

Cedar Grove Elementary School

2702 Sugarplum Drive • San Jose, CA 95148 • (408) 270-4958 • Grades K-6

Lea Peery, Principal

lpeery@eesd.org

2013-14 School Accountability Report Card Published During the 2014-15 School Year



Evergreen Elementary School District

3188 Quimby Road
San Jose CA, 95148
(408) 270-6800
www.eesd.org

District Governing Board

Sylvia Alvarez

Sylvia Arenas

Bonnie Mace

Vince Songcayawon

Jim Zito

District Administration

Katherine Gomez
Superintendent

Kathy Shepard
Superintendent

Dan Deguara
Assistant Superintendent

Gary Kishimoto
Director of Pupil Services

Carole Schmitt
Director of Human Resources

Rob Smiley
**Director of Communications and
Community Engagement**

Denise Williams
Director of Categorical Programs

Nelly Yang
Director of Business Services

Principal's Message

Cedar Grove Elementary School is located in the Evergreen area at the base of the East San Jose foothills. Our school was established in 1969 and has a history of wonderful traditions and accomplishments in the Evergreen School District. It has been recognized as a California Distinguished School and National Blue Ribbon School of Excellence.

The Cedar Grove community of learners is committed to life-long learning. Our dedicated educators have participated in numerous professional development opportunities focused on 21st Century Skills (communication, collaboration, critical thinking, and creativity), Career and College Readiness, and Common Core State Standards. Our students participate in rigorous curriculum and are engaged with new knowledge by practicing the 21st century skills in the daily instruction.

Cedar Grove is proud to be involved in many projects that support our theme, "Developing 21st Century Learners." Students are given opportunities to make positive choices and demonstrate responsibilities that will create contributing members of our greater community.

School Mission Statement

We at Cedar Grove School are dedicated to providing the best educational experience for our students. We strive to ensure academic and social success by using a variety of teaching strategies based upon quality research and successful practice. Our school is a place where children feel valued within a safe and nurturing environment and will achieve to the best of their ability. Our students are given opportunities to make positive choices and take responsibilities that enable them to become contributing members of our community. As our children develop a positive self-image and intellectual capacities, they will become successful in school and in their future.

Community & School Profile

Evergreen School District, located in the City of San Jose, is comprised of fifteen elementary schools and three middle schools. Once a small farming city, San Jose became a magnet for suburban newcomers between the 1960s and the 1990s, and is now the third largest city in California. The city is located in Silicon Valley, at the southern end of the San Francisco Bay Area, and is home to more than 973,000 residents.

Cedar Grove Elementary School is located in the northeastern section of the district's borders. The school provides a family-oriented, nurturing, and safe place for students to learn, grow, and develop intellectually. Teachers, staff, and administrators continue to act on the principle that students come first. During the 2012-13 school year, the school served 780 students in grades kindergarten through six on a traditional calendar schedule. The chart displays school enrollment broken down by ethnicity.

About the SARC

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. Under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) all local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to prepare a Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP), which describes how they intend to meet annual school-specific goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities. Additionally, data reported in an LCAP is to be consistent with data reported in the SARC.

- For more information about SARC requirements, see the California Department of Education (CDE) SARC Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/>.
- View this SARC online at the school and/or LEA Web sites.
- 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 and community members should contact the school at (408) 270-4958.

| 2013-14 Student Enrollment by Grade Level | |
|---|--------------------|
| Grade Level | Number of Students |
| Kinder. | 72 |
| Gr. 1 | 86 |
| Gr. 2 | 96 |
| Gr. 3 | 107 |
| Gr. 4 | 115 |
| Gr. 5 | 136 |
| Gr. 6 | 128 |
| Total | 740 |

| 2013-14 Student Enrollment by Group | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Group | Percent of Total Enrollment |
| Black or African American | 2.7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0.1 |
| Asian | 44.1 |
| Filipino | 12.4 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 30.3 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 1.6 |
| White | 5.4 |
| Two or More Races | 1.8 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 39.5 |
| English Learners | 27.8 |
| Students with Disabilities | 9.1 |

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 | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|
| Cedar Grove Elementary School | 12-13 | 13-14 | 14-15 |
| Fully Credentialed | 30 | | |
| Without Full Credential | 0 | | |
| Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence | 0 | | |
| Evergreen Elementary School District | 12-13 | 13-14 | 14-15 |
| Fully Credentialed | ♦ | ♦ | 30 |
| Without Full Credential | ♦ | ♦ | 0 |
| Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence | ♦ | ♦ | 0 |

| Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions at this School | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Cedar Grove Elementary School | 12-13 | 13-14 | 14-15 |
| Teachers of English Learners | 0 | 0 | |
| Total Teacher Misassignments | 0 | 0 | |
| Vacant Teacher Positions | 0 | 0 | |

* "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

| 2013-14 Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| Location of Classes | Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers | Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers |
| This School | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| Districtwide | | |
| All Schools | 99.89 | 0.11 |
| High-Poverty Schools | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| Low-Poverty Schools | 99.83 | 0.17 |

* 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 2014-15)

Evergreen School District held a Public Hearing on October 9, 2014, and determined that each school within the district has sufficient and good quality textbooks and instructional materials pursuant to the settlement of Williams vs. the State of California.

All students, including English Learners, are given their own individual standards-aligned textbooks or instructional materials, or both, in core subjects for use in the classroom and to take home. All textbooks and instructional materials used within the district must be aligned with the California State Content Standards and Frameworks, with final approval by the Board of Trustees. Textbooks and supplementary materials are adopted according to a cycle developed by the California Department of Education, making the textbooks used in the school the most current available. The table displays information collected in September 2014 about the quality, currency, and availability of the standards-aligned textbooks and other instructional materials used at the school. The district does not have a formal textbook adoption for Health or for Visual and Performing Arts.

| Textbooks and Instructional Materials | |
|---|--|
| Year and month in which data were collected: October 9, 2014 | |
| Core Curriculum Area | Textbooks and Instructional Materials/Year of Adoption |
| Reading/Language Arts The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0.0% | Adopted in 2009 (Grade K-6): MacMillan/McGraw Hill |
| Mathematics The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0.0% | Adopted in 2008 (Grade K): Harcourt Adopted in 2008 (Grade 1-5): Houghton Mifflin Adopted in 2008 (Grade 6): Glencoe (MacMillan/McGraw Hill) |
| Science The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0.0% | Adopted in 2007 (Grade K): Pearson Scott Foresman Adopted in 2007 (Grade 1-5): MacMillan/McGraw Hill Adopted in 2007 (Grade 6-8): Holt, Rhinehart, Winston |
| History-Social Science The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0.0% | Adopted in 2006: (Kinder): Pearson Scott Foresman Adopted in 2006: (Grade 1-6): Houghton Mifflin |

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

Cedar Grove Elementary School was originally constructed in 1969. School facilities are currently comprised of 22 permanent classrooms, 17 portable classrooms, a computer lab, a library, a cafeteria/multipurpose room, a staff lounge, and two playgrounds. Recent construction projects at the school have included extensive landscaping and beautification, installation of permanent classroom walls (in place of accordion style), and technology upgrades to the multipurpose room. Additional outdoor seating for students was added during the summer of 2010. The district passed a facilities bond measure in 2006 that will allow for future modernization. The chart displays the results of the most recent facilities inspection.

Cleaning Process:

Cedar Grove Elementary School provides a safe and clean environment for students, staff, and volunteers. The district has adopted cleaning standards for all schools in the district. Basic cleaning operations are performed on a daily basis throughout the school year with emphasis on classrooms and restrooms. A joint effort between students and staff helps keep the campus clean and litter-free. The principal works daily with the school's custodial staff to develop sanitation schedules that ensure a clean, safe, and functional learning environment.

Maintenance & Repair:

A scheduled maintenance program is administered by Cedar Grove Elementary School's custodial staff on a regular basis, with heavy maintenance functions occurring during vacation periods. Additionally, a scheduled maintenance program is administered by the district to ensure that school grounds and facilities remain in excellent repair. A work order process is used when issues arise that require immediate attention. Emergency repairs are given the highest priority; repair requests are completed efficiently and in the order in which they are received.

Deferred Maintenance Budget:

The State School Deferred Maintenance Program provides state matching funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis, to assist school districts with expenditures for major repair or replacement of existing school building components. Typically, this includes roofing, plumbing, heating, air conditioning, electrical systems, interior or exterior painting, and floor systems. In the Budget Act of July 2009, the State Legislature provided school districts with flexibility in using these funds to meet general fund needs. In an effort to mitigate the effects of declining state revenues, the Evergreen School District has taken advantage of this flexibility. The district will utilize bond funds and other appropriate sources to ensure its facilities are clean, safe and in good repair.

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)
Year and month in which data were collected: 11/25/2014

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

B. Pupil Outcomes

State Priority: Pupil Achievement

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Pupil Achievement State Priority (Priority 4):

- Statewide assessments (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress and its successor the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program);
- The Academic Performance Index; and
- The percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and the California State University, or career technical education sequences or programs of study.

| CAASPP 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 | | |
| | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 |
| Science | 72 | 60 | 77 | 81 | 79 | 79 | 60 | 59 | 60 |

* Science (grades 5, 8, and 10) assessments include California Standards Tests (CSTs), California Modified Assessment (CMA), and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). 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.

| STAR 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 | | |
| | 10-11 | 11-12 | 12-13 | 10-11 | 11-12 | 12-13 | 10-11 | 11-12 | 12-13 |
| ELA | 62 | 62 | 62 | 71 | 75 | 73 | 54 | 56 | 55 |
| Math | 68 | 63 | 65 | 76 | 76 | 74 | 49 | 50 | 50 |
| HSS | | | | 69 | 73 | 74 | 48 | 49 | 49 |

* STAR Program was last administered in 2012-13. 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.

| Academic Performance Index Ranks - Three-Year Comparison | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|
| API Rank | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| Statewide | 7 | 6 | 6 |
| Similar Schools | 3 | 2 | 1 |

* For 2014 and subsequent years, the statewide and similar schools ranks will no longer be produced.

| Grade Level | 2013-14 Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards | | |
|-------------|---|--------|--------|
| | 4 of 6 | 5 of 6 | 6 of 6 |
| 5 | 18.0 | 21.8 | 39.8 |

* 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.

| 2013-14 CAASPP Results by Student Group | |
|---|---|
| Group | Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced |
| | Science (grades 5, 8, and 10) |
| All Students in the LEA | 79 |
| All Student at the School | 77 |
| Male | 75 |
| Female | 79 |
| Black or African American | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | |
| Asian | 88 |
| Filipino | 69 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 57 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | |
| White | |
| Two or More Races | |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 66 |
| English Learners | 39 |
| Students with Disabilities | |
| Students Receiving Migrant Education Services | |

* CAASPP includes science assessments (CSTs, CMA, and CAPA) in grades 5, 8, and 10. 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.

| API Growth by Student Group – Three-Year Comparison | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------|-------|
| Group | Actual API Change | | |
| | 10-11 | 11-12 | 12-13 |
| All Students at the School | 17 | -12 | -2 |
| Black or African American | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | |
| Asian | 4 | 2 | -19 |
| Filipino | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 13 | -41 | 18 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | | | |
| Two or More Races | | | |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | -3 | -1 | 4 |
| English Learners | 15 | 12 | 3 |
| Students with Disabilities | | | |

* "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

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

At Cedar Grove Elementary School, parents are encouraged to be part of their child's educational experience. Parents are encouraged to volunteer in the classroom, serve on our School Site Council, and become active members in the Cedar Grove PTA.

Parents and students are informed of school rules and discipline policies at the beginning of the school year, during school safety and rules assemblies and at the Back-to-School night. Ongoing school-to-home communication is facilitated through weekly newsletters, Back-to-School Night, Exhibition Night (Open House), parent-teacher conferences, e-mails, weekly parent meetings, and the school website.

Contact Information

Parents or community members who wish to participate in leadership teams, school committees, school activities, or become a volunteer may contact the school at (408) 270-4958.

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.

School Safety Plan

The safety of students and staff is a primary concern of Cedar Grove Elementary School. Students are supervised before school, during recess, and after school by teachers and administrators. Lunch supervision is provided by noon-duty aides and parent volunteers. All visitors to the campus must sign in at the main office and wear a visitor's pass at all times during their stay on school grounds. There is also a designated area for student drop-off and pick-up at the front of the school.

The School Site Safety Plan was last reviewed and updated in November 2012 by the Emergency Response Team (ERT). Any and all revisions to the plan are immediately communicated to classified and certificated staff. Key elements of the Safety Plan focus on the following:

- School rules & procedures
- Sexual harassment policy
- Current status of school crime
- Notification to teachers
- Child abuse reporting procedures
- Schoolwide dress code
- Policies related to suspension/expulsion
- Disaster procedures/routine & emergency drills
- Safe ingress & egress of pupils, parents, & school employees

The school is in compliance with the laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to hazardous materials and state earthquake standards. The school's disaster preparedness plan includes steps for ensuring student and staff safety during a disaster. Fire, disaster, and lockdown drills are conducted on a rotating basis throughout the school year.

| Suspensions and Expulsions | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| School | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 |
| Suspensions Rate | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Expulsions Rate | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| District | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 |
| Suspensions Rate | 1.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Expulsions Rate | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| State | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 |
| Suspensions Rate | 5.7 | 5.1 | 4.4 |
| Expulsions Rate | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |

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

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.

| 2013-14 Adequate Yearly Progress Overall and by Criteria | | |
|--|--------|----------|
| AYP Criteria | School | District |
| Made AYP Overall | | |
| Met Participation Rate: English-Language Arts | | |
| Met Participation Rate: Mathematics | | |
| Met Percent Proficient: English-Language Arts | | |
| Met Percent Proficient: Mathematics | | |
| Met API Criteria | | |

| 2014-15 Federal Intervention Program | | |
|---|--------|-----------|
| Indicator | School | District |
| Program Improvement Status | | In PI |
| First Year of Program Improvement | | 2010-2011 |
| Year in Program Improvement | | Year 3 |
| Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement | | 5 |
| Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement | | 83.3 |

* DW (determination waiver) indicates that the PI status of the school was carried over from the prior year in accordance with the flexibility granted through the federal waiver process.

| Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff at this School | |
|--|-----------|
| Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) | |
| Academic Counselor | |
| Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development) | |
| Library Media Teacher (Librarian) | .028 |
| Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional) | .63 |
| Psychologist | .4 |
| Social Worker | |
| Nurse | .11 |
| Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist | .6 |
| Resource Specialist | 1.0 |
| Other | as needed |
| Average Number of Students per Staff Member | |
| Academic Counselor | |

* 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.

| Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|----|----|-----------------------|----|----|-------|----|----|-----|----|----|
| Average Class Size | | | | Number of Classrooms* | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 1-20 | | | 21-32 | | | 33+ | | |
| Grade | 12 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| Kinder. | 23.5 | 24 | 24 | 0 | | | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | | |
| Gr. 1 | 23.3 | 24 | 22 | 0 | | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | | |
| Gr. 2 | 23.4 | 21 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | | |
| Gr. 3 | 23.8 | 22 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 0 | | |
| Gr. 4 | 30.5 | 26 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | | |
| Gr. 5 | 26.8 | 27 | 27 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | |
| Gr. 6 | 31.3 | 24 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | | |

* 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.

| FY 2012-13 Teacher and Administrative Salaries | | |
|--|-----------------|--|
| Category | District Amount | State Average for Districts in Same Category |
| Beginning Teacher Salary | \$49,401 | \$41,507 |
| Mid-Range Teacher Salary | \$79,939 | \$67,890 |
| Highest Teacher Salary | \$92,975 | \$86,174 |
| Average Principal Salary (ES) | \$119,119 | \$109,131 |
| Average Principal Salary (MS) | \$126,476 | \$111,937 |
| Average Principal Salary (HS) | \$0 | \$109,837 |
| Superintendent Salary | \$180,000 | \$185,462 |
| Percent of District Budget | | |
| Teacher Salaries | 49 | 42 |
| Administrative Salaries | 5 | 6 |

* For detailed information on salaries, see the CDE Certificated Salaries & Benefits webpage at www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/.

FY 2012-13 Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries

| Level | Expenditures Per Pupil | | | Average Teacher Salary |
|---|------------------------|------------|--------------|------------------------|
| | Total | Restricted | Unrestricted | |
| School Site | 4,796 | 122 | 4,675 | 83,829 |
| District | ♦ | ♦ | \$6032 | \$80,971 |
| State | ♦ | ♦ | \$4,690 | \$70,788 |
| Percent Difference: School Site/District | | | -22.5 | 3.5 |
| Percent Difference: School Site/ State | | | -0.3 | 18.4 |

Types of Services Funded at Cedar Grove Elementary School

In addition to general state funding, all schools within Evergreen School District received state and federal categorical funding for the following support programs:

- Economic Impact Aid
- School & Library Improvement Program
- Title I, Targeted Assistance (for these schools: Cadwallader, Dove Hill, Holly Oak, Katherine Smith, Montgomery, and O.B. Whaley)
- Title II, Staff Development
- Title III, Limited English Proficient

Professional Development provided for Teachers at Cedar Grove Elementary School

Staff members build teaching skills and concepts through participation in conferences, workshops, and staff development meetings throughout the year. For the past three years, the district has sponsored three staff development days annually where teachers are offered a broad-based variety of professional growth opportunities in curriculum, teaching strategies, and methodologies which include innovative PBL (Project-Based Learning) to increase critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity.

To transition to Common Core State Standards, an instruction coach (50% full time employee) has been added to provide training, resources, meeting facilitation, and in class coaching opportunities for demonstrations and feedback.