

Morrill Middle School

School Accountability Report Card

Reported Using Data from the 2015-16 School Year

Published During 2016-17

By February 1 of each year, every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC). The SARC contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school. Under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) all local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to prepare a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), which describes how they intend to meet annual school-specific goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities. Additionally, data reported in an LCAP is to be consistent with data reported in the SARC.

- For more information about SARC requirements, see the California Department of Education (CDE) SARC Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/>.
- For more information about the LCFF or LCAP, see the CDE LCFF Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/>.
- For additional information about the school, parents/guardians and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.

DataQuest

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE DataQuest Web page at <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/> that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district and the county. Specifically, DataQuest is a dynamic system that provides reports for accountability (e.g., test data, enrollment, high school graduates, dropouts, course enrollments, staffing, and data regarding English learners).

Internet Access

Internet access is available at public libraries and other locations that are publicly accessible (e.g., the California State Library). Access to the Internet at libraries and public locations is generally provided on a first-come, first-served basis. Other use restrictions may include the hours of operation, the length of time that a workstation may be used (depending on availability), the types of software programs available on a workstation, and the ability to print documents.

About This School

Contact Information (School Year 2016-17)

School Contact Information	
School Name	Morrill Middle School
Street	1970 Morrill Ave
City, State, Zip	San Jose CA 95123
Phone Number	408-923-1930
Principal	Joann Vaars
E-mail Address	jvaars@busd.net
Web Site	http://morrill.berryessa.k12.ca.us/
CDS Code	43693776068928

District Contact Information	
District Name	Berryessa Union Elementary School District
Phone Number	408.923.1880
Superintendent	Mr. Will Ector
E-mail Address	wector@busd.net
Web Site	www.berryessa.k12.ca.us

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

My personal goal for Morrill Middle School is to foster a safe, clean, positive and respectful learning environment for all students and staff; provide a school learning environment where students can develop into positive and productive citizens well prepared for their future.

The mission of Morrill Middle School is to prepare each student to be successful in high school and in life. This is accomplished by providing our students with a safe and positive environment that supports their learning. Through high expectations for behavior and academics, we will guide students as they acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that foster an enjoyment of learning, a respect for them selves and others, and the ability to become responsible citizens. Morrill Middle School is a great place for children to grow and develop as they move from sixth to eighth grade. The staff at Morrill is caring and continually challenges the students to be at their best each and every day. We are continually changing to meet the needs of our learners as well as the needs of society.

Important to our school's success is an effective partnership between parents, the community, and the school. Our school pioneered the first uniform policy for the Berrryessa Unions School District. This is our tenth year as a mandatory uniform school, which has improved our school climate, creating a more positive atmosphere with a strong focus on high standards and school pride. Our students are very important to us, and all of the Morrill Middle School community will do whatever we can to help our students to be successful this year, and throughout their lives.

Berryessa Union School District provides all students the skills to become lifelong learners and successful 21st century global citizens.

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

Grade Level	Number of Students
Grade 6	240
Grade 7	240
Grade 8	241
Total Enrollment	721

Student Enrollment by Group (School Year 2015-16)

Student Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	2.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.4
Asian	34.4
Filipino	22.7
Hispanic or Latino	26.4
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.8
White	6.1
Two or More Races	6
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	45.2
English Learners	18.7
Students with Disabilities	15.8
Foster Youth	0.1

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

Teachers	School			District
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2016-17
With Full Credential	32	30	31	314.5
Without Full Credential	1	1	0	2.5
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence (with full credential)	0	0	0	0

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions

Indicator	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners	2	2	0
Total Teacher Misassignments *	2	2	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

Note: "Misassignments" refers to the number of positions filled by teachers who lack legal authorization to teach that grade level, subject area, student group, etc.

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

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

Location of Classes	Percent of Classes In Core Academic Subjects	
	Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
This School	96.1	3.9
All Schools in District	98.2	1.8
High-Poverty Schools in District	96.4	3.6
Low-Poverty Schools in District	99.7	0.3

Note: High-poverty schools are defined as those schools with student eligibility of approximately 40 percent or more in the free and reduced price meals program. Low-poverty schools are those with student eligibility of approximately 39 percent or less in the free and reduced price meals program.

Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2016-17)

Year and month in which data were collected: February 2017

Subject	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/ Year of Adoption	From Most Recent Adoption?	Percent of Students Lacking Own Assigned Copy
Reading/Language Arts	6-8 Holt, Rinehart, Winston: Literature & Language Arts - 6/18/02	Yes	0
Mathematics	6-8: CPM: College Preparatory Mathematics Common Core Series...Core Connections - 4/23/14	Yes	0
Science	6-8: CPO: CPO Science - 5/15/07	Yes	0
History-Social Science	6-8: Glencoe/McGraw Hill: Discovering our Past 6/13/2006	Yes	0
Visual and Performing Arts	6-8 Pearson Scott Foresman: Making Music, California Edition - 4/11/08		0

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)

General: The district places a strong emphasis on ensuring that all schools are safe, clean, environmentally friendly, mechanically functional and inviting for students, staff members, and the community. To assist in this effort, the district utilizes Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) developed by the State of California OPSC and local operations department developed inspection survey methods to keep facilities in compliance with all federal and state health and safety regulations. The district regularly inspects and reviews the condition of the school facilities and surrounding grounds. The district places the highest priority on those safeguards that impact the fire, life and safety protection of the students, staff, and school buildings. Below is more specific information on the condition of the school and the efforts made to ensure that students are provided with a clean, safe, and functional learning environment.

Age of School Buildings: Morrill was opened in 1972. This school has 46 regular classrooms; a computer lab; art, home economics, instrumental music, and choral music rooms; a multipurpose room; a library, and an administration building. In addition to the main classrooms, there are two portable classrooms added to provide addition classroom space.

In a joint venture with the City of San Jose, the district constructed a 22,000 sq. ft. Berryessa Youth Center (BYC) in 2005. The building has a large gymnasium for school use, and also serves as an after-hours youth center for the city of San Jose Department of Recreation and the community.

Maintenance and Repair: District maintenance staff ensures that the repairs necessary to keep the school in good repair and working order are completed in a timely manner. A work order system process is used to ensure efficient service and highest priority is given to emergency repairs. At the time of publication, 100% of the school’s restrooms on campus were in good working order. This site is also scheduled to have interior and exterior lighting upgrades completed through Prop. 39 initiatives in identified areas throughout the campus.

Cleaning Process and Schedule: The district has developed cleaning standards and schedules for all schools in the district. A summary of these standards and schedules is available at the school or the Maintenance & Operations office. The principal, with the guidance of the maintenance supervisor works daily with the custodial team to ensure that the cleaning standards are met, and that classrooms, restrooms, and campus grounds are kept clean, safe, and well-maintained.

Modernization Projects: No modernization projects are scheduled during the 2016-17 school year.

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year)				
Year and month of the most recent FIT report: July 2016				
System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
Systems: Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer		X		Replaced Heat Furnaces
Interior: Interior Surfaces		X		Conc Slab Repair 2017
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 Rating (Most Recent Year)

Year and month of the most recent FIT report: July 2016				
Overall Rating	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
			X	

B. Pupil Outcomes

State Priority: Pupil Achievement

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

- **Statewide assessments** (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress [CAASPP] System, which includes the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for students in the general education population and the California Alternate Assessments [CAAs] for English language arts/literacy [ELA] and mathematics given in grades three through eight and grade eleven. The CAAs have replaced the California Alternate Performance Assessment [CAPA] for ELA and mathematics, which were eliminated in 2015. Only eligible students may participate in the administration of the CAAs. CAA items are aligned with alternate achievement standards, which are linked with the Common Core State Standards [CCSS] for students with significant cognitive disabilities); and
- The percentage of students who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and the California State University, or career technical education sequences or programs of study

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

Subject	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standards (grades 3-8 and 11)					
	School		District		State	
	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16
English Language Arts/Literacy	47	49	56	59	44	48
Mathematics	40	43	50	54	34	36

Note: Percentages are not calculated when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

CAASPP Test Results in ELA by Student Group

Grades Three through Eight and Grade Eleven (School Year 2015-16)

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
All Students	6	239	234	97.9	45.3
	7	238	235	98.7	50.2
	8	239	235	98.3	51.5
Male	6	132	128	97.0	36.7
	7	126	126	100.0	42.9
	8	130	127	97.7	44.9
Female	6	107	106	99.1	55.7
	7	112	109	97.3	58.7
	8	109	108	99.1	59.3
Black or African American	6	--	--	--	--
	7	--	--	--	--
	8	--	--	--	--
American Indian or Alaska Native	6	--	--	--	--
	7	--	--	--	--
Asian	6	70	68	97.1	60.3
	7	87	85	97.7	67.1
	8	92	90	97.8	62.2
Filipino	6	56	55	98.2	49.1

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
	7	59	59	100.0	59.3
	8	49	48	98.0	66.7
Hispanic or Latino	6	65	64	98.5	21.9
	7	64	63	98.4	22.2
	8	54	53	98.2	37.7
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	6	--	--	--	--
	7	--	--	--	--
	8	--	--	--	--
White	6	14	14	100.0	57.1
	7	12	12	100.0	41.7
	8	19	19	100.0	26.3
Two or More Races	6	21	21	100.0	61.9
	7	--	--	--	--
	8	12	12	100.0	50.0
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	6	105	101	96.2	33.7
	7	108	106	98.2	39.6
	8	106	104	98.1	42.3
English Learners	6	44	41	93.2	17.1
	7	45	43	95.6	11.6
	8	43	40	93.0	17.5
Students with Disabilities	6	41	41	100.0	7.3
	7	34	34	100.0	5.9
	8	41	41	100.0	17.1
Foster Youth	6	--	--	--	--
	7	--	--	--	--
	8	--	--	--	--

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

Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Note: The number of students tested includes all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using only students who received scores.

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

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
All Students	6	239	236	98.7	39.4
	7	238	236	99.2	47.5
	8	238	237	99.6	43.5
Male	6	132	129	97.7	35.7
	7	126	125	99.2	44.8
	8	129	128	99.2	41.4
Female	6	107	107	100.0	43.9
	7	112	111	99.1	50.5
	8	109	109	100.0	45.9
Black or African American	6	--	--	--	--
	7	--	--	--	--
	8	--	--	--	--
American Indian or Alaska Native	6	--	--	--	--
	7	--	--	--	--
Asian	6	70	69	98.6	59.4
	7	87	86	98.8	68.6
	8	92	91	98.9	59.3
Filipino	6	56	56	100.0	39.3
	7	59	59	100.0	47.5
	8	49	49	100.0	49.0
Hispanic or Latino	6	65	64	98.5	14.1
	7	64	63	98.4	14.3
	8	53	53	100.0	28.3
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	6	--	--	--	--
	7	--	--	--	--
	8	--	--	--	--
White	6	14	14	100.0	35.7
	7	12	12	100.0	58.3
	8	19	19	100.0	26.3
Two or More Races	6	21	21	100.0	66.7
	7	--	--	--	--
	8	12	12	100.0	41.7
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	6	105	103	98.1	25.2
	7	108	107	99.1	37.4
	8	105	104	99.0	33.6

Student Group	Grade	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
		Enrolled	Tested	Tested	Standard Met or Exceeded
English Learners	6	44	43	97.7	16.3
	7	45	45	100.0	22.2
	8	43	43	100.0	18.6
Students with Disabilities	6	41	41	100.0	4.9
	7	34	33	97.1	9.1
	8	41	41	100.0	19.5
Foster Youth	6	--	--	--	--
	7	--	--	--	--
	8	--	--	--	--

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

Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Note: The number of students tested includes all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using only students who received scores.

CAASPP Test Results in Science for All Students

Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)								
	School			District			State		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)	78	75	78	77	73	76	60	56	54

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

Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

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

Student Group	Total Enrollment	# of Students with Valid Scores	% of Students with Valid Scores	% of Students Proficient or Advanced
All Students	238	232	97.5	77.6
Male	129	124	96.1	73.4
Female	109	108	99.1	82.4
Asian	92	91	98.9	89.0
Filipino	49	48	98.0	83.3
Hispanic or Latino	53	50	94.3	60.0
White	19	18	94.7	66.7
Two or More Races	12	12	100.0	91.7
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	105	103	98.1	68.0
English Learners	43	43	100.0	44.2
Students with Disabilities	41	39	95.1	46.2

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

Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

State Priority: Other Pupil Outcomes

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

- Pupil outcomes in the subject areas of physical education.

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

Grade Level	Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	Four of Six Standards	Five of Six Standards	Six of Six Standards
7	20.9	24.8	33.9

Note: Percentages are not calculated when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

C. Engagement

State Priority: Parental Involvement

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the Parental Involvement State Priority (Priority 3):

- Efforts the school district makes to seek parent input in making decisions for the school district and each schoolsite.

Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2016-17)

Important to our school's success is an effective partnership between parents, the community, and the school. Our school pioneered the first uniform policy for the Berryessa Unions School District. This is our tenth year as a mandatory uniform school, which has improved our school climate, creating a more positive atmosphere with a strong focus on high standards and school pride. Our students are very important to us, and all of the Morrill Middle School community will do whatever we can to help our students to be successful this year, and throughout their lives.

State Priority: School Climate

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the School Climate State Priority (Priority 6):

- Pupil suspension rates;
- Pupil expulsion rates; and
- Other local measures on the sense of safety.

Suspensions and Expulsions

Rate	School			District			State		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Suspensions	7.2	13.9	12.6	3.0	3.8	3.1	4.4	3.8	3.7
Expulsions	0.3	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1

School Safety Plan (School Year 2016-17)

As a result of our involvement with a city safety initiative, the city of San Jose provides resources that help us improve campus safety and are on call when needed. Members of our staff supervise our campus 10 minutes before the start of school and immediately after dismissal. Staff also supervise students during break and lunch. Our staff members hold monthly drill which include; fire, earthquake, intruder alert, and evacuation drills. We also require all visitors to register with the office

D. Other SARC Information

The information in this section is required to be in the SARC but is not included in the state priorities for LCFF.

Federal Intervention Program (School Year 2016-17)

Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status	In PI	In PI
First Year of Program Improvement	2008-2009	2010-2011
Year in Program Improvement*	Year 5	Year 3
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	6
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement	N/A	85.7

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

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Secondary)

Subject	2013-14				2014-15				2015-16			
	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	23	8	9	6	20	13	10	3	25	12	6	10
Mathematics	28	5	7	8	13	6	1		26	8	11	9
Science	31	1	8	7	27	2	9	6	29	3	10	11
Social Science	27	4	9	6	25	6	8	5	27	9	9	9

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.

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff (School Year 2015-16)

Title	Number of FTE Assigned to School	Average Number of Students per Academic Counselor
Academic Counselor	1	0
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	0	N/A
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	.07	N/A
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	1	N/A
Psychologist	.38	N/A
Social Worker	.61	N/A
Nurse	.11	N/A
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	.12	N/A
Resource Specialist	1	N/A
Other	0	N/A

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

*One Full Time Equivalent (FTE) equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time.

Expenditures per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries (Fiscal Year 2014-15)

Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Supplemental/ Restricted	Basic/ Unrestricted	
School Site	\$4642.5	\$232.7	\$4409.9	\$64539.3
District	N/A	N/A	\$4295.0	\$73,023
Percent Difference: School Site and District	N/A	N/A		
State	N/A	N/A	\$5,677	\$75,137
Percent Difference: School Site and State	N/A	N/A		

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

Types of Services Funded (Fiscal Year 2015-16)

Individual school sites offer Supplemental Instruction (SI) to students who are below grade level. It is up to each individual school site to identify the students who need extra support based upon district benchmarks or teacher recommendations. Each school site selects certificated and classified staff to teach these SI classes, usually after school (1 – 3 days a week). Each school also identifies the curriculum that will be used. The majority of the school sites select computer-based programs where students can work independently at their current academic level. Some schools provide this time to receive help on their homework.

Schools that are identified as Program Improvement Year 2 schools offer Supplemental Education Services (SES). Students in the 3rd – 8th grade are identified at the district level based on their SBAC and benchmark tests. Letters are sent out to students who qualify for the program. The district contracts out through SES providers to offer the extra tutoring assistance.

Teacher and Administrative Salaries (Fiscal Year 2014-15)

Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary	\$51,000	\$44,573
Mid-Range Teacher Salary	\$74,677	\$72,868
Highest Teacher Salary	\$94,735	\$92,972
Average Principal Salary (Elementary)	\$133,919	\$116,229
Average Principal Salary (Middle)	\$137,651	\$119,596
Average Principal Salary (High)		\$121,883
Superintendent Salary	\$206,785	\$201,784
Percent of Budget for Teacher Salaries	40%	39%
Percent of Budget for Administrative Salaries	7%	5%

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

Professional Development (Most Recent Three Years)

Professional Development this school year occurred on many different levels – before school started (Summer of 2016) and ongoing throughout the 2016 – 2017 school year. The district office working with our site principals worked on the scope/sequence of the professional development sessions. The work was also based on student data produced from benchmark tests, CELDT, and SBAC data, as well as teacher feedback.

At the beginning of the school year, all certificated staff participated in two days of professional development aligned with the subjects they teach. K-2 teachers received training on the Benchmark Assessment System and the Heinemann Writing Units of Study. Grade 3-5 teachers received training on the Heinemann Writing Units of study. Special Education staff and middle school teachers received specialized training related to new curriculum and teachers needs in the area of their specialty.

During the school year teachers were provided with additional release days to receive training on newly adopted ELA materials (up to 3 times during the year). Each release day provided collaborative planning time during which teachers prepared to teach a writing unit. Middle School science teachers were released three times during the school year to develop the integrated approach to teaching science in 6th and 7th grade. They also received training on 3 programs that were piloted in order to provide NGSS align materials. 3 Curriculum Leadership Teams were released 3-5 days during the school year to receive professional development, created resources such as curriculum maps and benchmarks, and prepare site professional development in math, science, and ELA/ELD.

Throughout the school year, we offered monthly professional development sessions in which all the teachers participated (1.5 hours on early release Thursday afternoons). The topics were chosen by principals and district office administrators. The focus was on building teachers' capacity for shared leadership to improve teaching and learning in math, NGSS, Technology and ELA/ELD. Teacher leaders from each site provided the professional development which was developed collaboratively with Curriculum and Instruction staff and focused on understanding the new California frameworks.

The Sobrato Early Academic Language (SEAL) program was implemented at six of our ten elementary schools in grades TK-3. The schools included Cherrywood, Laneview, and Summerdale where TK-3 teachers were trained; and Brooktree, Toyon, and Vinci Park, where kindergarten and first grade teachers were trained. Teachers received initial training in August 2016. They also received 3 2-day Professional Development sessions throughout the school year. Each grade level also received planning time after each 2-day PD session. The PD sessions were delivered by a contract through SEAL. Our three SEAL coaches provided the follow up planning PD sessions. Teachers were released from their classrooms for all of these PD days.