Edmonds
SCHOOL DISTRICT

School Improvement Plan

School Name: Mountlake Terrace Elementary

Year: 2019-20

Section I: School Mission, Vision, and Demographics:

School Mission: The Mountlake Terrace Elementary educational community works together to guide students to reach their academic and social potential as responsible world citizens and life-long learners in a safe and cooperative learning environment.

School Vision: We Welcome All - We Embrace Differences - We Learn and Grow - We Celebrate

School Demographics:

Group	Number of Students	% of Students	Group	Number of Students	% of Students
Enrollment (October)	442	NA	**Two or More Races**	49	11.09%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	0.23%	**English Language Learners**	78	17.65%
Asian	47	10.63%	**Homeless/ McKinney-Vento**	27	6.11%
Black/African American	23	5.20%	**Low Income**	262	59.28%
Hispanic/Latino	117	26.47%	**Section 504**	22	4.98%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	9	2.04%	**Students with Disabilities**	83	18.78%
White	196	44.34%	**Student Mobility**	14	3.17%

*The data in this table is from the 18-19 school year.

Student, Family and Community Involvement in Plan:

In the development of this plan, we completed a yearlong Needs Assessment process throughout the 2018-19 school year. During this process, we reviewed the annual Student Survey and Family Survey. We completed three family Focus Group discussions in the following focus areas: (1) families of general education students, (2) families of students enrolled in special education, and (3) families of students in our English Learner (EL) program. We also shadowed five individual students in special education for one complete school day, analyzing their experience and educational program at our school.

Section II: Reflection & Evaluation of Prior Year's Progress

Goals:	Narrative Reflection:
2018/2019 MTE SIP Theory of Action/Target Areas If we engage students and families in the most critical content within each math strand, and challenge students with real-world tasks that develop mathematical reasoning, students will show significant progress toward grade level standards. Math System • Regular use of common grade-level assessments to monitor student progress • Year-long planning aligned with Common Core State Standards (CCSS) Enhanced Math Instruction • Continued use of high cognitive demand tasks to strengthen mathematical reasoning • Regular communication with families regarding critical math content and student progress • Continued focus on engaging students by using strategies from Sheltered Instruction (SIOP) and Culturally Responsive Instruction • Use of the concepts of Growth Mindset with students to improve their perseverance and grit. Increased Math Outcomes Each child making progress toward or exceeding grade level standards in math with a specific focus on closing gaps for students in Special Education	**Overall Implementation Results** The overall Theory of Action was our focus for both the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 school years. Our professional development calendar was built with these goals in mind. Major areas of study and collaboration included: • Grade levels at the 3rd-6th grade levels used common assessments such as SBA IAB and curriculum-based assessments to guide student learning and interventions. K-2nd grade classes used curriculum-based and other CCSS-aligned assessments to monitor students' progress in math. • Grade levels collaborated in year-long planning aligned with CCSS (Common Core State Standards) • All classrooms continued to implement high cognitive demand tasks • A school-wide book study using The Growth Mindset Coach was incorporated into professional development activities throughout the year. • Culturally Responsive Instruction was included, but to a lesser degree. Staff learning about "windows and mirrors" focused on the curriculum reflecting students and families at MTE. • SIOP was not a major area of schoolwide study due to demands on time. • While family communication was an ongoing goal and teachers continued to emphasize this area, minimal professional development or new schoolwide strategies focused on this area. Again, this was due to time and focusing on other areas of the SIP.
Whole School Achievement Goal- As a result of this action: Compared to 41.63% meeting standard on the Math SBA in 2018, 46.6% will meet standard on the Math SBA in 2019.	Results as of 10/01/19 show that **48.9% of students at MTE have met standard on the Math SBA in 2019**. This achievement **exceeds our goal** of 46.6% and represents <u>an increase of 7.3%.</u>

Students enrolled in Special Education: Compared to 10.63% meeting standard on the Math SBA in 2018, 20.63% will meet standard on the Math SBA in 2019.	Results as of 10/01/19 show that **15.36% 19.05% of students at MTE <u>in</u> special education have met standard on the Math SBA in 2019.** This achievement **does not meet our goal** of 20.63% but it represents <u>an increase of 4.73%.</u>
Students not in Special Education: Compared to 49.46% meeting standard on the Math SBA in 2018, 54.46% will meet standard on the Math SBA in 2019.	**Results as of 10/01/19 show that 54.41% of students at MTE <u>not in</u> special education** have met standard on the Math SBA in 2019. This achievement **exceeds our goal** of 53.03% and represents <u>an increase of 5.04%.</u>

How has the progress described above informed your school's improvement planning for this school year?

The SIP of the last two years, along with our current Needs Assessment, is informing our 2019-2020 School Improvement Plan in many ways. We have seen that when we put together a systemic approach to increasing student achievement, the results can be significant. By increasing instructional rigor in math (i.e. High Cognitive Demand math tasks), aligning instruction with Common Core Standards, closely monitoring student progress with aligned assessments, and collaborating in teams across our school, student achievement has increased significantly. Our current SBA scores in both Mathematics and English Language Arts are the highest ever seen at Mountlake Terrace Elementary.

We have also seen the importance of supporting students' social-emotional learning in the pursuit of increased academic achievement. It is a common sentiment at our school that professional learning around Growth Mindset (and other social-emotional curricula such as Responsive Classroom and Second Step) and using these concepts intentionally in our classrooms has been a major contributing factor to this increased success.

We plan to continue to incorporate learning from our SIP work over the last two years as we move forward with focus on students in special education.

Section III: Needs Assessment

A. Areas of Strength

A year-long Needs Assessment was completed at MTE during the 2018-2019 school year that focused on students enrolled in our Special Education program. Based on this assessment we found the following areas of strength:

1. As of August, 2019, 3-year growth of students in SPED on the SBA: ELA +1.68%, Math +3.79%
    a. Based on Homeroom Maths State Data for Students that Qualify for Special Education

16-17	17-18	18-19	Total Growth
11.57%	13.70%	15.36%	+3.79%

   b. Based on Homeroom ELA State Data for Students that Qualify for Special Education

16-17	17-18	18-19	Total Growth
9.97%	12.78%	11.65%	+1.68%

2. Strong welcoming classroom environments - overwhelming attitude of MTE staff is that students in special education are "our kids" where everyone shares responsibility for their success.
3. Typically, people are working very hard to help students who qualify for Special Education to succeed, and are putting in extra time and effort in the form of student advocacy, tracking of student data, and providing extra individual attention.
4. Specific grade levels have a high degree of collaboration and alignment of instruction with special education services. Some examples include:

a. Alignment and collaboration around writing instruction in third grade
   b. Progress in math instructional alignment in fifth grade
   c. Overall instruction in sixth grade, where students and resources are focused on one general education classroom for learning support Special Education and another for intensive support Special Education services
5. Other notable examples from services other than special education included:
   a. Title 1/LAP Walk to Read and grade-level wide reading interventions in first grade
   b. Alignment of EL (English Learners) writing instruction in second grade
6. Higher degree of instructional alignment in certificated-led groups (higher degree of collaboration between certificated general ed. and special education teachers a major contributing factor, as well as increased professional development and planning time).

B. Areas of Needed Growth

Our students in Special Education have a persistent and significant gap with general education peers in SBA results (both ELA and Maths). While they have shown progress as a group, it is not enough to close the gap with their general education peers. These students also perform lower than other schools with similar demographics in our school district. This information led us to complete a year-long Needs Assessment, focusing on students enrolled in our Special Education program. Based on this assessment we found the following areas of needed growth:

1. Without sufficient time or systems for collaboration, educators have to provide instruction in silos, limiting greatly the alignment of learning for students.
2. Without sufficient professional development, staff do not have consistent knowledge of best practices of inclusion, understanding of disabilities, knowledge of differentiation approaches, or information about specific individual students. This is especially true for paraeducators, who cannot attend the majority of school and district professional development on these topics because meetings are scheduled outside of their work hours.
3. Systems of student referral and intervention (MTI, PST, DET) are not well-understood by general education teachers or could be improved for clarity and efficiency.
4. A variety of instructional delivery models exists such as push-in, pull-out, team teaching, paraeducator and certificated-led instruction, etc. In some cases, this is thoughtfully designed by the team and carried out with intention. In other cases, the delivery model is more guided by schedules, available resources, and limited time for collaboration.
5. Assessment information is inconsistently shared or communicated between general education and special education staff. This includes regular progress monitoring, curriculum-based assessments, and formative assessments. Without systems for sharing this information, or common assessments being used, monitoring of student progress is often done in silos.
6. Communication with families, particularly regarding student academic progress, is inconsistent across the school. This is further exacerbated by communication that is primarily using email and in English only; it was found that many of our families don't use email and thus miss out on much of our communication. Families that don't speak English are further disconnected from our current communication systems.
7. Without frequent or easily-accessible information about their children's progress and how they can help at home, families are less able to partner with the school in their children's success. This appears to be especially true for families who speak a language other than English.

Based on our analysis of our Needs Assessment, we have found these specific areas of needed growth that require our focus:
1. Increased knowledge of individual students' strengths, triggers, disabilities, IEP goals, plans, etc.
2. Increased time and systemic efficacy for collaboration around students with special needs:
   a. Collaboration systems for general education and special education teachers
   b. Collaboration systems for special education certificated and classified educators
3. Greater alignment in instruction between general education and special education settings:
   a. Use of precise pre-teaching models, when appropriate
   b. Close alignment of standards, instructional strategies, and curriculum

4. Regular use of assessment information for progress monitoring- shared between general education and special education groups
5. Systems of service delivery to students:
   a. Pull-out vs. push-in groups, team-teaching models (general education and special education staff)
   b. Certificated vs. Classified instruction, or team-teaching models (special education certificated and classified staff)
6. Improved systems of student intervention and referral and/or understanding of these systems:
   a. Problem Solving Team (PST)
   b. Disability Evaluation Team (DET)
   c. Multi-Tiered Instruction (MTI) meetings
   d. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
7. Communication systems with families:
   a. Use of non-email communication- ie: Class Dojo, in particular
   b. Translations services for families (Class Dojo, Smore, School Messenger)
   c. Frequency of communication of student progress
   d. Frequency of direct communication with families, such as conferences, family learning nights, etc.
8. Professional development as a staff to support the above listed areas of growth:
   a. Best practices around inclusion of students with disabilities
   b. Problem Solving Team/Evaluation Processes
   c. How to effectively differentiate instruction/Instructional models to meet all needs
   d. Understanding disabilities that our students have
   e. What is expected of a teacher when following an IEP
   f. Professional Learning Communities & Cycle of Inquiry around specific student data/evidence
   g. Understanding of behavioral approaches/social-emotional learning

C. Additional Data Required

State Participation Rate: 95% participation required

☒ **Area of Strength (95% or more participation)**	❏ **Area of Opportunity (less than 95% participation)**
If your participation rate is an area of opportunity, please describe your plan for increasing student participation during the school year Not Applicable	

D. Third Grade OSPI Literacy Expectation:

What Percentage of Third Graders Met or Exceeded standard on the SBA ELA?	**55 %, as of 10/1/19** **Plan is required: YES ☒ NO ☐**
If a plan is required for your building, add in your Third Grade SBA Claim Report Data (percentages met) below: Our 3rd grade Mountlake Terrace Elementary Students scored 56% proficient on their SBA ELA for the 2018-19 school year. **Reading:** 52% (2445±13) **Writing:** 55% (2431±14) **Listening:** 68% (2440±15) **Research/Inquiry:** 52% (2433±14)	

Section IV: Theory of Action

2019-2020: If we engage our educators in expanding their knowledge of special education students by providing time to collaborate, research, learn, implement and reflect on targeted teaching interventions, students will show significant progress toward grade level standards.

Theory of Action:

If we:
- increase our knowledge of individual students and their specific learning needs,
- devote time for collaboration in professional learning communities and professional development,
- improve the system of communication between all stakeholders,
- develop greater alignment between special education and general education,
- use regular progress monitoring to guide student support systems,

Then the progress of students in special education will be significant.

Rationale:

The main rationale behind MTE's Theory of Action is grounded in the research John Hattie did regarding effect size in relation to student achievement. Our collective teacher efficacy will be focused on coming together in professional learning communities and through the collaborative process of cycle of inquiries teachers will determine the best teaching approaches to intervene and increase student success.

Section V: Student Outcome Goals (Schoolwide & Opportunity Gap)

A. **Whole School Achievement Goal(s):**
   a. **Increase of whole school attendance rate**
      Increase 2018-19 attendance rate from 88% to 91%. If looking at comparable data this would be a decrease of 30 absences (ie: 2018-19 data would look like 967 whole school absences instead of 997).
   b. **Increase of SBA ELA Proficiency Rate**
      Increase 2018-19 SBA ELA Proficiency Rate from 49% by 5% to at least 54% achieving proficiency.
   c. **Increase of SBA Math Proficiency Rate**
      Increase 2018-19 SBA Math Proficiency Rate from 49% by 5% to at least 54% achieving proficiency.

B. **Opportunity Gap Goal(s):**
   a. **Increase of attendance rate of current FRL 5th graders**
      Decrease the 2018-19 attendance gap between our current 5th graders with the rest of the school by at least 3% from 26% to 23%. If looking at comparable data this would be a decrease of 30 absences (ie: 2018-19 data would look like 229 5th grade absences instead of 259 absences if the rest of the school absences remained the same)
   b. **Increase of Student with Disabilities ELA Proficiency Rate**
      Decrease the 2018-19 opportunity gap between our Students with Disabilities ELA Proficiency Rate with the non-Student with Disability ELA Proficiency Rate by 3%. (ie: Based on 2018-19 SBA ELA scores this would look like decreasing from a 43% gap to at most 40%)
   c. **Increase of Student with Disabilities Math Proficiency Rate**
      Decrease the 2018-19 opportunity gap between our Students with Disabilities Math Proficiency Rate with the non-Student with Disability Math Proficiency Rate by 3%. (ie: Based on 2018-19 SBA ELA scores this would look like decreasing from a 44% gap to at most 41%)

Section VI: Action Plan

1. Increased knowledge of individual students' strengths, triggers, disabilities, IEP goals, plans, etc.
2. Increased time and systemic efficacy for collaboration around students with special needs:
    a. Collaboration systems for general education and special education teachers
    b. Collaboration systems for special education certificated and classified educators
3. Greater alignment in instruction between general education and special education settings:
    a. Use of precise pre-teaching models, when appropriate
    b. Close alignment of standards, instructional strategies, and curriculum
4. Regular use of assessment information for progress monitoring- shared between general education and special education groups
5. Systems of service delivery to students:
    a. Pull-out vs. push-in groups, team-teaching models (general education and special education staff)
    b. Certificated vs. Classified instruction, or team-teaching models (special education certificated and classified staff)
6. Improved systems of student intervention and referral and/or understanding of these systems:
    a. Problem Solving Team (PST)
    b. Disability Evaluation Team (DET)
    c. Multi-Tiered Instruction (MTI) meetings
    d. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
7. Communication systems with families:
    a. Use of non-email communication- ie: Class Dojo, in particular
    b. Translations services for families (Class Dojo, Smore, School Messenger)
    c. Frequency of communication of student progress
    d. Frequency of direct communication with families, such as conferences, family learning nights, etc.
8. Professional development as a staff to support the above listed areas of growth:
    a. Best practices around inclusion of students with disabilities
    b. Problem Solving Team/Evaluation Processes
    c. How to effectively differentiate instruction/Instructional models to meet all needs
    d. Understanding disabilities that our students have
    e. What is expected of a teacher when following an IEP
    f. Professional Learning Communities & Cycle of Inquiry around specific student data/evidence
    g. Understanding of behavioral approaches/social-emotional learning

Plan for 2019-20:

Key Improvement Action	Description	Timeline

Increased time and systemic efficacy for collaboration around students with special needs:
• Collaboration systems for general education and special education teachers
• Collaboration systems for special education
	Date Source(s):
	• Building Directed Time Professional Development
	• Building Directed Time Professional Development Staff Feedback Surveys
	• John Hattie Effect Size/DuFour's 4 Questions/Data Analysis
	
	Specific Measure(s):
	• Number of MTE staff trained
	• Survey Questions
	  o Clarity
	  o Thank You & a Wish
		Specific Building Days with PLC/Collaboration Focus: Aug 28th, Aug 29th, Oct 4th, Nov 7th, Nov 8th
		
		Specific PLC Staff Meeting Focus: Sept 25th, Oct 9th, Oct 30th
		
		Specific PLC COI Days: Nov 20th, Dec 4th Jan 22, Feb 19, March 18th, April 22nd, May 20th, June 10th

Key Improvement Action	Description	Timeline
certificated and classified educators	• Professional Learning Communities Cycle of Inquiry • Problem Solving Team – Creation of Tier I Interventions	ILT Meetings to Reflect on SIP, PD & PLCs: 1st Monday of each Month PST: Tuesdays as needed
Greater alignment in instruction between general education and special education settings: • Use of precise pre-teaching models, when appropriate • Close alignment of standards, instructional strategies, and curriculum	**Date Source(s):** • Homeroom • Assessment Data (ie: TC) • Skyward • SWIS • 95% Curriculum PD • John Hattie Effect Size/DuFour's 4 Questions/Data Analysis **Specific Measure(s):** • Three 95% Professional Development Days • Fall Learning Support pre-teaching in collaboration with classroom teaching • Professional Learning Communities Cycle of Inquiry • Multiple Tiered Intervention/Instruction Inclusion of LS, EL and Classroom Teachers	95% Professional Development Days: Nov 20, Feb 20 & May 20 PD Fall Acadience & 95% Data Collection Fall, Winter & Spring MTI dates for classroom teachers to analyze data in collaboration with LS/EL departments
Regular use of assessment information for progress monitoring- shared between general education and special education groups	**Date Source(s):** • Homeroom • Skyward • SWIS • Assessment Data • John Hattie Effect Size/DuFour's 4 Questions/Cycle of Inquiry **Specific Measure(s):** • Professional Learning Communities Cycle of Inquiry	Specific PLC COI Days: Nov 20th, Dec 4th Jan 22, Feb 19, March 18th, April 22nd, May 20th, June 10th ILT Meetings to Reflect on SIP, PD & PLCs: 1st Monday of each Month Fall, Winter & Spring MTI dates for classroom teachers to analyze data in collaboration with LS/EL departments

Plan for Years 2 & 3
2020-2021:
• Continue focus on increasing professional knowledge and collaboration of professional learning communities to increase capacity to support our students with disabilities. Our action plan will focusing on increasing the use of research based instructional strategies that support our students with disabilities academic success.

2021-2022:

- Continue focus on increasing professional knowledge and collaboration of professional learning communities to increase capacity to support our English language learners. Our action plan will focusing on increasing the use of research based instructional strategies that support our English language learners' academic success.

Action Plan for the School to Address the Third Grade OSPI Literacy Expectation:

Third Grade OSPI Literacy Expectation

(The following information is required if <u>less than 60%</u> of

Third Grade Students met or exceeded standards on SBA ELA)

Intensive Reading and Literacy Improvement Plan	Description of Intervention Practices	Progress Monitoring Schedule
Identify the intensive and targeted reading/literacy intervention practices, K-4, your school will implement. After your selection, write a brief description of your plan for implementation of that practice.	❏ Utilize Instructional Coaching ❏ 95% Professional Development & Implementation ❏ Family Involvement at School (and outside of school) ❏ Targeted Professional Learning ❏ Professional Learning Communities	• Monthly check-in with admin • 3 times annually for K & 1 teachers & during title/lap intervention time • Parent Teacher Conferences (fall & spring) • Building & Staff Meeting days • 3 times annually for K-6 during MTI & Monthly during second staff meeting
Specifically identify and describe your building's grade to grade transition plan. How is student learning information shared and how are intervention plans from year to year continued/modified/expanded/discarded?	❏ Instructional Leadership Team ❏ Whole Staff Data Analysis ❏ Class Placement	• Monthly ILT meetings • Specific building & staff meeting days • Class Placement Staff Meeting
Describe your *Targeted Family Engagement Plan* (specifically K-4) that ensures two way communication between home and school regarding individual student progress, the interventions and strategies being used and strategies for improving the student's reading skills at home.	❏ Family Events ❏ Equity Team ❏ Family Survey & Family Advocacy Groups	• ie: curriculum night, parent teacher conferences, multi-cultural night, doctor for a day event, sno-isle library partnership, etc… • Monthly meeting • Annual survey or advocacy groups depending on the cycle year

Section VII: Grade Level/Specialist/Department Goals

Team Goals will be finalized on November 8th

Technology — this is how we will use technology to support meeting our goal:

- The most current focus of technology that is tied to our school SIP includes the use of family engagement apps/tools. Specifically apps/tools that allow us to better communicate with families whose home/first language is other than English. ie: Classroom Dojo