Frost Elementary School

School Improvement Plan

Annual Update: 2019-20

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

SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Description: Robert Frost Elementary School welcomed over 441 students for the start of the 2019-20 school year. This reflects an increase from the previous year in multiple grade levels, resulting in the addition of two additional classrooms for 2019-20. Our school was established in 1969, in the heart of the Kingsgate neighborhood in Kirkland, Washington. We provide an excellent instructional environment for a diverse community of students, providing students with rich academic challenges, as well as intensive instructional support through our English Language Learner, Safety net and Special Education programs. Our school hosts two Learning Center classrooms, which serve Lake Washington School District students with developmental and medical needs. We are one of six Title 1 schools in the Lake Washington School District, serving a community that is both economically and culturally diverse.

Robert Frost Elementary School has a strong, involved community with many parents and neighbors volunteering frequently in the classrooms. The PTSA coordinates many ongoing programs in support of student learning and offers a variety of after school classes and activities.

The results of the 2019 SBA showed Robert Frost Students making significant gains for cohort performance in ELA, while 3rd and 5th grade students also demonstrated significant improvement compared to the previous year's group. Cohorts declined in Math, and when comparing groups to the previous year declines were also present for 4th and 5th grade. However, 3rd grade students performed a significant 18% higher in math than the previous year's group. Compared to the state, Frost students performed above state averages in all areas by an average of 19%.

We understand the importance of identifying the areas of improvement to continue our work in aligning with district levels of proficiency. This Fall, we began examining individual SBA, and other student data, and are gathering additional sources of assessment information to determine areas of focus for each grade level and each student. All staff are participating in school-wide training for instructional intervention and differentiation, strategies for supporting bilingual students in content areas, and technology integration. We will continue to provide intensive support to those students who are not at standard. We will offer appropriate academic challenge for all students through continuous review of classroom performance data and collaborative intervention at every grade level.

Mission Statement: At Robert Frost Elementary, our mission is to provide a safe, supportive and inclusive environment where every student can learn and achieve to their highest potential, develop key life skills, and apply core values of respect, perseverance, and tolerance. At Robert Frost Elementary, we care for ourselves and our learning, we care for each other, and we care for our school and community.

Demographics:[1]

		2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Student Enrollment (count)		444	424	436
Racial Diversity (%)	American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.9	0.0	0.2
	Asian	9.2	9.4	6.7
	Black/African American	2.7	3.3	4.6
	Hispanic/Latino of any race(s)	28.4	28.5	28.2
	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0.2	1.7	0.2
	Two or more races	7.7	9.7	9.6
	White	50.9	48.4	50.5
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Meals (%)		35.1	34.2	38.3
Students Receiving Special Education Services (%)		15.1	14.9	14.8
English Language Learners (%)		26.6	26.0	22.3
Students with a First Language Other Than English (%)		33.3	34.5	32.3
Mobility Rate (%)[2]		13.5	12.3	10.6

[1]Enrollment and racial diversity based on annual October 1 headcount and includes Preschool-Gr 5 enrollment. Other demographic measures based on May headcount.

[2] Mobility rate is calculated by dividing the number students who entered or withdrew from the school between October 1 and June 15 by the October 1 enrollment.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DATA: LITERACY

READING: By Grade Level, DIBELS Assessment[3]

Grade	Percent at or above standard		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Kindergarten	86	87	89
1st Grade	81	73	77
2nd Grade	82	86	79

ELA: By Grade Level, Smarter Balanced Assessment

Grade	Percent at or above standard		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
3rd Grade	59	60	82
4th Grade	60	68	67
5th Grade	74	71	80

READING: By Group/Program, DIBELS Assessment[4]

Group/Program	Percent at or above standard		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Asian	89	100	92
Black/African American	-	-	69
Hispanic/Latino	73	67	71
Two or more races	92	95	89
White	87	85	86
English Learner	68	60	62
Low Income	75	70	67
Special Education	38	41	50

ELA: By Group/Program, Smarter Balanced Assessment[5]

Group/Program	Percent at or above standard		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Asian	83	81	90
Black/African American	-	-	-
Hispanic/Latino	35	35	57
Two or more races	90	88	95
White	73	81	83
English Learner	24	17	18
Low Income	41	44	63
Special Education	7	25	44

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DATA: MATH

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DATA: SCIENCE

MATH: By Grade Level, Smarter Balanced Assessment

Grade	Percent at or above standard		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
3rd Grade	60	60	78
4th Grade	54	60	54
5th Grade	72	60	51

SCIENCE: By Grade Level, WCAS[6]

Grade	Percent at or above standard		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
5th Grade	n/a	73	75

MATH: By Group/Program, Smarter Balanced Assessment[5]

Group/Program	Percent at or above standard		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Asian	72	63	60
Black/African American	-	-	-
Hispanic/Latino	33	33	33
Two or more races	85	88	95
White	73	73	69
English Learner	24	19	7
Low Income	40	42	42
Special Education	14	25	26

SCIENCE: By Group/Program, WCAS

Group/Program	Percent at or above standard		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Asian	n/a	-	-
Black/African American	n/a	-	-
Hispanic/Latino	n/a	39	47
Two or more races	n/a	-	90
White	n/a	86	83
English Learner	n/a	27	-
Low Income	n/a	48	46
Special Education	n/a	38	-

↘◢ = Cohort Track

---

[3] Based on DIBELS Next Assessment, End-of-Year Benchmark.

[4] 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.

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

[6] 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
Kindergarten	84	85	90
1st Grade	93	88	91
2nd Grade	90	100	87
3rd Grade	94	95	97
4th Grade	94	91	98
5th Grade	96	95	90

ATTENDANCE: By Group/Program[7]

Group/Program	Percent avoiding chronic absenteeism		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Asian	90	77	80
Black/African American	--	100	87
Hispanic/Latino	86	94	90
Two or more races	92	88	98
White	94	95	93
English Learner	84	84	88
Low Income	88	92	88
Special Education	83	87	86

WASHINGTON SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FRAMEWORK (WSIF) DATA

MOST RECENT WSIF 3-YEAR SUMMARY[8]

	All Students	Asian	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino	Two or more races	White	English Language Learners	Low income	Students with disabilities
ELA Proficiency Rate (%)	67	82	-	38	89	78	19	46	28
Math Proficiency Rate (%)	61	68	-	33	87	73	20	43	28
ELA Median Student Growth Percentile[9]	63	69.5	-	59	68.5	60	48	58	40
Math Median Student Growth Percentile	62	71	-	57	62	62	54	57	49
EL Progress Rate (%)	79	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Regular Attendance Rate (%)	93	86	-	93	93	95	86	93	88

◢ = Cohort Track

---

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

[8] Washington School Improvement Framework measures compile data across three years (2016-2018) 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.

[9] 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.

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	Mathematics
Focus Area	Place Value
Focus Grade Level(s)	Grade K-5
Desired Outcome	Improved student scores in target areas of the 2019-2020 Math grade 3, 4, 5 SBA. All students will achieve an = or + sign in targets related to Place Value. All students will receive an = or + sign in Place Value as compared to the rest of the test.
Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives	Professional Learning
Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area	Mathematics

Grade	Number of Students Tested	Percent Proficient
Grade 3	70	76%
Grade 4	64	53%
Grade 5	74	49%

Grades 3, 4 and 5 targeted Math data demonstrated growth necessary in the following areas:

Grade 3:	Target K: Reasoning with shapes and their attributes
Grade 4:	Target A: Use the four operations with whole numbers to solve problems Target B: Gain familiarity with factors and multiples Target C: Generate and analyze patterns
Grade 5:	Target C: Understand the place value system Target F: extend previous understandings of multiplication and division Target G: convert like measurement units within a given measurement system. Target I: Geometric measurement

Because place value knowledge affects multiple targets, the decision was made by the school's Instructional Leadership Team to prioritize professional learning around Place Value and Number Sense this school year, 2019-20. |

Strategy to Address Priority	Action	Measure of Fidelity of Implementation
	Kindergarten: • Teach Place Value during calendar time, using manipulatives to represent the one's and ten's places for the days of the month 1st Grade: • Point out patterns and teach place value during calendar time • Find moments to incorporate place value mini-lessons, such as students writing the date on their paper 2nd Grade: • Additional practice with place value mats and place value models • Teaching/modeling/practicing the relationship between addition and subtraction • Teaching/modeling/practicing multiple strategies for adding and subtracting with two- and three-digit numbers • Teaching/modeling/practicing how to apply computational skills to story problems • Teaching math vocabulary (including words found in directions) throughout the year 3rd Grade: • Teach Skip counting • Multiplication facts - teach, practice, learn, timed tests • Introduce, practice division • Emphasize/review place value for addition and subtraction 4th Grade: • Work on problem solving in math • Provide our students with more strategies for attacking problems that have a lot of words: help them read through	Percentage of K-5 teams focusing on actions during team meetings throughout the year. Percentage of Interim (IAB) and practice assessments given throughout the year.

	the problem, pull out the necessary information, determine the operation and complete the problem. 5th Grade: • Small group support • Differentiated lessons and homework	
	All teacher teams (K-5, SN, ELL, Specialits) review SBA target data and identify areas of success and areas of growth.	Percentage of teams completing Data Reflection and Planning Page in OneNote.
	Instructional Leadership Team narrows down and identifies growth areas as well as actions and strategies to improve Math areas of concern.	Completion of ILT SIP reflection page in one note, as well as identification of actions and strategies.
	Learn about what place value type problems look like at different grade levels.	Percentage of teacher teams completing practice SBA problems related to Place Value.
	(K-5, SN, ELL, Specialists) Complete sample SBA problems related to Place Value, identify critical lesson components to successfully complete SBA problems in grades 3, 4, and 5.	Percentage of teacher teams, in OneNote, identifying learning that takes place at their individual grade levels to be successful on the Grades 3, 4, and 5 SBA.
	K-5 grade levels identify areas of the curriculum to supplement and improve instruction related to Place Value.	Percentage of Grade level teams identifying Envision Units to supplement and improve instruction.
	Grades 3, 4 and 5 students will increase the amount of practice type SBA problems taken.	Percentage of Interim Assessments completed throughout the year.
	Teacher teams review SBA scoring rubrics, targets, and student exemplars provided by SBA.	Percentage of teams completing rubrics and exemplars.
	Staff will build their place value knowledge throughout the year with professional development.	Amount of articles, videos, etc. added to staff Place Value Tab in OneNote. Work with CORE facilitator, Mary Ann Jalbert, to increase knowledge in Place Value and Number Sense.
Timeline for Focus	Fall 2019- Spring 2020	
Method(s) to Monitor Progress	Math interim assessments (IAB's) will be given periodically after completion of Envision Math units.	
Priority #2		

Priority Area	English Language Arts/Literacy
Focus Area	Cite text Evidence, Analysis Across Texts
Focus Grade Level(s)	Grade K-5
Desired Outcome	Improved student scores in target areas of the 2019-2020 ELA grade 3, 4, 5 SBA. All students will achieve an = or + sign in targets related to citing text evidence and analysis across texts. All students will receive an = or + sign in citing text evidence and analysis across texts as compared to the rest of the test.
Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives	Professional Learning
Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area	ELA/Literacy

Grade	Number of Students Tested	Percent Proficient
Grade 3	69	83%
Grade 4	64	67%
Grade 5	71	80%

Grades 3, 4, and 5 targeted ELA SBA data demonstrated growth necessary in the following areas:

Grade 3:	Target 5: Analysis within or across texts: Describe and explain relationships among literary elements within or across texts or compare/contrast the narrator or characters' point of view within or across texts. Target 12: Analysis within or across texts: Interpret and explain how information is presented within or across texts or compare/contrast the author's point of view within or across texts.
Grade 4:	Target 5: Analysis within or across texts: Describe and explain relationships among literary elements within or across texts or compare/contrast the narrator or characters' point of view within or across texts. Target 8: Given an inference or conclusion, use explicit details and implicit information from the text to support the inference or conclusion provided.
Grade 5:	Target 9: Identify or determine a main idea and the key details that support it, or summarize key details using evidence from the text. Target 10: Word meanings - Determine intended meanings of words including academic/Tier 2 words and words with multiple meanings, based on context, word relationships, word structure, or use of reference materials.

. . .
Because *citing text evidence* affects multiple targets, the decision was made by the school's Instructional Leadership Team to prioritize professional |

	learning on *citing text evidence* and *analysis across texts* this school year, 2019-20.	

Strategy to Address Priority	**Action**	**Measure of Fidelity of Implementation**
	Kindergarten: • Model text to text, text to self, text to world connections within and across texts • Model how to find answers within the text 1st Grade: • More intentionality teaching text to text, text to self and text to world connections within and across texts 2nd Grade: • Identify main topic/key details in informational texts • Answer questions from informational texts with text evidence • Teach/model using informational text features • Teach strategies for understanding: multiple meaning words, prefixes/suffixes, inflectional endings, figurative language • Teach students to make text-to-text connections between Wonders texts each week • Teach topic in whole group and small group instruction • Communicate with 3rd grade team to find out what we can emphasize in our instruction to better prepare students 3rd Grade: • Model and practice finding text evidence and citing correctly in reading and writing. • Intentionally teaching vocabulary strategies and finding examples in texts; teaching vocabulary 4th Grade:	Percentage of K-5 teams focusing on actions during team meetings throughout the year. Percentage of Interim (IAB) and practice assessments given throughout the year.

- Work on using more paired texts with students so that we can ask within and across text comprehension questions that require students to cite evidence.
- Work more with students to edit and revise their own writing and writing that is provided to them.

5th Grade:
- Work on vocabulary strategies, determine the meaning of unknown words

All teacher teams (K-5, SN, ELL, Specialits) review SBA target data and identify areas of success and areas of growth.	Percentage of teams completing Data Reflection and Planning Page in OneNote.
Instructional Leadership Team narrows down and identifies growth areas as well as actions and strategies to improve ELA areas of concern.	Completion of ILT SIP reflection page in one note, as well as identification of actions and strategies.
Learn about what *citing text evidence* and *analysis across text* problems look like at different grade levels.	Percentage of teacher teams completing practice SBA problems related to *citing text evidence* and *analysis across texts*.
(K-5, SN, ELL, Specialists) Complete sample SBA problems related to *Citing Text Evidence* and *Analysis Across Texts,* identify critical lesson components to successfully complete SBA problems in grades 3, 4, and 5.	Percentage of teacher teams, in OneNote, identifying learning that takes place at their individual grade levels to be successful on the Grades 3, 4, and 5 ELA SBA.
K-5 grade levels identify areas of the curriculum to supplement and improve instruction related to *Citing Text Evidence* and *Analysis Across Texts*.	Percentage of Grade level teams identifying Envision Units to supplement and improve instruction.
Grades 3, 4, and 5 students will increase the amount of practice type SBA problems taken.	Percentage of Interim Assessments completed throughout the year.
Teacher teams review SBA scoring rubrics, targets, and student exemplars provided by SBA.	Percentage of teams completing rubrics and exemplars.
Staff will build their cite text evidence and analysis across texts knowledge throughout the year with professional development.	Amount of articles, videos, etc. added to staff Analysis Across Texts Tab in OneNote.

Timeline for Focus	Fall 2019 – Spring 2020
Method(s) to Monitor Progress	ELA interim assessments (IAB's) and practice tests will be given periodically after completion of Envision Math units. Wonders Unit Tests are given after each unit and will be monitored for growth on problems related to citing text evidence and analysis across texts.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2" align="center">Priority #3</td></tr>
<tr><td>Priority Area</td><td>Social and Emotional</td></tr>
<tr><td>Focus Area</td><td>Emotional Regulation</td></tr>
<tr><td>Focus Grade Level(s)</td><td>Grade K-5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Desired Outcome</td><td>Growth in the area of Emotional Regulation from 44% positive responses, on the Spring 2019 Panorama Survey, to 51% positive responses on the Spring 2020 Panorama Survey, to meet or exceed current LWSD averages.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives</td><td>Multi-Tiered Systems of Support - Behavioral, Social and Emotional Support (MTSS-B)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area</td><td>Panorama Student Survey Data (Spring 2019)
Frost students responded with a lower percentage of positive responses in Emotional Regulation than other social-emotional areas: 44% positive compared to 60% positive for Sense of Belonging.
Frost students scored 6% lower than the average for the Lake Washington School District. This was also a comparatively higher impact area for low income and Hispanic students who have demonstrated lower levels of academic achievement at Robert Frost Elementary.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">Strategy to Address Priority</td><td>

Action	Measure of Fidelity of Implementation
• Professional development in support of de-escalation strategies	• Scheduled during staff meetings and LEAP training days throughout the 2019-20 school year
• Professional development in trauma-informed intervention strategies	• Completion of trauma-informed intervention strategies (e.g.: ACES)
• Professional development in the application of classroom community interventions	• Inclusion of classroom community strategies (e.g.: class meetings, restorative circles, guided meditation)

</td></tr>
</table>

	• Data collection and response for behavior incidents related to emotional regulation	• Monthly data review and response planning through building PBIS team with referral to Guidance Team/SIT Team for Tier 3 intervention
	• Scheduled classroom lessons focused on emotional regulation provided through Counselor	• Instructional Schedule established for the year aligned to LWSD SEL curriculum
	• Instruction and intervention for emotional regulation provided through classroom teacher, including brain breaks, Kelso's Choices, Growth Mindset strategies, and individual student accommodations	• Lessons and interventions provided to teachers aligned to SEL curriculum and established instructional schedule
	• Small-group instruction and intervention for emotional regulation provided through Counselor	• Referrals created two times per year in collaboration between counselor and teacher using data from scheduled SEL instruction, teacher provided SEL intervention, and PBIS team data
	• Application of de-escalation and emotional regulation strategies aligned with SEL curriculum provided by recess/lunchroom supervisors, including student	• Progress monitored through monthly PBIS meetings and monthly Instructional Assistant meetings
Timeline for Focus	Fall, 2019 - Spring, 2020	
Method(s) to Monitor Progress	• Review of Panorama data (Fall 2019 and Spring 2020) • Mid-year check-in • Monthly discussion through professional development provided through LEAP professional learning days and staff meetings • Progress monitoring by counselor for student progress in classroom lessons and small-group intervention • PBIS behavior data	

Priority #4	
Priority Area	Focused Professional Development
Focus Area	"Staff members get help in areas they need to improve"
Focus Grade Level(s)	Grade K-5
Desired Outcome	Improve positive response to Focus Area in the annual *Nine Characteristics of High-Performing Schools Survey* from 32% in Spring 2019 to 60% in Spring 2020, with increases in completion by certificated staff from 54% (Spring 2019) to 80% completing the survey (Spring 2020).
Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives	Professional Learning

Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area	*Nine Characteristics of High-Performing Schools Survey* Data (Spring 2019)
	• This area garnered the lowest number of positive responses by the 21 respondents and was the only area with majority negative responses.

Strategy to Address Priority	Action	Measure of Fidelity of Implementation
	• Staff input for requested support for improvement	• Record of response data by November 2019
	• Development of professional learning and team support plans through Instructional Leadership Team	• Monthly Instructional Leadership Team meeting agendas and notes

	• Professional learning and collaboration through LEAP scheduling and staff meetings for teacher-identified growth areas:
	  o Science instruction with new curriculum/standards
	  o Collaboration between Specialist and Classroom teachers for aligning and improving services
		• Professional Learning LEAP agendas (Monthly)
		• Staff meeting agendas (monthly)

	• Release time provided for professional learning, collaboration, and curriculum planning around teacher/team-identified growth areas:
	  o Science instruction with new curriculum/standards
	  o Collaboration between Specialist and Classroom teachers for aligning and improving services
	  o Math intervention
	  o Small group instruction
	  o Co-teaching
	  o Behavior management
		• Release time provided through building budget
		• Usage promoted and reviewed monthly through Instructional Leadership Team
		• Usage documented through building budget management processes

	• Perception surveys for progress monitoring	• Survey two times per year
	• Monthly check-ins through Leadership Teams	• Survey data review and response
	• Surveys to staff following professional development/improvement activities	• Survey results

	• Ensure greater fidelity in completion of survey	• Increase completion rate by certificated staff from 54% to over 80%
Timeline for Focus	Fall, 2019 - Spring, 2020	
Method(s) to Monitor Progress	• *Nine Characteristics of High-Performing Schools Survey* Data (Spring 2020) • School-based professional development survey data • School-based perception survey data • Budget review process • Progress review through Instructional Leadership Team	

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

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 2018. During that year, the participation rate was met for ELA and met for mathematics.

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.

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.[10] 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
	Safety Net Parent Information Meetings • Process of determining school goals was shared and parents were invited to participate in SIP process • Interpreters translated in Spanish and Portuguese • Offered two meeting times (before school and evening) to accommodate family schedules • Childcare and light snack provided	October 2019
	Parent Advisory Committee • Families invited to review and provide feedback on school goals and parent/family engagement strategies Continuous and intentional outreach to parents and community members of diverse backgrounds to participate in this process.	Three times per year
	Collaboration with LWSD Family Engagement and Community Outreach Coordinator to communicate goals and build engagement strategies with families. Methods include, but are not limited to:	Throughout year

---

[10] LWSD's policy is found at: https://www.lwsd.org/about-us/policy-and-regulations/school-community-relations-goals-ka-r

	• Staff trainings on equity and family engagement • Community cafes • Empowerment and capacity building for families (i.e. Natural Leaders) • Offering workshops and/or resources that families request needing Informal and formal surveying of families	
	Parent surveys to collect feedback on school/parent compact.	November 2019
	• Focus on parent/home strategies to support student progress towards SIP goals • Specific home strategies and resources provided to parents via classroom PowerSchool, Safety Net Reading Connections Newsletter, Tuesday Bulletin, and parent information nights • Key resources translated into Spanish and Portuguese • Collaboration with LWSD Equity Office and Washington Alliance for Better Schools to maintain supports and training for community members in the Natural Leaders process • Community surveys to determine specific needs and interests • Parent education opportunities provided to develop skills for home academic support • Resources targeted to Spanish-speaking and Portuguese-speaking/underrepresented families • Collaboration with leadership from PTSA and Natural Leaders for feedback, planning, and alignment of family support programs • Continued inclusion of parent representative in school PBIS team	Throughout year
	• Monthly meeting with PTSA leadership for planning and collaboration	Throughout year

	• Parent information events scheduled in fall and spring • SIP posted online in January • Monthly information sharing with community through PTSA general meeting • Staff review of progress during scheduled LEAP days in late Winter and Spring	
Strategy to Inform Students, Families, Parents and Community Members of the SIP	**Action**	**Timeline**
	Safety Net Parent Information Meetings • Process of determining school goals was shared and parents were invited to participate in SIP process. • Interpreters translated in Spanish and Portuguese. • Offered 2 meeting times (before school and evening) to accommodate family schedules. • Childcare and light snack provided.	October 2019
	Parent Advisory Committee • Families invited to review and provide feedback on school goals and parent/family engagement strategies Continuous and intentional outreach to parents and community members of diverse backgrounds to participate in this process.	Three times per year
	Collaboration with LWSD Family Engagement and Community Outreach coordinator to communicate goals build engagement strategies with families. Methods include, but are not limited to: • Staff trainings on equity and family engagement • Community cafes • Empowerment and capacity building for families (i.e. Natural Leaders) • Offering workshops and/or resources that families request needing Informal and formal surveying of families	Throughout year

| | | • Information about goals, strategies, and interventions communicated through Frost Website, Classroom PowerSchool sites, Safety Net Reading Connections Newsletter, and weekly Tuesday Bulletin
• Key resources translated into Spanish and Portuguese
• Electronic translation tools included in all online communications
• Finalized SIP plan posted on school website
• Collaboration with LWSD Equity Office and Washington Alliance for Better Schools to maintain supports and training for community members in the Natural Leaders process
• Information shared/distributed during annual Meet & Greet, Curriculum Night, PTSA and Natural Leader meetings, Safety Net/ELL evening parent events, and Conferences | Throughout year |
| | | • Monthly meeting with PTSA leadership for planning and collaboration
• Weekly schoolwide parent newsletter distributed to all families
• Parent information events scheduled in fall and spring
• SIP posted online in January
• Monthly information sharing with community through PTSA general meeting
• Staff review of progress during scheduled LEAP days in late Winter and Spring | Throughout year |