs of low-achieving students enrolled in the highest poverty schools and to provide parent education.
- **ASES** (After School Education and Safety Program) state funds to provide improved academic achievement; enrichment services that reinforce and complement the academic program; family literacy and related educational development services; and services to help the students meet state and local standards in core content areas. Programs are planned through a collaborative process that includes parents, youth, and representatives of participating schools or local educational agencies, governmental agencies, community organizations, and the private sector.

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2011-12)

Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$38,121	\$40,933
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$53,164	\$65,087
Highest Teacher Salary	\$84,737	\$84,436
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	\$89,920	\$106,715
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$97,238	\$111,205
Average Principal Salary (High)	\$102,804	\$120,506
Superintendent Salary	\$164,900	\$207,812
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	39.8%	39.8%
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	4.5%	5.1%

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.)?

The Neal Dow staff participates in staff development, allowing monthly meeting time for collaboration in working toward our goal of achieving excellence in public education. A major curriculum focus is in the area of Standards Based Assessment. Another is full implementation of math and language arts curriculum with the use of Renaissance Learning programs.

To enhance teacher training and curricular development, individual staff members are encouraged to participate in the statewide subject matter programs.

We have written a school improvement plan that incorporates the budgeting of categorical (state) monies for the purpose of program improvement.