Port Angeles School District

Jefferson Elementary School

JEFFERSON
Elementary School
Port Angeles, WA

School Improvement Plan
2018 – 2019

Component One – Needs Assessment	**Component Three – Activities to Ensure Mastery**
Guiding Questions:	Guiding Questions:

• How does our needs assessment integrate current school year quantitative and qualitative data?
• How does your needs assessment give an accurate and thorough view of the entire school?
• What subjects, grade levels, and programs are the strongest and weakest?
• How does the school focus on the academic progress of English language learners?
• To what extent are discipline issues impacting students?
• What is the level of family and the community support at the school?
• What does the data say about the success of students transitioning into and out of your school? Examples: Elementary schools should look at WAKids, middle schools at 6th grade attendance and behavior data, high schools at 9th grade course completion.
• How have you identified any areas of concern from the following within your needs assessment: Family Engagement, Transitions Between Grades and/or Schools; Technology; Professional Development; Schoolwide Tiered Models of Instruction; Behavior and Discipline; Well Rounded Education; Secondary Education Program Needs
	• How does the plan support the most at-risk students in the school?
	• What strategies and programs will we use to help at-risk students remain or get back on track?
	• What is the district doing to help students in danger of dropping out or falling behind on mastery of a key skill?
	• What is the school doing to help students' academic and non-academic needs?
	• Does the plan ensure the school meets students' academic and non-academic needs?
	• Does the plan incorporate a wide range of strategies, programs and activities, including:
	    o Counseling and mental health support
	    o College and career readiness
	    o Tiered behavioral support
	    o AP & International Baccalaureate courses
	    o Preschool transition support
	    o Professional development for staff
	    o Intensive academic support to students

Component Two – Schoolwide Reform Strategies Guiding Questions:	**Component Four – Coordination and Integration** Guiding Questions:

Does the plan's schoolwide reform:
• Consider a well-rounded education ESSA Section: 8102(52). What about literacy, science, government, engineering, the arts, and mathematics?
• Improve transitions between grades and/or schools?
• Enrich and accelerate curriculum?
• Provide opportunities for students both ahead of and behind grade level?
• Include specific ways in which the school will reach each level of reform? Did you address staffing plans and hires, professional development strategies, and schoolwide goals?
• Outline the strategies that you will use to improve academics for all students? Did you outline how you will increase the amount and quality of learning using specific programs, activities, and courses?
• If your school is continuing as a priority or focus school in 2018-19, how do your strategies incorporate the 7 turn around principles?
	• How will the school leverage allowable combined funds to improve the schoolwide plan?
	• How will it make the most of available staff at the school and district to maximize the positive impact of the plan?
	• How does the plan combine funds to connect the reform strategies developed?
	• Does the plan outline how the school will combine funds, and how the school will meet the intents and purposes of each program?
	• Does the plan outline how funds from Title I, Part A and other federal education programs will be used to help the school meet the statutory requirements of the programs?
	• Does the plan include the total amount of funds for each program?
	• If a priority/focus school:
	    o Does the plan include school improvement funds?
	    o How are schoolwide funds being leveraged to support school improvement efforts?

SBA & MSP DATA

Color Key
Above State Avg.
At, or Near, State Avg.
Below State Avg.

Directions: Enter the scores on the READING, MATH and WRITING Sections of the MSP and SBA.

Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018	Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018
Reading/ELA 3: % of students at each level					**Math 3:** % of students at each level				
Level 1:	12.0	23.8	18	22	Level 1:	14.0	19.9	21	21
Level 2:	22.0	21.7	26	22	Level 2:	22.0	20.4	23	21
Level 3:	44.0	22.7	24	24	Level 3:	38.0	29.4	36	29
Level 4:	22.0	29.5	32	32	Level 4:	22.0	28.1	21	29
Reading/ELA 3: % Meeting Standard:	66.0%	52.6	55	56	**Math 3:** % Meeting Standard:	62.0%	57.8	56	58
% Not Meeting Standard:	34.0%	47.3	45	44	% Not Meeting Standard:	38.0%	42.1	44	42

Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018
Reading/ELA 4: % of students at each level				
Level 1:	28.2	25.2	34	25
Level 2:	26.0	17.7	22	18
Level 3:	26.0	24	26	24
Level 4:	19.5	30.7	18	34
Reading/ELA 4: % Meeting Standard:	45.6%	55.2	44	58
% Not Meeting Standard:	54.4%	44.7	56	42

SBA & MSP DATA

Directions: Enter the scores on the MATH, SCIENCE, and READING sections of the MSP and SBA.

Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018	Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018
Math 4: % of students at each level					MSP Science 5: % of students at each level				
Level 1:	19.5	17.3	32	19	Level 1:	9.5	15.7	14	23
Level 2:	26.0	26.5	28	27	Level 2:	14.3	18.8	24	21
Level 3:	34.7	27.7	22	28	Level 3:	35.7	29.7	43	37
Level 4:	15.2	26.2	18	27	Level 4:	40.5	33.2	19	19
Math 4: % Meeting Standard:	54.3%	54.3	40	54	MSP Science 5: % Meeting Standard:	76.2%	63.4	62%	56%
% Not Meeting Standard:	45.6%	45.6	60	46	% Not Meeting Standard:	47.6%	36.5	38%	44%

Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018	Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018
Reading/ELA 5: % of students at each level					Math 5: % of students at each level				
Level 1:	19.0	21.9	18	22	Level 1:	26.2	25	13	26
Level 2:	28.6	17.7	15	18	Level 2:	31.0	24.6	36	25
Level 3:	42.9	31	41	32	Level 3:	35.7	19.5	18	20
Level 4:	9.5	27.2	26	28	Level 4:	7.1	28.8	33	29
Reading/ELA 5: % Meeting Standard:	52.4%	58.6	67	60	Math 5: % Meeting Standard:	54.4%	48.6	51	49
% Not Meeting Standard:	47.6%	41.3	33	40	% Not Meeting Standard:	45.6%	51.3	49	51

4

October 5, 2018

SBA & MSP DATA

Directions: Enter the scores on the READING and MATH sections of the MSP and SBA.

Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018	Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018
Reading/ELA 6: % of students at each level					Math 6: % of students at each level				
Level 1:	8.3	19.2	21	20	Level 1:	18.7	23.9	9	25
Level 2:	20.8	23.4	23	23	Level 2:	33.3	25.9	40	27
Level 3:	62.4	34.2	44	35	Level 3:	25.0	21.9	37	22
Level 4:	8.3	20.7	12	22	Level 4:	18.7	25.9	14	27
Reading/ELA 6: % Meeting Standard:	70.8%	55.5	56	57	Math 6: % Meeting Standard:	45.8%	48.2	51	51
% Not Meeting Standard:	29.2%	44.4	44	43	% Not Meeting Standard:	54.2%	51.7	49	49

Needs Assessments Implications:

Read Naturally was utilized for RTI in 2nd, 3rd and 4th grade, with mixed data, including an overall drop in ELA scores. The use of Read Naturally versus targeted intervention (mixed grade) by essential standards will be examined after initial data is gathered on students in fall, 2018. Third grade took a dip in both reading and math, hovering right at the state average in a grade level that has historically been 5-10% above. Instructional practices and curricular implications among the grade team teachers will be examined at this level. 4th grade stayed similar in ELA, though the cohort dropped 22% in both ELA & math from 2017-2018. Staffing changes have occurred at this grade level, so data will be tracked closely under the new teaching team in 2018-19. Grade five was above the state in all three areas, showing marked improvement for that particular cohort. Grades 6 hovers right at the state average in both areas, which was a slight increase in math and a decrease in ELA from the previous year, though nearly identical in both areas when looking at the cohort of students. Math tutoring continued for level two students in grades 4th-6th, with mixed results on SBA with 5th grade maintaining 36% at level 2, and 6th grade 40% at level 2. 2018 began with one math para, and another will be hired in early October, targeting specific grade levels to streamline expertise. Para training on Eureka math is a critical component for the math curriculum adoption. After school tutoring begins twice a week for grades 4-6 by certificated teachers for 60 minutes each day. 3rd through 6th grade teachers continue to determine the best use of SBA Interim Assessment Blocks to enhance teaching and track student learning.

SBA & MSP DISAGGREGATION DATA

Color Key
Above State Avg.
At, or Near, State Avg.
Below State Avg.

Directions: Enter the percentage of students meeting and exceeding standard for each of the sub-groups with n>10. **If <10, enter an asterisk(*).**

Sub-Groups	GRADE 3 ELA							GRADE 3 MATH						
	SBA 2016	State 2016	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018		SBA 2016	State 2016	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018	
Male	40.0	50.5	60.7	49	38	52		40.0	59.6	57.1	58.6	50	59	
Female	82.1	58.4	72.7	56.4	68	60		71.4	58.1	68.2	56.9	61	57	
Low Income	61.8	37.7	58.6	35.6				47.1	43.9	55.2	42.1			
Special Ed	33.3		50.0	24.7	30	27		0.0		50.0	28.4	30	30	

Sub-Groups	GRADE 4 ELA							GRADE 4 MATH						
	SBA 2016	State 2016	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018		SBA 2016	State 2016	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018	
Male	23.8	53	35.0	51.5	52	55		45.0	56.5	40.0	55.8	48	56	
Female	18.2	61.2	53.8	59	36	61		13.6	54.2	65.4	52.8	32	53	
Low Income	12.0	40.2	41.7	37.9				16.0	38.9	50.0	38			
Special Ed	14.3		40.0	22.7	44	22		28.6		60.0	24	33	21	

Sub-Groups	GRADE 5 SCIENCE						
	MSP 2016	MSP 2016	MSP 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018	
Male	92.0	64.4	77.3	62.2	29	56.0	
Female	80.0	66.2	75.0	64.5	83	56.0	
Low Income	80.0	49.4	65.4	46.5			
Special Ed	87.5		0.00	32.6	0.00	21.0	

SBA & MSP DISAGGREGATION DATA

Color Key
Above State Avg.
At, or Near, State Avg.
Below State Avg.

Sub-Groups	GRADE 5 ELA							GRADE 5 MATH						
	SBA 2016	State 2016	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018		SBA 2016	State 2016	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018	
Male	80.0	54.6	45.5	53.6	44	55		68.0	50.1	54.5	49.9	25	50	
Female	60.0	65.8	60.0	63.8	83	65		25.0	48.2	30.0	47.2	70	48	
Low Income	63.3	43.5	46.2	41.2				36.7	32.5	34.6	31.1			
Special Ed	62.5		0.00	22.2	0	20		12.5		0.00	17.5	0	15	

Sub-Groups	GRADE 6 ELA							GRADE 6 MATH						
	SBA 2016	State 2016	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018		SBA 2016	State 2016	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018	
Male	29.1	50.6	76.0	49.8	46	51		52.1	47.1	52.0	47.7	54	48	
Female	52.0	62.7	65.2	61.5	71	62		48.0	49.1	39.1	49.4	47	50	
Low Income	37.9	39.3	63.6	37.4				51.7	30.5	42.4	30.3			
Special Ed	27.2		63.6	18.2	25	14		27.2		36.3	13.9	25	11	

Needs Assessments Implications:

Great strengths in ELA in 5th & 6th grade female students. Female consistently scored higher than males in ELA across the board, averaging a difference of 31% lower among males in 3rd, 5th, and 6th grades. 4th, interestingly, was 16% lower among females. Overall, the gap between ELA and math scores has decreased. 5th grade chose to use their designated RTI staffing to assist with push in support during social studies and science, with ELA scores increasing 21% among that particular cohort, indicating excellent use of staffing, resources, and instructional practices. In grades 3, 4, and 6 ELA, special education far out-performed the state, whereas grade 5 was below in all areas (ELA, math, science). Support staff dramatically increased their writing time with students, with all RTI and Resource I paraeducators trained in David Matteson. This cohort will be a focus as 6th graders. Math paras developed a stronger sense of curricular needs and were streamlined to work with targeted grade levels. Math tutoring continued to run for 10 students in grades 4-6 that needed intentional math intervention. Low income scores have not/were not released by the state, and therefore analysis of that subgroup is unavailable. Intentional areas of focus for 2018-2019: incoming 4th to 5th grade females, incoming 5th to 6th grade males, 5th to 6th grade special education, level two students, particularly in math, Eureka math, multi-tiered support for both math and ELA (including mixed grade intervention groups), special education inclusion model across all grade levels for reading, writing, math and social emotional learning.

Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	Data Analysis – Internal Accountability System Data Results for 2017-18						Data Analysis – Internal Accountability System Data Results For 2018-19					
	ELA						**ELA**					
# of Students that met standard and % for ALL Grades	Grade	Fall 7/9	Winter 16/26	Spring 26/26	Writing District Benchmark	**Kinder Only Blend/Site Words	GRADE	Fall 7/9	Winter 16/26	Spring 26/26	Writing District Benchmark	**Kinder Only Blend/Site Words
	**Kindergarten: Sounds / Standards - Fall Winter Spring - Blend/Site Words						**Kindergarten: Sounds / Standards - Fall Winter Spring - Blend/Site Words					
	K	74.3	82%	87%			K					
Grade 1 DRA	1	81%	80%	88%			1					
Grade 2 DIBELS	2						2					
Grade 2 STAR	2	74%	85%	69%			2					
Grade 3 – 6 MAP	3	46%	68%	SBA			3					
	4	40%	47%	SBA			4					
	5	59%	63%	SBA			5					
	6	61%	64%	SBA			6					
	Math						**Math**					
	Grade	Fall		Winter		Spring	Grade	Fall		Winter		Spring
NWEA MAP or Curriculum Benchmark Tests District Bench-marks Fall, Winter, Spring	K						K					
	1						1					
	2						2					
	3						3					SBA
	4						4					SBA
	5						5					SBA
	6						6					SBA

School Improvement Plan   October 5, 2018

INTERNAL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM DATA

Directions: Please enter grade-level appropriate data in the space provided.

Summary Student Internal Accountability System Demographic Data *(end-of-year data)*													
Internal Assessment Results for 2017-18 (EOY)							Internal Assessment Results for 2018-19(EOY)						
Grade	Unex-cused Ab-sences	Avg. Daily Attendance	Suspensions		Expulsions	Court Petitions	Grade	Unexcused Absences	Avg. Daily Attendance	Suspensions		Expulsions	Court Petitions
			Short-Term	Long-Term						Short-Term	Long- Term		
K	0.5	96.53%	3	0	0	0	K						
1	13	96.45%	10	0	0	1	1						
2	2	96.96%	0	0	0	0	2						
3	1.5	94.63%	3	0	0	0	3						
4	7	93.69%	6	0	0	0	4						
5	11.5	94.96%	8	0	0	0	5						
6	50.5	92.84%	4	0	0	1	6						

Summary of Student Support Services 2017-18(EOY)				
Grade	Special Education	Homeless EOY Number of Homeless Students	504	Student Assistance Team (SAT)
Pre	21	1	0	0
K	4	3	1	4
1	7	2	1	5
2	5	4	2	3
3	8	3	3	6
4	10	3	4	2
5	5	1	3	7
6	6	5	4	5

School Improvement Plan   October 5, 2018

DEMOGRAPHIC SCHOOL DATA

Directions: Fill in the blanks with the data sources given below. Only use data sources relevant to your school's grade levels and that which will assist you in focusing your plan.

Data Source	Information Provided By Data	Summary 2017-18 EOY
Attendance Report	Percent of students present per day (2017-18).	94.21
Unexcused Absences	Total number of absences not excused (2017-18).	177.5
Discipline Report	Summary of discipline activity for the building (2017-18).	Drugs/Alcohol: 0 Court Petitions: 1 Tobacco: 1 Expulsions: 0 Weapons: 0 Short-term Suspensions: 17 Fighting/Assaults: 15 Long-term Suspensions: 0
Free/Reduced Lunch Report	Percent of students where family income is below federally established poverty level (2017-18).	61.4%
Gender Report	Number of male and female students as reported by the 2017-18 OSPI School Report Card	Males: 50.8% Females: 49.2%
Ethnicity Report	Percent of students by ethnic groups as reported by the 2017-18 OSPI School Report Card	American Indian or Alaskan Native: 4.0% Asian or Pacific Islander: 0.6% Black: 2.2% Hispanic: 13.1% White: 69.8%
Staff Report	Staff demographic data as reported in the 2017-18 OSPI School Report Card	Headcount: Average Years of Exp: Overall Ratio: Percent ≥ a Master's Degree:

Summary of 2017-18 Attendance:

Attendance was a focus in 20178-2018, though a we did not utilize *Beat the BELL* as we had done the previous spring. Monthly recognition at assemblies, a prominent bulletin board in the main hallway, and the end of year assembly highlight those with perfect attendance (as well as the class with the best percentage each month – free recess!). 82 of our unexcused absences came from a 6th grade student who choiced into Jefferson after repeated years of school refusal at his home school. Despite countless interventions, team meetings, and truancy court hearings every other week, attendance remained a tremendous concern and the student was eventually dropped from active enrollment. Another 17.5 of unexcused were from a student who went through the truancy board process, which did have intermittent periods of success for the student. In reading through *Absenteeism & Truancy: Interventions & Universal Procedures*, we have discovered that conducting informal Functional Behavior Assessments on students with chronic absenteeism has shown marked improvement in student engagement in school. Therefore, we will begin holding SAT meetings specifically around attendance and establish these plans, spearheaded by our counselor. We are excited for this development in 2018-2019 around attendance and have already begun with the student mentioned above.

AREAS OF STRENGTH AND CONCERN

Directions: Remember how important it is to review past trends or changes over time. In reference to the MSP, analyze changes between Levels 1-4. Consider students who are not meeting standard; students who are at but not above standard; and students who are exceeding standard and determine which group of students needs what type of assistance. Based on individual subtest data or other data you have collected, determine the specific areas of strength and areas for improvement for your students.

AREAS OF STRENGTH	AREAS OF CONCERN
English Language Arts: • Female scores remained significantly higher than the state average in grades 3, 5, and 6. • Grade 3 – Level 1 4% less than the state • Grade 4 – Special education subgroup 22% above the state • Grade 5 – 83% of female subgroup met standard • Grade 6 – 71% of female subgroup met standard **Math:** • Grade 3 – Female subgroup 4% above the state in math • Grade 4 – Special education subgroup 12% above the state • Grade 5 – 70% of female subgroup met standard (state 48%) • Grade 6 – Males outperformed the state by 6% **Science:** • 83% of females met standard (state 56%) • Outperformed the state by 6% **Culture & Climate:** (taken from *03/2018 CEE Survey Data*) • 100% of staff at this school state "I am willing to work at changing my school for the better." • 95% of staff indicate "In our school we expect all staff to perform responsibilities with a high level of excellence." • 96% of staff indicate "The development of students' social emotional learning enhances the learning environment in our classrooms." • 92% of parents state "The school celebrates student success."	**English Language Arts:** • Male scores remain lower than the state in all grades, 3-6 • Grade 3 – 2018 cohort decreased by 11% from 2017 cohort • Grade 4 – Female subgroup 16% lower than male subgroup • Grade 5 – Male subgroup 39% lower than female subgroup • Grade 6 – 2018 cohort decreased by 14% from 2017 cohort **Math:** • Grade 3 – 21% students at level 1 • Grades 4 – 14% lower overall than the state • Grade 5 – Male subgroup 25% lower than the state • Grade 6 – 40% at level 2 **Science:** • Male subgroup 27% lower than the state and 54% lower than female subgroup **Culture & Climate:** (taken from *03/2018 CEE Survey Data*) • There is a 13% difference between the 100% of staff who feel they are willing to work at change, and the 87% who feel their colleagues are willing to work at change. • 28% feel that focused professional development is not always or often true • Clear and shared focus was only 75% always or often true in the parent survey. Focus are this year, per strategic plan focus area #3.

ACTION PLAN

Strategic Plan Focus Area 1 & 2: Powerful Teaching & Learning
Goal 1: All students will graduate college, career, and life ready, with 21st century skills which include creativity, innovation, critical thinking, problem solving, communication, collaboration, and strong informational and media literacy. **Goal 2:** All staff model and teach 21st century knowledge and skills to improve rigorous student learning in a complex, ever-changing and interconnected world.

Jefferson ELA	**Smart Goal All School:** Based on the last three years of SBA data in ELA, and in collaboration with building vertical teams, building & district grade teams, and RTI teams, Jefferson 3rd-6th grade students will be 3% above the state on the 2018 SBA in all grade levels in ELA. 90% of K-2 students will meet or exceed standard in grade level reading assessments and writing benchmarks.			
Targets	**Strategies**	**Activities to Ensure Mastery**	**Yes**	**Completed/Date**
All School: Multi-Tiered System of Support	All students receiving Tier III instruction also receive uninterrupted Tier I & II instruction. By **student**, by **standard**.	-Create uninterrupted 80 minute blocks by grade level -Develop full inclusion master schedule w/ support staff in classes -District adopted assessment calen.	☐	
1. 95% of K-6 students will know 26/26 capital and lower case letters as well as 26/26 sounds by spring 2018.	Daily teaching of standards aligned core instruction, utilizing effective teaching strategies and grade team/RTI partnering to provide intervention and support.	-Initial and on-going assessments -Monitor student progress and adjust RTI groups accordingly -Targeted intervention & support -2x/month RTI data meeting	☐	
2. 90% of 1st & 2nd grade students will meet standard on the grade level specific reading assessment. (1st – DRA & 2nd – DIBELS)	Daily teaching of standards aligned core instruction, utilizing effective teaching strategies and grade team/RTI partnering to provide intervention and support.	-1x/week RTI data meeting (1st) -1x/month RTI data meeting (2nd) -Initial and on-going assessments -Monitor student progress and adjust RTI groups accordingly -Targeted intervention & support	☐	
3. 90% of 3rd-6th grade students will meet their projected RIT score by spring 2019 MAP assessment.	Daily teaching of standards aligned core instruction, utilizing effective teaching strategies and grade team partnering to provide intervention and support.	-1x/month RTI data meeting (3rd) -Initial and on-going assessments -Monitor student progress and adjust interventions as needed -Targeted intervention & support w/ SpEd and LAP support staff	☐	
4. 80% of K-6 students will meet standard (70% or higher) on the two district assigned writing benchmarks. (K-2: winter & spring; 3-6 fall & winter)	Effective teaching of Lucy Calkins, David Matteson, and Step Up to Writing to	-Ongoing writing PD, including paras w/ David Matteson -Consistent use of 3 district supported writing curriculums -Use of writing in all RTI groups	☐	

12

School Improvement Plan   October 5, 2018

Strategic Plan Focus Area 1 & 2: Powerful Teaching & Learning
Goal 1: All students will graduate college, career, and life ready, with 21st century skills which include creativity, innovation, critical thinking, problem solving, communication, collaboration, and strong informational and media literacy. **Goal 2:** All staff model and teach 21st century knowledge and skills to improve rigorous student learning in a complex, ever-changing and interconnected world.

Jefferson Math	**Smart Goal All School:** Based on the last three years SBA & MAP data in math, and in collaboration with building vertical teams, building & district grade teams, math RTI teams, and in following the district assessment calendar, Jefferson 3rd-6th grade students will be 3% above the state on the 2018 SBA in all grade levels in math. 90% of K-2 students will meet or exceed standard on end of module curriculum-based assessments.			
Targets	**Strategies**	**Activities to Ensure Mastery**	**Yes**	**Completed/Date**
All School: Multi-Tiered System of Support	All students receiving Tier III instruction also receive Tier I & II instruction. By **student**, by **standard**.	-Create uninterrupted 80 minute blocks by grade level -Develop full inclusion master schedule w/ support staff in classes	☐	
1. 100% of K-6 students will show grade-level progress in grade level fact fluency.	Daily fluency practice, per Eureka math, including fluency counting and sprints, with students tracking personal growth daily.	-Daily sprints (grades 1-6) -Daily counting (K-6) -Sprint progress monitoring daily -Student charting of sprint progress monitoring	☐	
2. 100% of kindergarten students will solve addition and subtraction problems within 10.	Teachers will utilize the newly adopted Eureka math curriculum to teach with fidelity, coupled with effective instructional practices and ongoing formative assessment to track progress.	-Daily core instruction Daily intervention per exit slips/essential standards -Mid-module assessments w/ intervention & extension -End of module assessments	☐	
3. 90% of 1st & 2nd grade students will consistently meet the district standard of 70% on all end of module Eureka assessments.	Teachers will utilize the newly adopted Eureka math curriculum to teach with fidelity, coupled with effective instructional practices and ongoing formative assessment to track progress.	-Daily core instruction Daily intervention per exit slips/essential standards -Mid-module assessments w/ intervention & extension -End of module assessments	☐	
4. 80% of 3rd-6th grade students will meet their projected RIT score by spring 2019 MAP assessment.	Teachers will utilize the newly adopted Eureka math curriculum to teach with fidelity, coupled with effective instructional practices and ongoing formative assessment to track progress.	-Daily core instruction -Daily intervention per exit slips/essential standards -Mid-module assessments w/ intervention & extension; MAP 3x/year -End of Module assessments; IABs	☐	

Strategic Plan Focus Area 2: District Culture
Goal 1: Promote a safe, healthy, affirming, and welcoming learning environment. **Goal 2:** Celebrate success through broad-based, varied media.

Jefferson Goal 1	**Smart Goal:** Jefferson Elementary staff will maintain a culture of trust among staff, students, parents, and community while continuing to implement research-based practices that strengthen the culture of the school. 2017-2018 CEE survey data will increase in the area of High Levels of Community & Parent Involvement from 90% (staff) and 77% (parent), to 95% among both using an internally developed survey.			
Targets	**Strategies**	**Activities to Ensure Mastery**	**Yes**	**Completed/Date**
Action Item 2: Maintain Positive Behavior Intervention & Supports	Continue Tier II & III practices for select students, while maintaining school wide Tier I practices for all students.	-PBIS videos -Monthly recognition -Wolf slips & weekly winners -Schoolwide behavior celebrations per trimester -Majors & minors tracked in SWIS with monthly data analysis -Teaching & reteaching expectations to ALL students	☐	
Target			☐	
*Social/Emotional: Work with all students and families to build a school culture that supports the social, emotional, behavioral, and academic well-being of the child.	Establish strong relationships between students, families, teacher and support staff so there are open lines of communication regarding the social/emotional needs of a student.	-Classroom lessons in all classrooms by school counselor -Integration of RBD students in general education classrooms -Classroom meetings Check In Check Out	☐	

*This section includes Strategic Plan Focus Area 1 – Goal 3.

ACTION PLAN

Strategic Plan Focus Area 3: Family & Community Engagement

Goal 1: Create and promote a system that facilitates open and accessible communication between family, staff, students, and community.

Jefferson Goal 1	**Smart Goal:** Jefferson Elementary staff will maintain a culture of trust among staff, students, parents, and community while continuing to implement research-based practices that strengthen the culture of the school. This will include the use of data to drive decision making strategically involving students and parents in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of practices. 2017-2018 CEE survey data indicated 77% of **parents** scored Almost Always or Often true in the area of Parent & Community Involvement. This will increase to 90% on an internally established survey in 2018-2019.			
Targets	**Strategies**	**Activities to Ensure Mastery**	**Yes**	**Completed/Date**
Attendance: Create Functional Behavior Assessments on all students with 10% or more days absent.	*Absenteeism & Truancy: Interventions & Universal Procedures (a multi-tiered approach)*	-SAT on students absent over 10% of school days -Determine school motivators -Establish FBA -Track data to monitor progress	☐	
Communication: Create a system of open and accessible communication between staff and families, including technology based options in 100% of classrooms.	Allow parents access to curricular and extracurricular components to their child's education, as well as openly share concerns and celebrations with the staff.	-Class DoJo -Parent-teacher conferences -Back to School nights & Open House & Monthly STEAM Nights -Weekly folders w/ newsletters -Internally created parent survey	☐	

NUTRITION AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY POLICY #6700

Directions: Each school will report their physical education plan biennially to the Board through their CSIP (Continuous School Improvement Plan), documenting their planned use of the recommended 100 instructional minutes of physical education.

Activities	Start/End Dates	Persons Responsible	Completed	
			Yes	Comments
Physical Education classes taught by certified P.E. instructor. • K-3 2 x 30 minutes per week (60) • 4-6 2 x 40 minutes per week (80)	Start: September 1, 2018 End: June 16, 2019	Karl Myers, PE Teacher Mark Van Rossen, PE Teacher	☐	
Opportunity for additional minutes: • Classroom Brain Boosters (monthly ideas shared with classroom teachers)	Start: September 1, 2018 End: June 16, 2019	Karl Myers, PE Teacher Mark Van Rossen, PE Teacher Classroom Teachers	☐	
Opportunity for additional instructional min.: • Adventure to Fitness (school subscription to online fitness program for the classroom)	Start: September 1, 2018 End: June 16, 2019	Karl Myers, PE Teacher Mark Van Rossen, PE Teacher Classroom Teachers	☐	
Opportunity for additional instructional min.: • Fuel Up to Play60 Activities (nutrition and fitness activities done schoolwide)	On-going throughout the school year.	Karl Myers, PE Teacher Mark Van Rossen, PE Teacher Classroom Teachers Jefferson Recess Staff	☐	
Opportunity for additional physical activity: • Playworks (backyard games, organized team games) • Sports Club – Thursday after school	Start: September 1, 2018 End: June 16, 2019	Karl Myers, PE Teacher Cookie Kalfur, PE Teacher Jefferson Recess Staff Jefferson PTO	☐	

CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGH PERFORMING SCHOOLS

✓ Data Source: Center for Educational Effectiveness **STAFF** Survey

Directions: Under the sub-categories for the characteristics of high performing schools, locate the percentage of *staff* that indicated support for the following categories:

Category	2013	2014	2015	March 2017	2018
Clear & Shared Focus	78.0%	*		82%	89%
Effective School Leadership	75%	*		84%	89%
High Standards & Expectations	70%	*		74%	81%
High Levels of Collaboration and Communication	72.0%	*		78%	84%
Supportive Learning Environment	80.0%	*		86%	90%
Frequent Monitoring of Teaching and Learning	62.0%	*		63%	83%
Focused Professional Development	67.0%	*		68%	73%
Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Aligned with Standards	61.1%	*		73%	88%
High Levels of Community & Parent Involvement	75.0%	*		68%	83%
Staff Willingness to Change	91.0%	*		98%	100%

CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGH PERFORMING SCHOOLS

✓ Data Source: Center for Educational Effectiveness **PARENTS** Survey

Directions: Under the sub-categories for the characteristics of high performing schools, locate the percentage of *parents* that indicated support for the following categories:

Category	2013	2014	2015	March 2017	2018
Clear & Shared Focus	85%	*		81%	75%
Effective School Leadership	89%	*		89%	89%
Frequent Monitoring of Teaching and Learning	78%	*		82%	78%
High Standards & Expectations	90%	*		89%	84%
High Levels of Collaboration and Communication	84%	*		84%	83%
High Levels of Community & Parent Involvement	78%	*		81%	77%
Supportive Learning Environment	88%	*		85%	79%

STUDENT TUTORIAL/ENRICHMENT STRATEGIES SUMMARY

Directions: Briefly summarize your school's strategies for student remediation and enrichment. Remember, summer school is no longer an option for remediation. Specific strategies, numbers of students, staff responsible, and timeline for implementation and other related details should be found in the action plans. Student remediation strategies are coherent, and action steps demonstrate responsiveness to student tutorial needs. This summary should clearly describe a comprehensive approach embedded in strategies.

<u>Enrichment Opportunities:</u>
- After School Clubs
- Math Olympiad offered for 5th/6th grades
- Wolf Pack Student Council – 6th grade elected officers, 3rd-6th grade elected student reps
- WSU Extension Project – Repurposing Wasted Food Items (6th grade PBL project)
- Swimming lessons for 4th grade students in the spring via PTO & PAEF Grant
- 6th grade outdoor education offered at NatureBridge for 3 days/2 nights, October 15-17, 2018
- Young Writers Conference for 1st-6th grade students March 2019 at Peninsula College
- 5th Grade/Kindergarten Reading Buddies, 4th Grade/Kindergarten Reading/Writing Buddies, 6th/1st Writing Buddies
- Poetry Slam-6th grade
- 1st – 4th grade Pen Pal program with Japan
- 4th Grade Battle of the Books through NOLS

<u>Remediation Opportunities:</u>
- Small group instruction in RTI in three levels (K-5th): 1) core curriculum, 2) strategic intervention (supplemental instruction in addition to core), and 3) intensive intervention for basic skill development
- Math reteaching and remediation through Zearn, Happy Numbers, and Edulastic
- 2 Math Paras hired to assist in 2nd-6th grade classrooms for math remediation
- Math tutoring Monday & Thursday after school by certificated teachers, grades 4th-6th
- School-wide universal screening using DIBELS in reading in the fall, winter, and spring; DRA to 1st 3x per year
- Progress monitoring using the Houghton Mifflin curriculum, DIBELS, & AR/STAR
- Collaboration time dedicated to looking at tiered instruction & movement in response to individual student needs
- After school program for 3rd grade students needing additional support in reading
- Small group homework help supported by AmeriCorps & volunteers after school for 4-6 grade students

COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION

*Budget Program: Basic Education, Title I, Title II, LAP, High Poverty Lap, Other

Program	Amount Available	Resource and Professional Development Activities	Description of Participating Staff
State Basic	$ 2,084,679	Focused professional development in Eureka math, revamping RTI with Mike Mattos, Professional Learning Communities, Social Emotional Learning, Outdoor Education.	All classroom teachers, principal, and counselor
State Special Ed	$ 391,083	Included with above listed professional development, as well as targeted PD around inclusive classrooms, utilizing RTI model for appropriate special education intervention and identification.	Three special education teachers, special education paraeducators, school psychologist, speech therapist
Federal Special Ed	$ 106,141	Same as above state special education.	Three special education teachers, special education paraeducators, school psychologist, speech therapist
Title IA	$ 116,100	Training for Title I paras will align with that for special education funded paraeducators, including Response to Intervention, Words their Way, Read Live, and David Matteson writing.	Coya Erickson (Title I teacher), paraeducators, principal
State LAP/HP LAP	$ 200,470	Kindergarten Jump Start, two paraeducators targeting math intervention (Tier II supports), Support staff training in Response to Intervention (Mike Mattos), after school intervention supports, professional development in math and literacy.	Kindergarten teachers, up to 15 paraeducators, LST, principal, counselor

School Improvement Plan   October 5, 2018

SIGN-OFF SHEET

Directions: Ask identified stakeholders at your site to sign off on this CSIP, indicating their participation and support for the current CSIP, their role, and their continued participation in the coordination and monitoring of the plan. Examples of roles may include, but are not limited to, parent, certificated staff, classified staff, student, principal, etc. Please print and submit this page in hard copy.

ROLE	PRINTED NAME	SIGNATURE
Principal	Joyce Mininger	
1st Grade Teacher	Christine Chang	
2nd Grade Teacher	Karen Toth	
3rd Grade Teacher	Melissa Lisk	
4th Grade Teacher	Raena Young	
5th Grade Teacher	Theresa Faires	
6th Grade Teacher	Brooke Hendry	
Learning Support Teacher	Coya Erickson	
Special Education Teacher	Christine Bohman	
Parent	Sean Galloway	
Parent	Doni Thomason	
Assistant Superintendent	Chuck Lisk	
Superintendent	Martin Brewer	
School Board President	Sarah Methner	*Board Approved Date:* _____

School Improvement Plan   October 5, 2018