

**Port Angeles School District**  
**Roosevelt Elementary School**



**School Improvement Plan**  
**2018 - 2019**

<p><b>Component One – Needs Assessment</b></p> <p>Guiding Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does our needs assessment integrate current school year quantitative and qualitative data?</li> <li>• How does your needs assessment give an accurate and thorough view of the entire school?</li> <li>• What subjects, grade levels, and programs are the strongest and weakest?</li> <li>• How does the school focus on the academic progress of English language learners?</li> <li>• To what extent are discipline issues impacting students?</li> <li>• What is the level of family and the community support at the school?</li> <li>• 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 6<sup>th</sup> grade attendance and behavior data, high schools at 9<sup>th</sup> grade course completion.</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p><b>Component Three – Activities to Ensure Mastery</b></p> <p>Guiding Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the plan support the most at-risk students in the school?</li> <li>• What strategies and programs will we use to help at-risk students remain or get back on track?</li> <li>• What is the district doing to help students in danger of dropping out or falling behind on mastery of a key skill?</li> <li>• What is the school doing to help students’ academic and non-academic needs?</li> <li>• Does the plan ensure the school meets students’ academic and non-academic needs?</li> <li>• Does the plan incorporate a wide range of strategies, programs and activities, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Counseling and mental health support</li> <li>○ College and career readiness</li> <li>○ Tiered behavioral support</li> <li>○ AP &amp; International Baccalaureate courses</li> <li>○ Preschool transition support</li> <li>○ Professional development for staff</li> <li>○ Intensive academic support to students</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Component Two – Schoolwide Reform Strategies</b></p> <p>Guiding Questions:</p> <p>Does the plan’s schoolwide reform:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider a well-rounded education ESSA Section: 8102(52). What about literacy, science, government, engineering, the arts, and mathematics?</li> <li>• Improve transitions between grades and/or schools?</li> <li>• Enrich and accelerate curriculum?</li> <li>• Provide opportunities for students both ahead of and behind grade level?</li> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• If your school is continuing as a priority or focus school in 2018-19, how do your strategies incorporate the 7 turn around principles?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Component Four – Coordination and Integration</b></p> <p>Guiding Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will the school leverage allowable combined funds to improve the schoolwide plan?</li> <li>• How will it make the most of available staff at the school and district to maximize the positive impact of the plan?</li> <li>• How does the plan combine funds to connect the reform strategies developed?</li> <li>• Does the plan outline how the school will combine funds, and how the school will meet the intents and purposes of each program?</li> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Does the plan include the total amount of funds for each program?</li> <li>• If a priority/focus school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Does the plan include school improvement funds?</li> <li>○ How are schoolwide funds being leveraged to support school improvement efforts?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

# 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
<b>Reading/ELA 3:</b> % of students at each level					<b>Math 3:</b> % of students at each level				
Level 1:	15.1%	23.8%	16%	22%	Level 1:	10.6%	21.7%	13%	21%
Level 2:	13.6%	21.7%	14%	22%	Level 2:	13.6%	20.4%	9%	21%
Level 3:	27.2%	22.7%	37%	24%	Level 3:	33.3%	29.4%	45%	29%
Level 4:					Level 4:				
Level 4:	43.9%	29.5%	33%	32%	Level 4:	42.4%	28.1%	33%	29%
<b>Reading/ELA 3:</b> % Meeting Standard:	71.2%	52.6%	70%	56%	<b>Math 3:</b> % Meeting Standard:	75.7%	57.8%	78%	58%
% Not Meeting Standard:	28.8%	47.3%	30%	44%	% Not Meeting Standard:	24.3%	42.1%	22%	42%

Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018
<b>Reading/ELA 4:</b> % of students at each level				
Level 1:	16.8%	25.2	21%	24%
Level 2:	10.3%	17.7	16%	18%
Level 3:	27.2%	24	25%	24%
Level 4:	45.4%	30.7	38%	34%
<b>Reading/ELA 4:</b> % Meeting Standard:	72.7%	55.2	63%	58%
% Not Meeting Standard:	27.3%	44.7	37%	42%

## SBA & MSP DATA

<b>Color Key</b>
<b>Above State Avg.</b>
<b>At, or Near, State Avg.</b>
<b>Below State Avg.</b>

**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	WCAS 2018	State 2018		
<b>Math 4:</b> % of students at each level					<b>WCAS Science 5:</b> % of students at each level						
	Level 1:	7.7%	17.3	11%		19%	Level 1:	12.7%	15.7	10%	23%
	Level 2:	19.4%	26.5	16%		27%	Level 2:	18%	18.8	15%	21%
	Level 3:	32.4%	27.7	27%		28%	Level 3:	29.7%	29.7	41%	37%
	Level 4:	37.6%	26.2	46%		26%	Level 4:	39.3%	33.2	34%	19%
<b>Math 4:</b> % Meeting Standard:	72.7%	54.3	73%	54%	<b>WCAS Science 5:</b> % Meeting Standard:	69.1%	63.4	75%	56%		
% Not Meeting Standard:	27.3%	45.6	27%	46%	% Not Meeting Standard:	30.9%	36.5	25%	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		
<b>Reading/ELA 5:</b> % of students at each level					<b>Math 5:</b> % of students at each level						
	Level 1:	27.6%	21.9	13%		22%	Level 1:	31.9%	25	10%	26%
	Level 2:	19.1%	17.7	12%		18%	Level 2:	23.4%	24.6	20%	25%
	Level 3:	24.4%	31	31%		32%	Level 3:	13.7%	19.5	24%	20%
	Level 4:	28.7%	27.2	44%		28%	Level 4:	30.8%	28.8	42%	29%
<b>Reading/ELA 5:</b> % Meeting Standard:	53.1%	58.6	75%	60%	<b>Math 5:</b> % Meeting Standard:	44.6%	48.6	66%	49%		
% Not Meeting Standard:	45.9%	41.3	25%	40%	% Not Meeting Standard:	55.4%	51.3	34%	51%		

# SBA & MSP DATA

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

**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
<b>Reading/ELA 6:</b> % of students at each level					<b>Math 6:</b> % of students at each level				
Level 1:	18.8%	19.2	21%	20%	Level 1:	20.7%	23.9	25%	24%
Level 2:	16.9%	23.4	21%	23%	Level 2:	15%	25.9	29%	27%
Level 3:	32%	34.2	32%	35%	Level 3:	24.5%	21.9	16%	22%
Level 4:	32%	20.7	26%	22%	Level 4:	39.6%	25.9	30%	27%
<b>Reading/ELA 6:</b> % Meeting Standard:	64.1%	55.5	58%	57%	<b>Math 6:</b> % Meeting Standard:	64.1%	48.2	46%	49%
% Not Meeting Standard:	35.9%	44.4	42%	43%	% Not Meeting Standard:	35.9%	51.7	54%	51%

## **Needs Assessment and Implications: ELA:**

- All 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade outperformed the state
- 3<sup>rd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> cohort showed a decrease of 8% overall
- 4<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> cohort showed an increase of 2.3% overall
- 5<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> cohort showed an increase of 5.1% overall
- Given that 3<sup>rd</sup> grade to 4<sup>th</sup> grade cohort consistently drops we will focus on 4<sup>th</sup> grade.

## **Math:**

- 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> grades outperformed the state
- 3<sup>rd</sup> grade at 78% (2.3% increase over last year)
- 3<sup>rd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> cohort decreased 2.7%
- 4<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> cohort decreased by 6.7%
- 5<sup>th</sup> grade at 66% (21.4% increase over last year)
- Given that 6<sup>th</sup> grade students have had the least amount of time with our new curriculum, Eureka, and given the strong scores last year with this cohort we will focus on 6<sup>th</sup> grade.
- **Science:** Outperformed the state by 19% on more rigorous test.

level 1 increasing 5.9%      level 4 decrease by 5.9%

level 1 decreasing 3.8%,      level 4 remained high at 44%

level 1 decreasing 6.6%      level 4 remained about 26%

6<sup>th</sup> grade underperformed the state by 3% (49% to 46%)

level 1 remained about 10%      level 4 increase by 3.6%

level 1 increased by 2.3%      level 4 increase by 4.4%

6<sup>th</sup> grade at 46% (18.1% decrease over last year)

# SBA & MSP DISAGGREGATION DATA

<b>Color Key</b>
<b>Above State Avg.</b>
<b>At, or Near, State Avg.</b>
<b>Below State Avg.</b>

**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	79.4	50.5%	61.2%	49%	69%	52%	89.7%	59.6%	77.4%	58.6%	83%	59%
Female	72.5	58.4%	80%	56.4%	71%	60%	62.5%	58.1%	74.2%	56.9%	71%	57%
Low Income	72.7	37.7%	58.6	35.6%	64%	39%	72.7	43.9%	62%	42.1%	70%	42%
Special Ed	*	26.3%	*	24.7%	*(29%)	27%	*	29.5%	*	28.4%	*(57%)	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	60.7	53%	78.9	51.5%	58%	55%	56.8%	56.5%	84.2%	55.8%	74%	56%
Female	55.5	61.2%	66.6	59%	69%	61%	52.7%	54.2%	61.5%	52.8%	72%	53%
Low Income	45%	40.2%	64.5	37.9%	40%	41%	47.5%	38.9%	64.5%	38%	53%	38%
Special Ed	17%	24.9%	*	22.7%	*(17%)	36%	26%	26%	*	24%	*(0%)	21%

Sub-Groups	GRADE 5 SCIENCE					
	MSP 2016	State 2016	MSP 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018
Male	79%	64.4%	69.2%	62.2%	71%	56%
Female	85%	66.2%	69%	64.5%	79%	56%
Low Income	75%	49.4%	60.8%	46.5%	63%	38%
Special Ed	46%	36.1%	42.8%	32.6%	*22%	21%

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

## SBA & MSP DISAGGREGATION DATA

**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 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	50%	54.6%	51.9%	53.6%	78%	55%	42.8	50.1%	50%	49.9%	73%	50%
Female	73%	65.8%	54.7%	63.8%	73%	65%	61.5	48.2%	38%	47.2%	59%	48%
Low Income	53.8	43.5%	43.4%	41.2%	60%	43%	36%	32.5%	32.6%	31.1%	51%	32%
Special Ed	31%	24.5%	10.7%	22.2%	*(25%)	20%	15%	18.7%	17.8%	17.5%	*(25%)	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	58.9%	50.6	53.3	49.8	53%	51%	67%	47.1%	60.0%	47.1%	47%	48%
Female	70.9%	62.7	78.2	61.5	66%	62%	71%	49.1%	69.5%	49.4%	45%	50%
Low Income	48%	39.3	40	37.4	48%	39%	52%	30.5%	35%	30.3	35%	31%
Special Ed	*	18%	*	18.2%	5%	14%	*	13.1%	*	13.22	5%	11%

### Needs Assessment Implications:

#### ELA:

- 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> outperformed state in all sub group areas except in 4<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> in special education
- Girls outperformed boys (3<sup>rd</sup>: 2%, 4<sup>th</sup>: 11%, 6<sup>th</sup>:13%) at every grade except 5<sup>th</sup> where boys outperformed by 5%
- 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> Low income students outperformed the state

#### Math:

- 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> outperformed state in all sub group areas except IN 4<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> special education and IN 6<sup>th</sup> grade male/female
- Boys outperformed girls at every grade (4<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup>/: 2%, 3<sup>rd</sup>: 12%, 5<sup>th</sup>: 14%)
- 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> Low income students outperformed the state

**\*\* Given our gap between special ed students and general ed students in ELA and math we will focus on supporting these students using best practices.**

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	/	/	/	/	91.2% Blend 88.2% Sight	K	/	/	/	/	/
Grade 1 DRA	1	67%	73%	91.2%	/		1	/	/	/	/	/
Grade 2 DIBELS	2	55%	60%	70.4%	67.6%		2	/	/	/	/	/
Grade 2 STAR	2	65%	59%	79.1%	84.2%		2	/	/	/	/	/
Grade 3 – 6 MAP	3	n/a	54%	84.2%	/		3	/	/	/	/	/
	4	54%	75%	71.2%	/		4	/	/	/	/	/
	5	71%	78%	65.6%	/		5	/	/	/	/	/
	6	65%	80%	63.5%	/		6	/	/	/	/	/
	6	63%	64%	51.6%	/		6	/	/	/	/	/
<b>Math</b>							<b>Math</b>					
NWEA MAP or Curriculum Benchmark Tests District Bench- marks Fall, Winter, Spring	Grade	Fall	Winter	Spring			Grade	Fall	Winter	Spring		
	K	New BM 100%	n/a	/	/	K	/	/	/	/	/	
	1	/	n/a	100%	/	1	/	/	/	/	/	
	2	80%	n/a	81.7%	/	2	/	/	/	/	/	
	3	79%	/	89.5%	/	3	/	/	/	/	SBA	
	4	58%	70%	54.5%	/	4	/	/	/	/	SBA	
	5	76%	73%	68.9%	/	5	/	/	/	/	SBA	
	6	61%	64%	55.3%	/	6	/	/	/	/	SBA	
	6	55%	53%	40%	6	/	/	/	/	SBA		



# INTERNAL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM DATA

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

Summary Student Internal Accountability System Demographic Data													
Internal Assessment Results for 2017-18 (EOY)							Internal Assessment Results for 2018-19 (EOY)						
Grade	Unexcused Absences	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		
	90.5	93.85%	36	0		4							
K	0	94.17	2	0	n/a		K						
1	45.5	93.31	3	0	n/a	2	1						
2	0	93.55	6	0	n/a		2						
3	0	93.79	11	0	n/a	1	3						
4	.5	93.93	2	0	n/a		4						
5	37	94.24	5	0	n/a	1	5						
6	7.5	93.75	7	0	n/a		6						

Summary of Student Support Services 2017-18 (EOY)				
Grade	Special Education (not speech)	Homeless Number of Homeless Students McKinney Vento	504	Student Assistance Team (SAT)
K	2	3	1	3
1	7	6	1	3
2	10	5	0	6
3	6	3	0	0
4	9	4	0	2
5	11	5	3	8
6	22	5	1	6
				(plus multiple follow up meetings)

# 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).	93.85% <sup>3</sup>	
Unexcused Absences	Total number of absences not excused (2017-18).	.09%	
Discipline Report	Summary of discipline activity for the building (2017-18).	Drugs/Alcohol: 0 Tobacco: 0 Weapons: 0 Fighting/Assaults: 2	Court Petitions: 4 Expulsions: 0 Short-term Suspensions: 36 Long-term Suspensions: 0
Free/Reduced Lunch Report	Percent of students where family income is below federally established poverty level (2017-18).	50.4%	
Gender Report	Number of male and female students as reported by the 2017-18 OSPI School Report Card	Males:52% Females: 48%	
Ethnicity Report	Percent of students by ethnic groups as reported by the 2017-18 OSPI School Report Card	American Indian or Alaskan Native: 1.3% Asian or Pacific Islander: .8% Black:.2% Hispanic: 5.9% White: 80.8%	
Staff Report	Staff demographic data as reported in the 2017-18 OSPI School Report Card (not available until December 2018 per OSPI website)	Gen/Ed Classroom Teachers: Overall Ratio:	Average Years of Exp: Percent ≥ a Master’s Degree:

**Summary of 2017-18 Attendance:**

- 90.5 unexcused absences down from 137 in 16-17 school year
- 93.85% average daily attendance up from 90.42% in 16-17 school year
- Our data did improve from last year even though we didn’t meet our goal of going from 70 students missing 18 or more days to 35 students, but we did go down to just 50 students. **This was a decrease of 29% in the number of students missing 18+ days.**
- Our Annual average number of tardies per student decreased from 2.87 per students to 1.95 per student. Our annual average number of absences per student decreased from 10.38 to 9.23 per student.

## AREAS OF STRENGTH AND CONCERN

**Directions:** Remember how important it is to review past trends or changes over time. In reference to the SBAC, 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
<p><b><u>ELA:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K: 91.2% blending</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup>: 70.4% DRA at level 18</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup>: DIBELS 79.1%</li> <li>• SBAC: 3<sup>rd</sup>: 70%      4<sup>th</sup>: 63%      5<sup>th</sup>: 75% 6<sup>th</sup>: 58%</li> <li>• All 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade outperformed the state</li> <li>• 5<sup>th</sup> grade w/ 13% at level 1 and 44% at level 4</li> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> low income students outperformed the state</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Math:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All classrooms used Eureka math for 17-18</li> <li>• K 100% at standard on EOY CCSS District Assessment</li> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> low income students outperformed the state</li> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> outperformed the state</li> <li>• 5<sup>th</sup> grade increased from 44.6% to 66%</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Discipline Data (2017-2018):</u></b>            397 students did not have any major referrals            58 students or 11% had just one major referral            52 students or 10% had 2-5 major referrals            13 students or 2.5% had 6+ major referrals</p>	<p><b><u>ELA:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*6<sup>th</sup> grade SBAC 42% not at standard, yet</li> <li>*5<sup>th</sup> grade SBAC 25% not at standard, yet</li> <li>*4<sup>th</sup> grade SBAC 37% not at standard, yet</li> <li>*3<sup>rd</sup> grade SBAC 30% not at standard, yet</li> <li>*2<sup>nd</sup> grade 20.9% not at standard in DIBELS, yet</li> <li>*1<sup>st</sup> grade 29.6% not at standard in DRA, yet (level 18)</li> <li>*Kinders 11.8% not at standard in sight words, yet</li> </ul> <p><b>Special Education Snapshot:</b> Just 3/16 students in grade K-2 receiving special education support met standard. 11/48 students receiving special education support in grades 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> met standard. The gap between students passing SBA for ELA without IEPs as compared to students with IEPs decreased from an average gap of 61.25% to 41.1% for grades 3-6.</p> <p><b><u>Math:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*6<sup>th</sup> grade SBAC 51.7% not at standard, yet</li> <li>*5<sup>th</sup> grade SBAC 34% not at standard, yet</li> <li>*4<sup>th</sup> grade SBAC 27% not at standard, yet</li> <li>*3<sup>rd</sup> grade SBAC 22% not at standard, yet</li> <li>*Boys outperformed girls</li> </ul> <p><b>Special Education Snapshot:</b> 7/16 students met standard in grades K-2. 13/48 students in 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade met standard. The gap between students passing SBA for math without IEPs as compared to students with IEPs decreased from an average gap of 37.75% to 29.9% for grades 3-6.</p>

**Attendance:**

- 90.5 unexcused absences down from 137 in 16-17 school year
- 93.85% average daily attendance up from 90.42% in 16-17 school year
- Decrease of 29% in the number of students missing 18+ days from 70 students to 50 students

**Discipline Data 2017-2018:**

65 students had 2 or more major referrals  
Wednesday was the day with the most referrals each week  
5-10% of total referrals happening out at recess  
Classroom and playground top areas for referrals  
6<sup>th</sup> grade received the most referrals

**Attendance:**

- 90.5 unexcused absences
- 93.85% average daily attendance
- 50 students missing 18+ days

**ACTION PLAN**

**Strategic Plan Focus Area 1 & 2: Powerful Teaching & Learning**

**Goal 1:** All students will graduate college, career, and life ready, with 21<sup>st</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> century knowledge and skills to improve rigorous student learning in a complex, ever-changing and interconnected world.

<b>Roosevelt ELA</b>	<b>Smart Goal All School</b> Based on the last two years of SBA data in ELA (as compared to the state average) and in collaboration with our building teams, our goal is to outscore the state average on the SBA by 10% in all areas as measured by the 2019 SBA in ELA.			
<b>Targets</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Activities to Ensure Mastery</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Completed/Date</b>
<b>All School</b>	Balanced Literacy	*All certificated staff using Daily 5/Café strategies *All K-5 <sup>th</sup> students participating in RTI	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>1</b> All students will make one year’s growth as measured by classroom, school, and district assessments used for progress monitoring.  80% of 3 <sup>rd</sup> -6 <sup>th</sup> grade students will make or exceed RIT growth on MAP.	Focused Professional Development	*Book Study: Who’s Doing the Work? *Writing PD provided monthly *Monday am para literacy training *Creating clear learning targets aligned to the standards and shared verbally and visually to students	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<p><b>2</b> Our sixth-grade cohort will increase their overall SBA proficiency levels and will make or exceed MAPS growth data from fall 2018 to spring 2019</p>	<p>Multi-Tiered Systems of Support in literacy instruction-</p>	<p>*Data meetings with SPED, RTI instructors and para-educators and grade level teachers every 5-6 weeks *Core instruction for ALL *RTI for K-5<sup>th</sup> *2<sup>nd</sup> dose for K-2<sup>nd</sup> *6<sup>th</sup> grade Daily 5/Café Model using individual conferencing *Progress monitoring for tier 2 and tier 3 students</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p><b>3</b> Our special education students will make or exceed typical growth on MAPS assessment grades 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>.</p>	<p>Professional Learning Communities (PLC)</p>	<p>General education and special education teachers meeting in teams to support building PLC model using recent data</p> <p>Progress monitoring K-6 *2<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> using DIBELS/DAZE bi-monthly *K-1 using HM assessments *1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> WTW benchmark 3 x year</p>		

**ACTION PLAN**

**Strategic Plan Focus Area 1 & 2: Powerful Teaching & Learning**

**Goal 1:** All students will graduate college, career, and life ready, with 21<sup>st</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> century knowledge and skills to improve rigorous student learning in a complex, ever-changing and interconnected world.

<b>Roosevelt Math</b>	<b>Smart Goal All School</b> Based on the last two years of SBA data in math (as compared to the state average) and in collaboration with our building teams, our goal is to surpass the state average on the SBA by 10% in all areas as measured by the 2019 SBA in math.			
<b>Targets</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Activities to Ensure Mastery</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Completed/Date</b>
<b>All School</b>	Professional Development	All classroom teachers will participate in on-going math pd led by Karen and other teachers  Math support paras will have daily support and/or training	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p><b>1</b> All students will show growth as measured by mid-module and end of module Eureka assessments.</p> <p>All 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade students will make one year's growth as measured by MAPS testing.</p>	PLC (Professional Learning Community)	Using Tuesday Collaboration for PLC work  Essential Standards for Modules  Half Day Guest Teacher every 4-8 weeks for Prepping and Customization Work and Reviewing data as team with admin	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<p><b>2</b> Our fourth-grade cohort will increase their overall SBA proficiency levels and will make or exceed MAPS growth data from fall 2018 to spring 2019</p>	<p>Multi-Tiered Systems of Support</p>	<p>All students receiving core instruction</p> <p>Extra math support provided during after school tutoring time</p> <p>Math para working with students on daily exit tickets (1-2, 3-4, 5-6)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p><b>3</b> Our special education students will make or exceed typical growth on MAPS assessment grades 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> and K-2 students will show proficiency on identified essential standards for each module.</p>	<p>Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Focused Professional Development</p>	<p>All teachers intentionally teaching math practices each day</p> <p>Special Education support pushing in during core instruction</p> <p>Special Education teachers pre-teaching math skills</p> <p>Book Study-Getting to Yes</p>		



**ACTION PLAN**

**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.

<b>Roosevelt Goal 1</b>	<b>Smart Goal: Based on the number of 2018 major referrals and in collaboration with our PBIS team and staff our goal is to decrease the number students having two or more major referrals from 65-40 students as measured by SWIS through June 2019. We will progress monitor monthly and review data at PBIS meetings.</b>			
<b>Targets</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Activities to Ensure Mastery</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Completed/Date</b>
<b>Action Item 2: Establish a positive behavior intervention program in all schools.</b>	PBIS leadership team	Monthly meetings to review data Plan staff PD Adjust schedule and/or supervision as needed	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Target: Tier 2 students</b>	Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	-Identify tier 2 students based on Sept.-Oct. data -Use para to support wellness room --Every classroom will have a calming corner by November	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<p><b>*Social/Emotional</b></p>	<p>Focused Professional Development Community Partnerships</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Using Tuesday collaboration time to learn and practice Brain Based Learning Strategies</li> <li>-Parent leadership team to facilitate every other month parent education</li> <li>-Implement and use “Wellness Room” to teach students self-regulation skills</li> <li>-Every classroom will have a calming corner by November</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
---------------------------------	--	---	--------------------------	--

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

**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.

<b>Roosevelt Goal 1</b>	<b>Smart Goal:</b> Based on the 2017-18 attendance data from Skyward, Roosevelt will reduce the number of students who are missing 18+ days of school each year going from 50 students to 25 students as measured by Skyward data by June 2019. (a decrease of 50%)			
Targets	Strategies	Activities to Ensure Mastery	Yes	Completed/Date
<b>Attendance</b>	Multi-targeted: Students, families	-Use schoolwide “Bee” at school theme -Reward classes for 6 days of perfect attendance w/ free recess and dance party -Recognize monthly perfect attendance -Track attendance daily and weekly -Conference with parents as needed -Use truancy process as needed	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<p><b>Communication</b></p> <p>100% of our families will be connected to DOJO</p> <p>100% of our families will participate in parent-teacher conferences</p>	<p>Communication Tools</p>	<p>All classroom teachers will use DOJO system by minimally posting one whole class and three individual posts each week.</p> <p>Monthly School-Wide Newsletter</p> <p>Use School Messenger System to give reminders to families</p> <p>Monitor and review Red folder usage</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	
--	----------------------------	---	---------------------------------	--

## 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
Students in grades 4 <sup>th</sup> -6 <sup>th</sup> will receive 80 minutes of Physical Education per week (40 Min X 2 per week).	September 2018 - June 2019	Suzanne and Mark	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Students in grades K-3 <sup>rd</sup> will receive 60 minutes of Physical Education per week (30 Min X 2 per week).	September 2018-June 2019	Suzanne and Mark	<input type="checkbox"/>	
All K-5 <sup>th</sup> grade students will have two recesses throughout the day. 6 <sup>th</sup> grade students will have one recess throughout the day.	October 2018-June 2019	Site team	<input type="checkbox"/>	

## 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	2016	2017
Clear & Shared Focus	79%	X	85%	87%	92%
Effective School Leadership	76%	X	81%	86%	89%
High Standards & Expectations	73%	X	77%	77%	84%
High Levels of Collaboration and Communication	77%	X	81%	83%	88%
Supportive Learning Environment	82%	X	87%	76%	91%
Frequent Monitoring of Teaching and Learning	63%	X	73%	76%	87%
Focused Professional Development	58%	X	71%	82%	<b>80%</b>
Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Aligned with Standards	67%	X	78%	78%	90%
High Levels of Community & Parent Involvement	70%	X	73%	80%	84%
Staff Willingness to Change	94%	X	98%	100%	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	2016	2017
Clear & Shared Focus	83%	X	76%	79%	83%
Effective School Leadership	89%	X	71%	86%	92%
Frequent Monitoring of Teaching and Learning	79%	X	73%	78%	80%
High Standards & Expectations	88%	X	79%	87%	88%
High Levels of Collaboration and Communication	84%	X	70%	83%	85%
High Levels of Community & Parent Involvement	78%	X	72%	76%	81%
Supportive Learning Environment	88%	X	75%	86%	86%

## 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.

Roosevelt Elementary is a learning community where 100% of the staff are willing to change to do what it takes to help ALL students to be successful. This past summer 99% of our general education staff attended the Daily 5/Café training in Tacoma. This was the first step in our plan to ensure that we are providing a balanced literacy program for ALL students. We will be implementing strategies from this training to support our current core instruction and RTI program. Our staff is “ALL” in which means we will be providing training to our classified staff as well, so that they understand the best ways to support balanced literacy in the classroom. We will continue to learn more about literacy instruction this year both in reading and writing which will allow us to continuously review and add to our literacy plans.

We are currently beginning year four of our math plan. We began our journey researching and learning about best teaching practices which led us to doing school visits, book studies, learning about connections between the standards and math practices, attending math conferences, and providing school based, teacher led professional development which led to all Roosevelt teachers switching over to the Eureka math curriculum last year (17-18). We are in our second year of teaching Eureka. This year we have hired paras to support our students in math. We have three paras that will work with grade bands (1-2, 3-4, 5-6) to provide immediate feedback and reteaching daily while collaborating with classroom teachers. Our lead math teacher/leader, Karen Doran, will provide daily/weekly support to the paras so that they have the skills needed.

Additionally, we are beginning our sixth year in using the PBIS framework to support ALL students being successful learners. We will continue our learning by providing professional development in brain-based learning strategies and trauma informed practices. This year we will begin using our “Wellness Room” to support students who struggle in self-regulation by teaching them strategies to help them be more successful in the classroom. As we know, we can’t support students unless they are at school, so our work in promoting positive attendance behaviors and supporting families will continue. We also plan to create a parent leadership team to support families in learning about trauma and care.

**Tutorial Strategies:** RTI (small/flexible reading groups), Second-dose instruction (k-2), before/after-school support, Read-Live Computer Program for reading, peer tutoring, parent/community volunteers to support classroom instruction, use of wellness room, daily math support for all classrooms, student jobs, universal screening and progress monitoring for reading, focused professional development for staff, PBIS school wide model along with tier 2 (wellness room) and tier 3 supports for struggling students. More strategies will be added as we move into the school year.

**Enrichment Strategies:** Math Olympiad, chess club, computer club, coding, novel engineering. Nature Bridge Outdoor science education (3 days for 6<sup>th</sup> grade), math night, partnership with Peninsula college, assemblies for the entire school to promote the arts and sciences, field trips as possible to provide hands on learning experiences connected to classroom instruction, Battle of the Books (4<sup>th</sup> grade), Juan de Fuca Festival, Adventures in Music performances, 1<sup>st</sup> grade public library visits, Turn the Wheel Workshop (performing arts), Snapshots time for Highly Capable classrooms. More enrichment opportunities will continue to be added as we collaborate with each other and the community.



## 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	\$ 3,186,092	On-going PD in math, ELA, science, writing, brain-based learning, trauma informed practices, balanced literacy, coding	All classroom teachers, assistant principal, secretaries, some paras
State Special Ed	\$ 844,257	Included with above listed PD in addition to other more focused PD around issues specific to IEP writing, instruction, etc..	Four special education teachers, plus therapists, plus paras
Federal Special Ed	\$ 142,998	Included with the above	Four special education teachers, plus therapists, plus paras
Title IA	\$ 123,300	Training for Title 1 paras will take place on Monday mornings. Topics to be covered will be: Guided reading, balanced literacy, data collection, progress monitoring, Read Live, Words Their Way	Kathy Millar-Title 1 teacher Candie H., Kathy B., Kristy H. Kim O. (paras)
State LAP/HP LAP	\$ 271,961	Kinder Camp Para Training (Tuesday) beyond contract Wellness Room Para Additional para time for math exit tickets Before and after school reading support	Kindergarten teachers (4) Para-educators (3) Up to 20 paras Devyn R. -para facilitator Laurie K., Rachel B., Carla G., 2-3 paras
Highly Capable	\$ 345,810	Roosevelt is home to the district's three self-contained classrooms. The team will attend the WAETAG conference in October.	Karen Doran, Lambert Grimes, Terri Longin, (teachers) Warren Horsley (para)

## 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	Michelle Olsen	
1 <sup>st</sup> Grade Teacher	Jody Adams	
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Teacher	Erika Kuch	
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher	Jennifer Reynolds	
5/6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher	Karen Doran	
Kindergarten Teacher	Molly Hibler	
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher	Brandon Howard	
Assistant Principal	Jennifer Van De Wege	
Special Education Teacher	Beth Dicks	
Parent	Nicole Woodhouse	
Grandparent	Mary Hebert	
Assistant Superintendent	Chuck Lisk	
Superintendent	Martin Brewer	
School Board President	Sarah Methner	<i>Board Approved Date:</i> _____