

# **Sacramento County Office of Education**

## **2025-26 Williams Site Review Summary**

District: Natomas Unified School District  
School Site: American Lakes Elementary

### **Instructional Materials Site Review**

Result: Sufficient

### **School Facility Inspection Review**

Inspection Date: 8/26/2025  
Number of Areas Evaluated: 22

#### **Category Ranking\***

Systems (Gas leaks, mechanical, HVAC, sewer): Good  
Interior surfaces: Good  
Cleanliness (Overall cleanliness, pest or vermin infestation): Good  
Electrical: Good  
Restrooms and Fountains: Good  
Safety (Fire safety and hazardous materials): Good  
Structural (Structural damage and roofs): Good  
External (Playground, school grounds, windows, doors, and fences): Good

#### **School Rating and Description**

Exemplary: The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.

\* Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a “poor” ranking for that category.

# **Sacramento County Office of Education**

## **2025-26 Williams Site Review Summary**

District: Natomas Unified School District  
School Site: Bannon Creek Elementary

### **Instructional Materials Site Review**

Result: Sufficient

### **School Facility Inspection Review**

Inspection Date: 8/26/2025  
Number of Areas Evaluated: 19

#### **Category Ranking\***

Systems (Gas leaks, mechanical, HVAC, sewer): Good  
Interior surfaces: Good  
Cleanliness (Overall cleanliness, pest or vermin infestation): Good  
Electrical: Good  
Restrooms and Fountains: Good  
Safety (Fire safety and hazardous materials): Good  
Structural (Structural damage and roofs): Good  
External (Playground, school grounds, windows, doors, and fences): Good

#### **School Rating and Description**

Exemplary: The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.

\* Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a “poor” ranking for that category.

# **Sacramento County Office of Education**

## **2025-26 Williams Site Review Summary**

District: Natomas Unified School District  
School Site: H. Allen Hight Elementary

### **Instructional Materials Site Review**

Result: Sufficient

### **School Facility Inspection Review**

Inspection Date: 8/28/2025  
Number of Areas Evaluated: 23

#### **Category Ranking\***

Systems (Gas leaks, mechanical, HVAC, sewer): Good  
Interior surfaces: Good  
Cleanliness (Overall cleanliness, pest or vermin infestation): Good  
Electrical: Good  
Restrooms and Fountains: Good  
Safety (Fire safety and hazardous materials): Good  
Structural (Structural damage and roofs): Good  
External (Playground, school grounds, windows, doors, and fences): Good

#### **School Rating and Description**

Exemplary: The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.

\* Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a “poor” ranking for that category.

# **Sacramento County Office of Education**

## **2025-26 Williams Site Review Summary**

District: Natomas Unified School District  
School Site: Inderkum High

### **Instructional Materials Site Review**

Result: Sufficient

### **School Facility Inspection Review**

Inspection Date: 9/4/2025  
Number of Areas Evaluated: 34

#### **Category Ranking\***

Systems (Gas leaks, mechanical, HVAC, sewer): Good  
Interior surfaces: Good  
Cleanliness (Overall cleanliness, pest or vermin infestation): Good  
Electrical: Good  
Restrooms and Fountains: Good  
Safety (Fire safety and hazardous materials): Good  
Structural (Structural damage and roofs): Good  
External (Playground, school grounds, windows, doors, and fences): Good

#### **School Rating and Description**

Exemplary: The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.

\* Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a “poor” ranking for that category.

# **Sacramento County Office of Education**

## **2025-26 Williams Site Review Summary**

District: Natomas Unified School District  
School Site: Jefferson Elementary

### **Instructional Materials Site Review**

Result: Sufficient

### **School Facility Inspection Review**

Inspection Date: 9/8/2025  
Number of Areas Evaluated: 22

#### **Category Ranking\***

Systems (Gas leaks, mechanical, HVAC, sewer): Good  
Interior surfaces: Fair  
Cleanliness (Overall cleanliness, pest or vermin infestation): Good  
Electrical: Good  
Restrooms and Fountains: Good  
Safety (Fire safety and hazardous materials): Good  
Structural (Structural damage and roofs): Good  
External (Playground, school grounds, windows, doors, and fences): Good

#### **School Rating and Description**

Good: The school is maintained in good repair with a number of non-critical deficiencies noted. These deficiencies are isolated, and/or resulting from minor wear and tear, and/or in the process of being mitigated.

\* Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a “poor” ranking for that category.

# **Sacramento County Office of Education**

## **2025-26 Williams Site Review Summary**

District: Natomas Unified School District  
School Site: Natomas High

### **Instructional Materials Site Review**

Result: Sufficient

### **School Facility Inspection Review**

Inspection Date: 9/9/2025  
Number of Areas Evaluated: 32

#### **Category Ranking\***

Systems (Gas leaks, mechanical, HVAC, sewer): Good  
Interior surfaces: Good  
Cleanliness (Overall cleanliness, pest or vermin infestation): Good  
Electrical: Good  
Restrooms and Fountains: Good  
Safety (Fire safety and hazardous materials): Good  
Structural (Structural damage and roofs): Good  
External (Playground, school grounds, windows, doors, and fences): Good

#### **School Rating and Description**

Exemplary: The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.

\* Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a “poor” ranking for that category.

# **Sacramento County Office of Education**

## **2025-26 Williams Site Review Summary**

District: Natomas Unified School District  
School Site: Natomas Middle

### **Instructional Materials Site Review**

Result: Sufficient

### **School Facility Inspection Review**

Inspection Date: 8/28/2025  
Number of Areas Evaluated: 19

#### **Category Ranking\***

Systems (Gas leaks, mechanical, HVAC, sewer): Good  
Interior surfaces: Good  
Cleanliness (Overall cleanliness, pest or vermin infestation): Good  
Electrical: Good  
Restrooms and Fountains: Good  
Safety (Fire safety and hazardous materials): Good  
Structural (Structural damage and roofs): Good  
External (Playground, school grounds, windows, doors, and fences): Good

### **School Rating and Description**

Exemplary: The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.

\* Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a “poor” ranking for that category.

# **Sacramento County Office of Education**

## **2025-26 Williams Site Review Summary**

District: Natomas Unified School District  
School Site: Natomas Park Elementary

### **Instructional Materials Site Review**

Result: Sufficient

### **School Facility Inspection Review**

Inspection Date: 8/28/2025  
Number of Areas Evaluated: 26

#### **Category Ranking\***

Systems (Gas leaks, mechanical, HVAC, sewer): Good  
Interior surfaces: Good  
Cleanliness (Overall cleanliness, pest or vermin infestation): Good  
Electrical: Good  
Restrooms and Fountains: Good  
Safety (Fire safety and hazardous materials): Good  
Structural (Structural damage and roofs): Good  
External (Playground, school grounds, windows, doors, and fences): Good

#### **School Rating and Description**

Exemplary: The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.

\* Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a “poor” ranking for that category.

# **Sacramento County Office of Education**

## **2025-26 Williams Site Review Summary**

District: Natomas Unified School District  
School Site: Two Rivers Elementary

### **Instructional Materials Site Review**

Result: Sufficient

### **School Facility Inspection Review**

Inspection Date: 8/29/2025  
Number of Areas Evaluated: 18

#### **Category Ranking\***

Systems (Gas leaks, mechanical, HVAC, sewer): Good  
Interior surfaces: Good  
Cleanliness (Overall cleanliness, pest or vermin infestation): Good  
Electrical: Good  
Restrooms and Fountains: Good  
Safety (Fire safety and hazardous materials): Good  
Structural (Structural damage and roofs): Good  
External (Playground, school grounds, windows, doors, and fences): Good

#### **School Rating and Description**

Exemplary: The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.

\* Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a “poor” ranking for that category.

# **Sacramento County Office of Education**

## **2025-26 Williams Site Review Summary**

District: Natomas Unified School District  
School Site: Witter Ranch Elementary

### **Instructional Materials Site Review**

Result: Sufficient

### **School Facility Inspection Review**

Inspection Date: 8/29/2025  
Number of Areas Evaluated: 24

#### **Category Ranking\***

Systems (Gas leaks, mechanical, HVAC, sewer): Good  
Interior surfaces: Good  
Cleanliness (Overall cleanliness, pest or vermin infestation): Good  
Electrical: Good  
Restrooms and Fountains: Good  
Safety (Fire safety and hazardous materials): Good  
Structural (Structural damage and roofs): Good  
External (Playground, school grounds, windows, doors, and fences): Good

#### **School Rating and Description**

Exemplary: The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.

\* Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a “poor” ranking for that category.