

 Component One - Needs Assessment Guiding Questions: How does our needs assessment integrate current school year quantitative and qualitative data? How does your needs assessment give an accurate and thorough view of the entire school? What subjects, grade levels, and programs are the strongest and weakest? How does the school focus on the academic progress of English language learners? To what extent are discipline issues impacting students? What is the level of family and the community support at the school? What does the data say about the success of students transitioning into and out of your school? Examples: Elementary schools should look at WAKids, middle schools at 6th grade attendance and behavior data, high schools at 9th grade course completion. How have you identified any areas of concern from the following within your needs assessment: Family Engagement, Transitions Between Grades and/or Schools; Technology; Professional Development; Schoolwide 	 Component Three – Activities to Ensure Mastery Guiding Questions: How does the plan support the most at-risk students in the school? What strategies and programs will we use to help at-risk students remain or get back on track? What is the district doing to help students in danger of dropping out or falling behind on mastery of a key skill? What is the school doing to help students' academic and non-academic needs? Does the plan ensure the school meets students' academic and non-aca- demic needs? Does the plan incorporate a wide range of strategies, programs and activities, including: Counseling and mental health support College and career readiness Tiered behavioral support AP & International Baccalaureate courses Preschool transition support
Tiered Models of Instruction; Behavior and Discipline; Well Rounded Education; Secondary Education Program Needs Component Two – Schoolwide Reform Strategies Guiding Questions:	 Professional development for staff Intensive academic support to students Component Four – Coordination and Integration Guiding Questions:
 Does the plan's schoolwide reform: Consider a well-rounded education ESSA Section: 8102(52). What about literacy, science, government, engineering, the arts, and mathematics? Improve transitions between grades and/or schools? Enrich and accelerate curriculum? Provide opportunities for students both ahead of and behind grade level? Include specific ways in which the school will reach each level of reform? Did you address staffing plans and hires, professional development strategies, and schoolwide goals? Outline the strategies that you will use to improve academics for all students? Did you outline how you will increase the amount and quality of learning using specific programs, activities, and courses? If your school is continuing as a priority or focus school in 2018-19, how do your strategies incorporate the 7 turn around principles? 	 How will the school leverage allowable combined funds to improve the schoolwide plan? How will it make the most of available staff at the school and district to maximize the positive impact of the plan? How does the plan combine funds to connect the reform strategies developed? Does the plan outline how the school will combine funds, and how the school will meet the intents and purposes of each program? Does the plan outline how funds from Title I, Part A and other federal education programs will be used to help the school meet the statutory requirements of the programs? Does the plan include the total amount of funds for each program? If a priority/focus school: Does the plan include school improvement funds? How are schoolwide funds being leveraged to support school improvement efforts?

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

SBA & MSP DATA

Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018	Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018
Reading/ELA 3:					Math 3:				
% of students at each level					% of students at each level				
Level 1:	22.5%	23.8%	17%	22%	Level 1:	14.7%	19.9%	7%	21%
Level 2:	20.9%	21.7%	17%	22%	Level 2:	24.5%	20.4%	21%	21%
Level 3:	27.4%	22.7%	30%	24%	Level 3:	37.6%	29.4%	38%	29%
Level 4:	29.0%	29.5%	36%	32%	Level 4:	22.9%	28.1%	34%	29%
Reading/ELA 3: % Meeting Standard:	56.4%	52.6%	66%	56%	Math 3: % Meeting Standard:	60.6%	57.8%	72%	58%
% Not Meeting Standard:	43.5%	47.3%	34%	44%	% Not Meeting Standard:	23.7%	42.1%	28%	42%

Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018	Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018
Reading/ELA 4:					Math 4:				
% of students at each level					% of students at each level				
Level 1:	26.7%	25.2%	13%	24%	Level 1:	17.8%	17.3%	12%	19%
Level 2:	23.2%	17.7%	19%	18%		28.5%	26.5%	13%	27%
Level 3:	21.3%	24.0%	29%	24%		26.7%	27.7%	41%	28%
Level 4:	28.5%	30.7%	39%	34%		26.7%	26.2%	34%	26%
Reading/ELA 4:					Math 4:				
% Meeting Standard:	50.0%	55.2%	68%	58%	% Meeting Standard:	53.5%	54.3%	75%	54%
% Not Meeting Standard:	50.0%	44.7%	32%	42%		46.4%	45.6%	25%	46%

SBA & MSP DATA

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

Analysis Tool/ Measurement Devic	e	MSP 2017	State 2017	WCAS 2018	State 2018
MSP Science 5 (2017)					
WCAS (2018):					
% of students at each level	Level 1:	11.3%	15.7%	19%	23%
	Level 2:	14.4%	18.8%	21%	21%
	Level 3:	30.8%	29.7%	42%	37%
	Level 4:	41.9%	33.2%	18%	19%
MSP Science 5: WCAS (201	8)				
% Meeting Standard:		72.8%	63.4%	60%	56%
% Not Meeting Standard:		27.1%	36.5%	40%	44%

Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018	Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018
Reading/ELA 5:					Math 5:				
% of students at each level					% of students at each level				
Level 1:	17.3%	21.9%	33%	22%	Level 1:	32.6%	25.0%	37%	26%
Level 2:	23.0%	17.7%	28%	18%	Level 2:	17.3%	24.6%	26%	25%
Level 3:	30.7%	31.0%	16%	32%	Level 3:	25.0%	19.5%	16%	20%
Level 4:	28.8%	27.2%	23%	28%	Level 4:	25.0%	28.8%	19%	29%
Reading/ELA 5: % Meeting Standard:	59.6%	58.6%	39%	60%	Math 5: % Meeting Standard:	50.0%	48.6%	35%	49%
% Not Meeting Standard:	40.3%	41.3%	61%	40%	% Not Meeting Standard:	50.0%	51.3%	65%	51%

SBA & MSP DATA

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

Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018	Analysis Tool/ Measurement Device	SBA 2017	State 2017	SBA 2018	State 2018
Reading/ELA 6:					Math 6:				
% of students at each level					% of students at each level				
Level 1:	10.5%	19.2%	14%	20%	Level 1:	22.8%	23.9%	20%	24%
Level 2:	22.8%	23.4%	34%	23%	Level 2:	21.0%	25.9%	36%	27%
Level 3:	40.2%	34.2%	30%	35%	Level 3:	31.5%	21.9%	20%	22%
Level 4:	24.5%	20.7%	20%	22%	Level 4:	24.5%	25.9%	22%	27%
Reading/ELA 6: % Meeting Standard:	66.0%	55.5%	50%	57%	Math 6: % Meeting Standard:	56.1%	48.2%	42%	49%
% Not Meeting Standard:	35.0%	44.4%	50%	43%	% Not Meeting Standard:	43.8%	51.7%	58%	51%

Needs Assessments Implications: Our current sixth grade students will need a great deal of support this year. We had 16 students with IEPs last year and have 18 this year. That accounts for about 30% of our sixth grade students who need extra support. Of those students, 6 are academically served primarily in our self-contained classroom. We are working to find ways to support all of our sixth grade students and their individual needs. We also discovered needs at grade 2 as we completed our beginning of the year testing. We have many students who moved to us below where we would like them to be at the beginning of second grade. We have moved our services to meet both of these cohort needs and are working to fill other needs as we can. Our staff are incredibly flexible and work to provide coherent instruction for students both in the classroom and in small groups whenever we can. Students often receive two or even three doses of support throughout a school day of after school if we can find a way to provide services.

SBA & MSP DISAGGREGATION DATA

Directions: Enter the percentage of students meeting and exceeding standard for each of the sub-groups with n>10. If <5, enter an asterisk (*).

			GF	RADE 3	ELA		GRADE 3 MATH							
Sub-Groups	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	45	50.5	60	49	65	52%		47	59.6	64.7	58.6	75	59%	
Female	16	58.4	52	56.4	68	60%		5	58.1	55.5	56.9	68	57%	
Low Income	25	37.7	47	35.6	54	39%		9	43.9	51.5	42.1	60	42%	
Special Ed	17		44.7	24.7	17	27%		17		42.1	28.4	33	30%	

			GF	RADE 4	ELA		GRADE 4 MATH							
Sub-Groups	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	55	53	57	51.5	67	55%		45	56.5	62.8	55.8	74	56%	
Female	52	61.2	38	59	71	61%		52	54.2	38.0	52.8	75	53%	
Low Income	48	40.2	34.2	37.9	67	41%		35	38.9	42.8	38	70	38%	
Special Ed	17		35.7	22.7	0	36%		33		42.8	24	17	21%	

		GRADE 5 SCIENCE											
Sub-Groups	MSP 2016	State 2016	MSP 2017	State 2017	WCAS 2018	State 2018							
Male	82	64.4	70.9	62.2	67	56%							
Female	91	66.2	75.0	64.5	50	56%							
Low Income	80	49.4	65.8	46.5	42	38%							
Special Ed	50		46.9	32.6	25	21%							



SBA & MSP DISAGGREGATION DATA

			GF	RADE 5	ELA		GRADE 5 MATH						
Sub-Groups	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	53.8	53.6	43	55%	64	50.1	50.0	49.9	43	50%	
Female	78	65.8	65.3	63.8	32	65%	56	48.2	50.0	47.2	27	48%	
Low Income	53	43.5	50.0	41.2	18	43%	37	32.5	32.1	31.1	15	32%	
Special Ed	50		16.3	22.2	19	20%	17		20.4	17.5	13	15%	

	GRADE 6 ELA					GRADE 6 MATH								
Sub-Groups	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	49	50.6	47.6	49.8	48	51%		31	47.1	47.6	47.7	43	48%	
Female	70	62.7	75.0	61.5	54	62%		39	49.1	61.1	49.4	43	50%	
Low Income	48	39.3	45.1	37.4	31	39%		29	30.5	41.9	30.3	35	31%	
Special Ed	29		30.9	18.2	0	14%		*		14.2	13.9	0	11%	

Needs Assessments Implications: Our current sixth grade girls continue to need support. We continue to have an achievement gap between girls and boys in grade 6. According to SBA data, we do not have gender gaps in other grades. Our students in grades three and four performed well on the SBA last year and we expect to continue to see their performance improve. We are working to implement a new math curriculum while we support students in their areas of need and areas where they also need to be pushed to extend themselves.

Our gap exists at all levels in special education. We have fewer than 10 students in special education who took the SBA in 2018 in grades 3,4 and 6, thus we do not have disaggregated data from the state, but our gap exists according to the data I collected.

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
**Kir	ndergarten:	Sounds / Stan	dards - Fall W	inter Spring - B	lend/Site Word	s	**Kinderg	garten: Sounds / S	tandards - Fal	1 Winter Spring -	Blend/Site Wo	rds
	K	76%	91%	88%	78%/79%		К					
Grade 1 DRA	1	54%	77%	86%	67%/70%		1					
Grade 2 DIBELS	2						2					
Grade 2 STAR	2	72%	77%	77%	64%/71%		2					
Grade 3 – 6 MAP	3	62%	69%	SBA	49%		3					
	4	73%	64%	SBA	61%		4					
	5	59%	58%	SBA	70%		5					
	6	46%	57%	SBA	64%		6					
		¢	<u>v</u>	Math	<u>v</u>			~	v	Math		
	Grade	Fall		Winter		Spring	Grade	Fall		Winter		Spring
	К		88%	96	5%	80%	К					
	1		67%	73	3%	75%	1					
NWEA MAP or Curriculum	2		68%	80)%	85%	2					
Benchmark Tests District Bench- marks	3		46%		SBA 2%		3				SBA	
Fall, Winter, Spring	4		62%		SBA		4				SBA	
	5		46%		SBA 3%		5				SBA	
	6		57%		SBA SBA		6				SBA	

School Improvement Plan

INTERNAL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM DATA

	Summary Student Internal Accountability System Demographic Data (end-of-year data)												
Internal Assessment Results for 2017-18 (EOY)					Interna	l Assessmen	t Result	ts for 20	18-19 (EOY	<i>(</i>)			
G	Unexcused	Avg. Daily	Suspe	ensions	F 1.	Court	G	Unexcused	Avg. Daily	Suspe	nsions	.	Court
frade	Absences	Attendance	Short-Term	Long- Term	Expulsions	Petitions	Grade	Absences At	Attendance	Short-Term	Long- Term	Expulsions	Petitions
le							le						
K	25.0	93.89%	0	0	0	1	K						
1	13.0	94.29%	0	0	0	0	1						
2	6.5	95.09%	3	0	0	1	2						
3	1.5	95.28%	0	0	0	0	3						
4	5.5	94.57%	3	1	0	0	4						
5	5.0	93.55%	0	0	0	0	5						
6	4.5	95.42%	2	0	0	0	6						

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

	S	Summary of Student Suppo	rt Services (current numbers)				
Grade	Special Education (not speech)	Homeless EOY Number of Homeless Students	504	Student Assistance Team (SAT)			
K	4	2	0				
1	4	1	1				
2	5	0	1				
3	9	0	0	2			
4	7	1	3				
5	9	1	1				
6	17	1	1				
	55	6	7				

DEMOGRAPHIC SCHOOL DATA

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

Data Source	Information Provided By Data	Summary 2017-18 EOY
Attendance Report	Percent of students present per day (2017-18).	94.69%
Unexcused Absences	Total number of absences not excused (2017-18).	61
Discipline Report	Summary of discipline activity for the building (2017- 18).	Drugs/Alcohol: 0Court Petitions: 2Tobacco: 0Expulsions: 0Weapons: 1Short-term Suspensions: 8Fighting/Assaults: 0Long-term Suspensions: 1
Free/Reduced Lunch Report	Percent of students where family income is below fed- erally established poverty level (2017-18).	56%
Gender Report	Percent of male and female students as reported by the 2017-18 OSPI School Report Card	Males: 227 54% Females: 193 46%
Ethnicity Report	Percent of students by ethnic groups as reported by the 2017-18 OSPI School Report Card	American Indian or Alaskan Native: 4.5% Asian or Pacific Islander: 2.4% Black: 0.7% Hispanic: 9.0% White: 75.0%
Staff Report	Staff demographic data as reported in the 2017-18 OSPI School Report Card	Headcount: 28Average Years of Exp: 17Overall Ratio: 1:15Percent ≥ a Master's Degree: 75%

Summary of 2017-18 Attendance: Franklin focused on improving attendance during the 2017-18 school year. We tracked daily attendance including how many students arrived late as well as how many were absent. We set attendance incentives for each month. This may have affected some student attendance, but we are not sure it changed the behavior of those we most needed to target. Those with the attendance we most want to change really need to have personal attendance goals as well as conversations with families regarding what is in the way of getting to school. Often, the issue does not have to do with the children, rather, it is a parent issue and a value that is given or not given to school. We are working to chip away at those specific situations when we can. We do have some students whose attendance is affected by their health. In those situations, we are careful to provide as much support to families as possible when their child must miss school.

AREAS OF STRENGTH AND CONCERN

AREAS OF STRENGTH	AREAS OF CONCERN						
 ELA: Grade 1: 86% of our students met standard according to the end of year DRA expectations Grade 3: 66% passage on the SBA Grade 4: 68% passage on the SBA Math: Grade 2: 85% met standard at the end of the year on CBA's in math Grade 3: 72% passage on the SBA Grade 3: 72% passage on the SBA Science: Grade 5: 60% passage on the WCAS (25% of whom are special needs students) Franklin low income students outperformed the state in 6 out of 9 areas of the SBA. Franklin had a record low number of suspensions last year at only 8 suspensions. 	ELA: Kindergarten: We would like to see 90% or more of our students learn all their letters and sounds by the end of kindergarten. Grade 2: 77% reading at grade level by the end of second grade accord- ing to STAR Grade 5: 39% passage on the SBA Grade 6: 50% passage on the SBAMath: Grade 5: 35% passage on the SBA Grade 6: 42% passage on the SBAMath: Grade 6: 42% passage on the SBA $\frac{4 \text{ year SBA Avg. (2017)}}{\text{Franklin State Difference}}$ $\frac{3^{rd} \text{ Reading 52.4 53.7 -1.3}}{4^{th} \text{ Reading 55.6 59.0 -3.4}}$ $6^{th} \text{ Reading 58.8 55.7 +3.1}$ $\frac{3^{rd} \text{ Math } 52.2 57.8 -5.6}{4^{th} \text{ Math } 59.6 54.3 +5.3}$ $\frac{3^{rd} \text{ Math } 48.7 48.6 +0.1}{6^{th} \text{ Math } 46.0 48.2 -2.2}$						

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

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

Franklin ELA	Smart Goal: Eighty-five percent of Franklin students will exceed grade level or make at least one year's growth in reading as measured by district assessment data. This goal will enable our students to outperform the state on the Smarter Balanced Assessment in all grade levels in English Language Arts (ELA).							
Targets	StrategiesActivities to Ensure MasteryYesCompleted/							
All School:	DifferentiationInclusionRTI	 Unpack content standards Prof. Development focused on PLC work 						
1: We will improve our sixth grade student passage on our SBA from 50% to 70%.	Push in supportSmall classesRTI focused support	• Begin conversations about essen- tial learnings in both reading and writing based on the common core standards						
2: Focus on getting 90% of our grade 2 students reading at grade level by the end of the year as measured by STAR, running records, and class- room based assessments.	 RTI After school reading clubs Small group focused support 	 PD in <i>Words Their Way</i> to add to our toolkit to support student reading skills Continued conversations about focused instruction for students and ways to provide support 						

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

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

Franklin Math	Smart Goal: Based on grade level summative assessments, in collaboration with all Franklin stake- holders, Franklin will continue to improve its grade level expectations in math. At grades K-2, goals will align with essential learnings and end of year expectations with a goal of more than 80% of our students achieving standard. In grades 3-6 our goal will be to improve our SBA cohort data and improve our SBA average data compared to the state by 5%.							
Targets	Strategies	Yes	Completed/Date					
All School:	 Differentiation within the class- room Use our new math learning support teacher to support instructional practices as we implement Eureka 	 Implementation of Eureka After school math support Small Group interventions Push in support 						
1: Franklin 6 th grade students will improve their math performance on both curriculum based assessments and the SBA. We would like to improve performance from 42% passage to 60%.	 Push in support for IEP students A second dose of math for students who need support Monitoring of exit tickets to pro- vide flexible support skill by skill 	 Monitor progress using CBAs, MAP, sprints, and other as- sessments supporting Eureka Collaborate to discuss support needs for individual students 						
2: Franklin 4 th grade students will continue to improve their SBA perfor- mance in math. We would like to have over 70% achieve standard.	 Use of Interim tests to expose students to the SBA Math nights to support parent involvement in math 	 After school math club Continued professional devel- opment throughout the school year 						

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.

Franklin Goal 1	Smart Goal: Franklin will continue to develop a positive school and community cul- ture by continuing to include parents when possible, working with our community to provide enrichment for our students, and focusing on teaching behaviors so we keep our number of referrals and suspensions low.								
Targets	Strategies	Yes	Completed/Date						
Action Item 2: Establish a positive behavior intervention program in all schools.	 Franklin will continue its focus on monthly Habits of Mind Establish three tiers of supports for students (Tiers I,II, and III) 	 Parent connection activities each month (PTO) Student recognition Fantastic Five instruction as well as clear expectations throughout the school 							
Target									
*Social/Emotional: We will work to meet the social/emotional needs for each student as we teach them to inde- pendently self-regulate.	 Franklin will continue to teach the difference between rude behavior, mean behavior, and bullying. We will work to establish a sense of one Franklin community. 	 PAHS Health Center Kelso's Choices Second Step Friendship groups Zones of Regulation 							

*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.

Franklin Goal 1	Smart Goal: Franklin will work to improve attendance to over 95% on a daily basis. We will work with our families who have chronic absenteeism.							
Targets	Strategies	Activities to Ensure Mastery	Yes	Completed/Date				
Attendance: Franklin will decrease the number of students who have chronic absenteeism to below 5% (below 20).	• We will work to find a way to con- nect each student to Franklin so they want to be at school every day and they all feel valued as members of our community.	 Intervention for those struggling with attendance Early intervention Support families when possible in getting to school 						
Communication: Franklin will work to improve our two-way communica- tion with all stakeholders.	• Email, phone calls, letters home, Fri- day folders, and other forms of com- munication to let families know what is going on with their students at school	 Parent nights Emails, phone calls, online services Newsletters PTO events 						

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	Con Yes	npleted Comments
 Physical Education classes taught by certified P.E. instructor. K 1 x 30 minutes per week (30) 1-3 2 x 30 minutes per week (60) 4-5 2 x 40 min + 1 x 30 min every other week, (110) 6 2 x 40 minutes per week (80) 	September - June 2019	Campbell Kirkman, PE Teacher		
 Opportunity for additional minutes: Classroom Brain Boosters (resources shared with classroom teachers) 	September - June 2019	Campbell Kirkman, PE Teacher Classroom Teachers		
• We are working on setting up a running club to provide an after school and possible during lunch option for students.	November-May	Campbell Kirkman, Jessica Baccus		

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	89%	Х	93%	90%	91%
Effective School Leadership	86%	Х	90%	90%	91%
High Standards & Expectations	74%	Х	82%	78%	78%
High Levels of Collaboration and Communication	85%	Х	87%	85%	86%
Supportive Learning Environment	90%	Х	93%	94%	89%
Frequent Monitoring of Teaching and Learning	72%	Х	77%	77%	88%
Focused Professional Development	64%	Х	74%	75%	75%
Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Aligned with Standards	73%	Х	83%	80%	91%
High Levels of Community & Parent Involvement	84%	Х	81%	79%	82%
Staff Willingness to Change	97%	Х	100%	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	84%	Х	78%	86%	76%
Effective School Leadership	88%	Х	72%	87%	86%
Frequent Monitoring of Teaching and Learning	79%	Х	75%	85%	75%
High Standards & Expectations	88%	Х	81%	92%	82%
High Levels of Collaboration and Communication	83%	Х	72%	86%	80%
High Levels of Community & Parent Involvement	78%	Х	75%	79%	69%
Supportive Learning Environment	88%	Х	77%	88%	79%

STUDENT TUTORIAL/ENRICHMENT STRATEGIES SUMMARY

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

Remediation: We work to meet every child's needs throughout the school day. Teachers first differentiate instruction and provide supports within the classroom to meet student needs as they provide access to district curriculum. Teachers use small groups, centers, scaffolding, along with many other supports while students work within the classroom. Along with classroom instruction, we assess students to determine who needs Response to Intervention (RTI) support. Each grade level receives support between 30 and 40 minutes, four days per week, in small instructional groups focused on student need from phonemic awareness to fluency to comprehension strategies. We also focus on enrichment during RTI time for students who are ready for a challenge. Throughout the school year, we progress monitor using DIBELS, classroom based assessments (HM), MAP testing, and teacher observations to determine if students need to move from one RTI group to another as they make gains in their reading and writing ability. Teachers and para educators providing instruction meet once a month to discuss student progress and compare data to determine student movement.

We now have a learning resource teacher in math to complement the implementation of a new math curriculum throughout our building. Eureka is new to grades K, 2, 3, and 6. Our learning support teacher currently provides support to teachers as well as works in classrooms providing support while students are working. She also works with teachers after school to provide professional development on various parts of the new curriculum so we can implement portions of the curriculum to support all classrooms and students. We will continue to grow in how we utilize the new coaching support for both students and teachers. Ms. Rausch also provides after school support for students in math along with Ms. Roos (our reading support teacher) who provides support to students in reading. They work with a cadre of para educators to offer a third dose of reading and math instruction to our students who need more support.

Our district funded transportation on Mondays and Thursdays provides us the opportunity to offer after school support to other students as well. Our fourth grade teachers have already begun after school support to students in math. We will continue to add supports as we have teachers able to stay after school.

We provide other enrichment opportunities for students throughout the school year. Students participate in student council, creation of our yearbook, running club, after school art club, game club, Battle of the Books and the Poetry Slam. We also have many classrooms planning enrichment cluster ideas this year and applying for Education Foundation grants based on community service. We look forward to developing enrichment opportunities for all students as the year progresses.

COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION

Directions: Please identify all of your school's professional development activities and resources you plan to use this year. Identify the funding source along with your budget estimates. Review the example below:

	These are the	Illustrating How to combine Funds in Schoolwide Plan ne programs commonly combined in a Schoolwide Plan. t the only set of program funds that may be combined.		
Program	Amount Available	How Intents and Purposes of the Program will be Met		
Basic Education	\$1,719.026	To provide all students with instruction aligned to grade level specific state standards in- cluding differentiation and enrichment services as needed.		
		Basic education funds are combined to support the activities listed above. Examples in- clude: classroom teachers, textbooks, supplemental materials, supplies, equipment, tech- nology, staff development, and substitutes.		
Title I, Part A	\$269,477	To provide all children significant opportunity to receive affair, equitable, and high qual- ity well-rounded education, and to close educational achievement gaps.		
Title II, Part A	\$ 33,118	Preparing, training, and recruiting effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders.		
Title III	\$17,855	Our District doesn't have this category.		
Learning Assistance Program (LAP)	\$100,000	To coordinate the use of state Learning Assistance Program (LAP) revenue as long as it can be shown services are provided only to students who have not met annual measurable objectives or are at-risk of not meeting state/local graduation requirements.		
Local Funds		Local levy revenue may be combined in school wide programs.		
Total	\$2,139,476			

COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION

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

Program	Amount Available	Resource and Professional Development Activities	Description of Participating Staff	
State Basic	\$2,860,035	Professional development in math, science, writing, ELA, differentiation, inclusion, ACES, project based learning, STEM, and technology.	Classroom teachers, administrator, secretaries, and para educators	
State Special Education	\$517,207	Additional training around strategies focused around meeting IEP goals and providing accommodations to students along with scaffolding in order to meet the needs of all students.	Special education staff, para educa- tors, some general education teachers	
Federal Special Education	\$219,569	Continued work toward understanding the meaning of FAPE and what we can do to include students whenever possible.	All staff	
Title IA	\$145,020	Words Their Way Training, Progress Monitoring Training (Running Records, etc.), Read Live, model- ing of instructional strategies, Parent Nights	Debra Roos, Title One Paras, Open to other staff as well, parent information nights	
State LAP/HP LAP	\$254,867	Blast into First Grade Boot Camp, Learning Resource Position for Math, Math Training for staff	Kindergarten Teachers, Learning Support Teacher, Para educators, other staff members	

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	Amity Butler	
1 st Grade Teacher	Eric Pickens	
2 nd Grade Teacher	Nancy LeBlanc	
3 rd Grade Teacher	Debbie Erickson	
4 th Grade Teacher	Lara Hernandez	
5 th Grade Teacher	Gunnar Thomason	
6 th Grade Teacher	Maria Kays	
Learning Support Teacher	Debra Roos	
Learning Support Teacher	Claire Rausch	
Special Education Teacher	Christine Richardson	
Para Educator	Marie Heikkila	
Parent	Katie Rudd	
Assistant Superintendent	Chuck Lisk	
Superintendent	Martin Brewer	
School Board President		Board Approved Date:

School Improvement Plan