

Rosa Parks Elementary School

School Improvement Plan

Annual Update: 2020-21

This school improvement plan meets the requirements of WAC 180-16-220 and WAC 180-105-020.

SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Description: Rosa Parks Elementary School opened the 2006-2007 school year. Located in Redmond, our school serves students in kindergarten through fifth grade. We meet the needs of all learners by providing a wide array of service delivery models to extend and remediate learning. Our services models include small group pull-out instruction, push-in support, and coteaching with the goal of achieving inclusive classroom environments for all students. Students at Rosa Parks also benefit from an arts integrated approach to teaching and learning, and in partnership with our PTSA we have an artist in residence program that integrates theater standards with academic standards. Students from Rosa Parks Elementary School go on to attend Timberline Middle School and Redmond High School.

Mission Statement: *To grow the whole child as a joyful, lifelong learner within a respectful environment.*

Demographics:¹

		2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Student Enrollment (count)		647	644	659	650
Racial Diversity (%)	American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.5
	Asian	50.2	51.4	56.1	55.8
	Black/African American	1.7	1.9	2.0	2.3
	Hispanic/Latino of any race(s)	6.2	5.6	5.2	5.1
	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2
	Two or more races	5.7	5.9	6.2	4.9
	White	35.7	34.5	29.9	31.2
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Meals (%)		2.2	3.3	2.1	2.0
Students Receiving Special Education Services (%)		8.7	8.9	9.3	8.8
English Language Learners (%)		13.9	13.0	14.0	16.3
Students with a First Language Other Than English (%)		36.3	38.9	41.2	46.0

¹Enrollment and racial diversity based on annual October 1 headcount and includes Preschool-Gr 5 enrollment. Students included in program count (FRL, SpEd, EL) if enrolled on October 1 and receiving services at any time during that school year.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DATA: LITERACY

READING: By Grade Level, DIBELS Assessment²

Grade	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Kindergarten	95	90	84	n/a
1 st Grade	96	>97	86	n/a
2 nd Grade	>97	96	93	n/a

ELA: By Grade Level, Smarter Balanced Assessment

Grade	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
3 rd Grade	85	91	88	n/a
4 th Grade	93	89	93	n/a
5 th Grade	90	93	89	n/a

READING: By Group/Program, DIBELS Assessment³

Group/Program	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Asian	>97	97	95	n/a
Black/African American	-	-	90	n/a
Hispanic/Latino	>97	93	71	n/a
Two or more races	94	>97	78	n/a
White	96	91	78	n/a
English Learner	96	91	76	n/a
Low Income	-	-	-	n/a
Special Education	78	79	48	n/a

ELA: By Group/Program, Smarter Balanced Assessment⁴

Group/Program	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Asian	93	96	95	n/a
Black/African American	-	-	-	n/a
Hispanic/Latino	92	>97	80	n/a
Two or more races	86	86	86	n/a
White	84	87	86	n/a
English Learner	50	63	33	n/a
Low Income	-	55	27	n/a
Special Education	38	77	58	n/a

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DATA: MATH

MATH: By Grade Level, Smarter Balanced Assessment

Grade	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
3 rd Grade	87	90	89	n/a
4 th Grade	95	83	92	n/a
5 th Grade	89	92	88	n/a

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DATA: SCIENCE

SCIENCE: By Grade Level, WCAS⁵

Grade	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
5 th Grade	n/a	93	89	n/a

MATH: By Group/Program, Smarter Balanced Assessment⁵

Group/Program	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Asian	>97	96	95	n/a
Black/African American	-	-	-	n/a
Hispanic/Latino	88	>97	80	n/a
Two or more races	86	82	95	n/a
White	83	82	84	n/a
English Learner	79	83	57	n/a
Low Income	-	55	46	n/a
Special Education	33	58	38	n/a

SCIENCE: By Group/Program, WCAS

Group/Program	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Asian	n/a	94	95	n/a
Black/African American	n/a	-	-	n/a
Hispanic/Latino	n/a	-	-	n/a
Two or more races	n/a	-	-	n/a
White	n/a	92	80	n/a
English Learner	n/a	-	-	n/a
Low Income	n/a	-	-	n/a
Special Education	n/a	90	40	n/a

↘ = cohort track
n/a = not available

² Based on DIBELS Next Assessment, End-of-Year Benchmark.

³ Grades K-2 combined. Student/Program groups with less than 10 students marked as "-" and data not displayed due to privacy reasons. "American Indian/Alaskan Native" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander" not included in report due to fewer than 10 students in all categories.

⁴ Grades 3-5 combined. Student/Program groups with less than 10 students marked as "-" and data not displayed due to privacy reasons.

⁵ WCAS = Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science. Given only to 5th grade at the elementary level. Assessment first given in 2017-18.

ATTENDANCE DATA

ATTENDANCE: By Grade

Grade	Percent avoiding chronic absenteeism			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Kindergarten	90	87	91	n/a
1 st Grade	88	94	86	n/a
2 nd Grade	94	94	89	n/a
3 rd Grade	96	93	93	n/a
4 th Grade	97	94	93	n/a
5 th Grade	91	96	96	n/a

ATTENDANCE: By Group/Program⁶

Group/Program	Percent avoiding chronic absenteeism			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Asian	92	94	90	n/a
Black/African American	--	92	93	n/a
Hispanic/Latino	90	97	89	n/a
Two or more races	86	100	90	n/a
White	95	91	95	n/a
English Learner	89	92	89	n/a
Low Income	70	90	94	n/a
Special Education	87	82	79	n/a

WASHINGTON SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FRAMEWORK (WSIF) DATA

MOST RECENT WSIF 3-YEAR SUMMARY⁷

	All Students	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Two or more races	White	English Language Learners	Low income	Students with disabilities
ELA Proficiency Rate (%)	91	95	-	93	90	86	49	42	62
Math Proficiency Rate (%)	90	96	-	93	90	84	69	52	49
ELA Median Student Growth Percentile ⁸	61	65	-	51.5	46	55	-	-	48
Math Median Student Growth Percentile	67	71	-	63.5	67.5	62	-	-	53
EL Progress Rate (%)	85	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Regular Attendance Rate (%)	94	93	-	96	95	96	91	87	87

= cohort track
 n/a = not available

⁶ Grades K-5 combined. Student/Program groups with less than 10 students marked as "--" and data not displayed due to privacy reasons.

⁷ Washington School Improvement Framework measures compile data across three years (2017-2019) and include both the general education assessment (Smarter Balanced assessments) and the alternative assessment for student with severe cognitive disabilities (WA-AIM). OSPI suppression rules apply to some data marked as "--" and not displayed due to privacy reasons.

⁸ Median Student Growth Percentile is calculated by ordering individual student growth percentiles from lowest to highest and identifying the middle score. Washington State defines an SGP of 1-33 as low, 34-66 as typical, and 67-99 as high.

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PRIORITIES

Our target is that all students and student groups are improving, with all gaps closing, each year. The following priorities have been set to guide us in achieving this.

Priority #1															
Priority Area	English Language Arts/Literacy														
Focus Area	Information and Opinion Writing														
Focus Grade Level(s)	3-5														
Desired Outcome	70% of Grade 3-5 students will score at least three out of four on the evidence/elaboration rubric on the Smarter Balanced Performance Task for Informational Writing by spring, 2022.														
Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives	Multi-Tiered Systems of Support - Academics (MTSS-A)														
Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area	<p>Students have three types of writing on the Smarter Balanced Assessment: Informational, Narrative, and Opinion. Students receive scores on a four-point rubric for the categories of organization/purpose and evidence/elaboration. Data from the 2019 Spring writing performance task was as follows:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Writing Type</th> <th colspan="2">% of Gr 3-5 students receiving at least three out of four on the scoring rubric</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Organization/Purpose</th> <th>Evidence/Elaboration</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Informational</td> <td style="text-align: center;">49%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">49%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Narrative</td> <td style="text-align: center;">73%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">72%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Opinion</td> <td style="text-align: center;">46%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">45%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Overall, students are scoring less on informational and opinion writing as compared to narrative. This trend has been consistent over the past three years (2017-2019). This data supports a focus on informational and opinion writing.</p>	Writing Type	% of Gr 3-5 students receiving at least three out of four on the scoring rubric		Organization/Purpose	Evidence/Elaboration	Informational	49%	49%	Narrative	73%	72%	Opinion	46%	45%
Writing Type	% of Gr 3-5 students receiving at least three out of four on the scoring rubric														
	Organization/Purpose	Evidence/Elaboration													
Informational	49%	49%													
Narrative	73%	72%													
Opinion	46%	45%													
Strategy to Address Priority	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Action</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Measure of Fidelity of Implementation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3rd-5th grade teacher teams review scoring rubric and student exemplars (provided by SBA) for information and opinion writing tasks.</td> <td>% of teacher teams that have completed rubric and exemplar analysis.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All grade levels (K-5) collaborate to ensure alignment and share teaching strategies for elaboration/evidence within writing</td> <td>% of teachers that access and align writing curriculum.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Action	Measure of Fidelity of Implementation	3 rd -5 th grade teacher teams review scoring rubric and student exemplars (provided by SBA) for information and opinion writing tasks.	% of teacher teams that have completed rubric and exemplar analysis.	All grade levels (K-5) collaborate to ensure alignment and share teaching strategies for elaboration/evidence within writing	% of teachers that access and align writing curriculum.								
Action	Measure of Fidelity of Implementation														
3 rd -5 th grade teacher teams review scoring rubric and student exemplars (provided by SBA) for information and opinion writing tasks.	% of teacher teams that have completed rubric and exemplar analysis.														
All grade levels (K-5) collaborate to ensure alignment and share teaching strategies for elaboration/evidence within writing	% of teachers that access and align writing curriculum.														

	units designed by Teaching and Learning Department.	
	3 rd -5 th grade teams identify critical lesson components from applicable writing units to focus on for the upcoming school year.	Lesson components identified for 3 rd -5 th grades.
	3 rd -5 th grade teams develop a pre- and post- assessment plan using the On-Demand Writing Assessments paired with the Information and Opinion units.	Instructional plan completed.
	Cross-curricular evidence-based explanations in science and mathematics content areas (K-5).	Cross-curricular writing opportunities are identified and applied for all grade levels.
Timeline for Focus	Fall, 2019 - Spring, 2022	
Method(s) to Monitor Progress	Teachers will monitor student progress by analyzing student work using our district informational and opinion writing rubrics.	

Priority #2

Priority Area	English Language Arts/Literacy	
Focus Area	Reading	
Focus Grade Level(s)	K-2	
Desired Outcome	85% of students who qualify as English learners, will score at or above benchmark on the district adopted screening assessment by the Spring assessment window, 2021.	
Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives	Multi-Tiered Systems of Support - Academics (MTSS-A)	
Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area	In the 2018-2019 school year, 80.4% of English learning Kindergarten students, 69.6% of English learning 1 st grade students, and 69.2% of English learning 2 nd grade students were at or above benchmark based on the end of year DIBELS assessment. Reading is a foundational skill for success in all content areas, so our focus will be to increase the total number of students who are proficient readers as well as close the achievement gap that exists between our English learners and general education students.	
Strategy to Address Priority	Action	Measure of Fidelity of Implementation
	Safety Net and English Language teachers will use a combination of push-in and pull-out service delivery models to provide supplemental instruction to students.	Instructional plan completed.
	SIOP strategies will be utilized school wide.	Teacher reflection around SIOP strategies and teacher self-assessments will be used periodically throughout the year.
	EL teachers will conduct progress monitoring for EL students, analyze areas for growth and collaborate with classroom teachers to refine small group instruction as needed.	
Timeline for Focus	Fall, 2019 - Spring, 2021	
Method(s) to Monitor Progress	General education and English Learner support teachers will monitor progress using the district adopted universal screeners and progress monitoring data.	

Priority #3

Priority Area	Social and Emotional
Focus Area	Self-Regulation
Focus Grade Level(s)	K-5
Desired Outcome	75% of all students will be able to regulate their emotions according to teacher observation and self-perception data as recorded by teacher-created rubrics and Panorama survey data by Spring, 2022.

Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives	Multi-Tiered Systems of Support - Behavioral, Social and Emotional Support (MTSS-B)
--	---

Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area	At the end of the 2018-2019 school year, 54% of students responded favorably on the Panorama survey when prompted to rate their ability to regulate their emotions. At the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year, 48% of students responded favorably to the same survey questions, representing growth of 6% over the year. With focused, strategic, and school-wide instruction, we believe we can significantly increase students' abilities to self-regulate their emotions.
	We have also noticed that students are coming into kindergarten less ready for kindergarten socially and emotionally according to the TSGold assessment.

Social Emotionally K-Ready?

Ready?	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
N	36%	46%	49%
Y	64%	54%	51%

Strategy to Address Priority	Action	Measure of Fidelity of Implementation
	School-wide adoption of the Zones of Regulation.	% of teachers confident in teaching the Zones curriculum.
	Teach the Zones and strategies for getting back to the "Green Zone."	Instructional plan completed % of teachers confident in teaching Zones curriculum.
	Increase student access to sensory walks.	Add sensory walks to common spaces.
	Community education events.	
	Create and implement observational data rubrics to cross-check student self-perception data.	% of teachers who complete observational data records/rubrics.
	Student support teams will identify additional strategies for students who qualify for special education support.	

	<p>The school counselor will use the Recess Leaders program to help students develop social-emotional regulation and problem-solving skills.</p>	<p>Data collected by the counselor: what the problem was, whether the problem was solved, and the tools the students used to solve it.</p>
Timeline for Focus	Fall, 2019 - Spring, 2022	
Method(s) to Monitor Progress	Panorama survey data, teacher observation checklists, and TS Gold assessment, Guidance Team referral data.	

Priority #4

Priority Area	Clear and Shared Focus	
Focus Area	The staff keep the school's goals in mind when making important decisions	
Focus Grade Level(s)	All school staff	
Desired Outcome	85% of school staff will respond Agree Completely or Agree Mostly to the statement "The staff keep the school's goal in mind when making important decisions" by Spring, 2022.	
Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives	School Equity Teams	
Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area	28% of respondents of the Nine Characteristics Survey responded agree slightly to the statement "The staff keep the school's goal in mind when making important decisions" at the end of the 2018-2019 school year. At the end of the 2019-2020 school year, only 9% of the staff responded agree slightly or do not agree at all to the same statement. In addition, 30% of staff responded agree slightly or do not agree at all to the statement, "The staff share a common understanding of what the school wants to achieve." By spending time over the next two years to refine our school vision and outline long-term goals, we will be able to establish a clear sense of purpose and priorities when we have important decisions to make.	
Strategy to Address Priority	Action	Measure of Fidelity of Implementation
	Staff will connect professional learning to the school's mission statement.	% of staff meeting/professional learning agendas that align with mission.
	We will begin our meetings with a review of how our work together connects to our mission.	Meeting agendas contain relevant connections to mission.
	When discussing new initiatives or revising existing practice, we will connect our perspectives with our over-arching mission.	Staff self-assessments.
	Presenters will explicitly state the connections between professional learning and the school SIP and/or district strategic plan.	
Timeline for Focus	Fall, 2019 - Spring, 2022	
Method(s) to Monitor Progress	Nine Characteristics Survey	

TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION PLAN

The Washington Basic Education Act requires schools to “integrate technology literacy and fluency” in their curriculum. The updated K-12 Educational Technology Learning Standards emphasize the ways technology can be used to amplify and transform learning and teaching.

The Technology Integration Facilitator Program (TIF) and Building Instructional Technology Plan (BIT) provide the structure and funding to support this requirement.

The goals of the TIF program are to support teachers in effectively:

1. Integrating the use of core instructional technologies within teaching and learning.
2. Utilizing digital tools to enhance the learning process for all students in all classrooms.
3. Understanding and applying the Educational Technology Learning Standards across content areas.
4. Embedding digital citizenship and media literacy within instruction.

Building administrators work with their Technology Integration Facilitator (TIF) to identify needs based on the TIF program goals and develop the BIT Plan to meet those needs. Beginning and end of year survey data informs the personalization of individual school plans.

Based on Fall data, strategic implementations and OSPI requirements, the BIT Plan will focus on the following:

- Digital Citizenship
- Integrating core instructional technologies
- Utilizing digital tools to enhance learning
- Applying Ed Tech Learning Standards
- Embedding digital citizenship & media literacy
- Teaching digital learning in both traditional and remote learning settings

STATE ASSESSMENT PARTICIPATION

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires that all schools meet at least a 95% participation rate for state assessments for all students as well as each subgroup. Schools that fall below this threshold in any group must include goals and actions the school will take to ensure 95% of students participate. The latest participation rate that has been published by OSPI for the school was for state testing in spring 2019. During that year, the participation rate was met.

Strategies the school is using to meet participation requirements include:

- Common language on the importance of state testing is used by all schools in the district.
- Staff receive training on the administration of state assessments, including the use of supports and accommodations to ensure all students have an equal opportunity to demonstrate learning.
- Make-up testing is provided for students that miss the school’s date.
- Test completion lists are monitored by both school testing coordinators and district personnel.
- The district is using the recommended refusal procedures and form developed by the Washington Educational Research Association.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN

As a district of doers, learners, and believers, our “why” drives us. We do this all-important work because we want all of our students to have equitable and quality experiences in the Lake Washington School District in order to ensure that they get to choose their futures instead of their circumstances choosing them.

Research has consistently shown that family and community engagement is key to increasing the academic success and positive connections that students have at school, especially students from groups that are demographically under-represented or those historically marginalized. Therefore, it is imperative that we consistently plan and implement strategies to engage our families and school communities in authentic and culturally appropriate approaches.

To ensure that families have the support that they need to assist their children, OSPI requires that school districts have a family engagement policy in place that applies to all families.⁹ The specific strategy our school is using to involve and inform the community of the School Improvement Plan is as follows:

Strategy to Engage Students, Families, Parents and Community Members in the development of the SIP	Action	Timeline
	Parent Feedback Open House	October, 2020
	Coffee and Conversation session	October, 2020
	Parent Feedback Survey	Yearly through 2022
Strategy to Inform Students, Families, Parents and Community Members of the SIP	Action	Timeline
	School Newsletter	Monthly through 2022
	PTSA General Membership Meeting	March, 2021
	Curriculum Night All School Meeting	August 2020 August 2021
	Coffee and Conversation sessions	Monthly through 2022

⁹ LWSD’s policy is found at: <https://www.lwsd.org/about-us/policy-and-regulations/community-relations-4000/community-education-program-4265>