

Muir 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: John Muir Elementary (JME) is a community of learning and learners where all students are provided a rich academic program in a safe, nurturing environment. JME serves a socially, economically, and ethnically diverse population of children. This diversity is a source of strength and pride for the school. The students from JME will attend Kamiakin Middle School and then progress to Juanita High School.

One of our primary focuses at JME is to equitably provide an academically rigorous experience that allows each student to achieve their personal best. Our professional educators spend considerable time in staff development to continuously improve their practices to meet the needs of all children. Ongoing assessments allow teachers to monitor the progress of students to ensure they are making annual growth and alter instruction when necessary.

Every year, we analyze data, write goals, and collect data for our School Improvement Plan. Staff use assessment results to focus on improving student learning through effective teaching pedagogy. In addition to academic success, JME focuses on developing the social-emotional intelligence of our students. We believe that to be academically successful; students also need to develop the social-emotional skills of collaboration, empathy, self-control, and problem-solving. We approach our social-emotional instruction by explicitly teaching the *Lake Washington Interdisciplinary Life Skills and Attributes*, integrating counselor led lessons using *Second Step*, the social-emotional learning curriculum, and implementing *Positive Behavior Interventions of Supports* (PBIS) school-wide.

Mission Statement: Each student will graduate prepared to lead a responsible rewarding life as a contributing member of our community and great society.

Demographics:¹

| | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | |
|---|--|---------|---------|------|
| Student Enrollment (count) | 442 | 435 | 448 | |
| Racial Diversity (%) | American Indian/Alaskan Native | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| | Asian | 21.7 | 24.4 | 26.8 |
| | Black/African American | 1.4 | 1.4 | 2.7 |
| | Hispanic/Latino of any race(s) | 19.0 | 18.4 | 16.3 |
| | Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Two or more races | 8.8 | 8.5 | 7.8 |
| White | 48.9 | 46.9 | 46.0 | |
| Students Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Meals (%) | 35.6 | 33.2 | 30.5 | |
| Students Receiving Special Education Services (%) | 15.2 | 14.9 | 13.5 | |
| English Language Learners (%) | 24.6 | 24.2 | 24.1 | |
| Students with a First Language Other Than English (%) | 40.7 | 41.5 | 41.9 | |
| Mobility Rate (%) ² | 17.2 | 15.4 | 17.0 | |

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DATA: LITERACY

¹Enrollment 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.

READING: By Grade Level, DIBELS Assessment³

| Grade | Percent at or above standard | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 |
| Kindergarten | 86 | 91 | 90 |
| 1 st Grade | 83 | 72 | 89 |
| 2 nd Grade | 86 | 88 | 80 |

ELA: By Grade Level, Smarter Balanced Assessment

| Grade | Percent at or above standard | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 |
| 3 rd Grade | 67 | 66 | 71 |
| 4 th Grade | 62 | 67 | 54 |
| 5 th Grade | 78 | 68 | 75 |

READING: By Group/Program, DIBELS Assessment⁴

| Group/Program | Percent at or above standard | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 |
| Asian | 84 | 83 | 81 |
| Black/African American | - | - | - |
| Hispanic/Latino | 85 | 68 | 68 |
| Two or more races | 71 | 89 | 93 |
| White | 88 | 90 | 93 |
| English Learner | 78 | 75 | 72 |
| Low Income | 75 | 70 | 72 |
| Special Education | 50 | 39 | 67 |

ELA: By Group/Program, Smarter Balanced Assessment⁵

| Group/Program | Percent at or above standard | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 |
| Asian | 57 | 63 | 60 |
| Black/African American | - | - | - |
| Hispanic/Latino | 58 | 52 | 50 |
| Two or more races | 74 | 86 | 93 |
| White | 77 | 74 | 72 |
| English Learner | 7 | 19 | 15 |
| Low Income | 54 | 48 | 41 |
| Special Education | 15 | 14 | 21 |

**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 |
| 3 rd Grade | 72 | 61 | 72 |
| 4 th Grade | 65 | 72 | 56 |
| 5 th Grade | 76 | 62 | 75 |

SCIENCE: By Grade Level, WCAS⁶

| Grade | Percent at or above standard | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 |
| 5 th Grade | n/a | 63 | 73 |

MATH: By Group/Program, Smarter Balanced Assessment⁵

| Group/Program | Percent at or above standard | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 |
| Asian | 65 | 67 | 66 |
| Black/African American | - | - | - |
| Hispanic/Latino | 53 | 52 | 41 |
| Two or more races | 58 | 64 | 93 |
| White | 84 | 69 | 76 |
| English Learner | 7 | 19 | 12 |
| Low Income | 55 | 48 | 41 |
| Special Education | 19 | 11 | 21 |

SCIENCE: By Group/Program, WCAS

| Group/Program | Percent at or above standard | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 |
| Asian | n/a | 56 | 75 |
| Black/African American | n/a | - | - |
| Hispanic/Latino | n/a | 40 | 50 |
| Two or more races | n/a | - | - |
| White | n/a | 78 | 84 |
| English Learner | n/a | <5 | - |
| Low Income | n/a | 38 | 57 |
| Special Education | n/a | 19 | - |

 = Cohort Track

ATTENDANCE DATA

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: By Grade

| Grade | Percent avoiding chronic absenteeism | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 |
| Kindergarten | 90 | 84 | 86 |
| 1 st Grade | 92 | 90 | 82 |
| 2 nd Grade | 90 | 96 | 87 |
| 3 rd Grade | 92 | 97 | 94 |
| 4 th Grade | 94 | 91 | 90 |
| 5 th Grade | 96 | 94 | 86 |

ATTENDANCE: By Group/Program⁷

| Group/Program | Percent avoiding chronic absenteeism | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 |
| Asian | 97 | 96 | 89 |
| Black/African American | -- | - | - |
| Hispanic/Latino | 87 | 86 | 84 |
| Two or more races | 93 | 88 | 89 |
| White | 93 | 95 | 91 |
| English Learner | 88 | 93 | 86 |
| Low Income | 89 | 90 | 86 |
| Special Education | 87 | 88 | 79 |

WASHINGTON SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FRAMEWORK (WSIF) DATA

MOST RECENT WSIF 3-YEAR SUMMARY⁸

| | All Students | Asian | Black/African American | Hispanic/Latino | Two or more races | White | English Language Learners | Low income | Students with disabilities |
|---|--------------|-------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------|---------------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| ELA Proficiency Rate (%) | 71 | 63 | - | 62 | - | 77 | 19 | 56 | 20 |
| Math Proficiency Rate (%) | 67 | 63 | - | 54 | - | 76 | 18 | 51 | 21 |
| ELA Median Student Growth Percentile ⁹ | 52 | 53 | - | 45 | 53 | 52 | 25.5 | 44 | 28 |
| Math Median Student Growth Percentile | 53 | 54 | - | 46 | 72.5 | 53.5 | 27 | 46.5 | 26.5 |
| EL Progress Rate (%) | 74 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Regular Attendance Rate (%) | 93 | 96 | - | 89 | 91 | 95 | 92 | 91 | 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.

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 | ELA Research and Inquiry | | | | | | | | | | |
| Focus Grade Level(s) | Grade 3-5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Desired Outcome | By Spring 2022, students in grades 3-5 receiving EL services will decrease from 47% scoring below standard to 25% scoring below standard, and 0% of students scoring above standard to 22% students above standard, as measured by the SBA ELA Research & Inquiry. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives | Multi-Tiered Systems of Support - Academics (MTSS-A) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area | <p>Students area measured in four areas on the English Language Arts portion of the Smarter Balanced Assessment: Reading, Listening, Writing, and Research and Inquiry.</p> <p>Data from the Smarter Balanced Assessment indicates nearly half of students receiving English Language services have scored below standard in Research and Inquiry for the past three years.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Research and Inquiry Students receiving EL services</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Percent of Below Standard</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2016-2017</td> <td style="text-align: center;">55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2017-2018</td> <td style="text-align: center;">48%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2018-2029</td> <td style="text-align: center;">47%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Research and Inquiry Students receiving EL services | | Year | Percent of Below Standard | 2016-2017 | 55% | 2017-2018 | 48% | 2018-2029 | 47% |
| Research and Inquiry Students receiving EL services | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | Percent of Below Standard | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2016-2017 | 55% | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2017-2018 | 48% | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018-2029 | 47% | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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>K-2 scoring calibration of <i>All About Book</i> and continued professional development for informational writing.</td> <td>Number of K-2 who calibrated grading for <i>All About Books</i>.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade level teams K-5, and support staff will take the SBA IAB practice test for informational text <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAB for grades 3-5 </td> <td>Percentage of teachers and support staff who have taken the Reading Informational Text SBA IAB</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All K-5 teachers will collaboratively plan their assessment calendar with a focus on Informational Text Key Ideas and Details</td> <td>All teachers will give the Key Ideas & Details sections of all the end of unit Wonders assessments and track proficiency per classroom</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Action | Measure of Fidelity of Implementation | K-2 scoring calibration of <i>All About Book</i> and continued professional development for informational writing. | Number of K-2 who calibrated grading for <i>All About Books</i> . | Grade level teams K-5, and support staff will take the SBA IAB practice test for informational text <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAB for grades 3-5 | Percentage of teachers and support staff who have taken the Reading Informational Text SBA IAB | All K-5 teachers will collaboratively plan their assessment calendar with a focus on Informational Text Key Ideas and Details | All teachers will give the Key Ideas & Details sections of all the end of unit Wonders assessments and track proficiency per classroom | | |
| Action | Measure of Fidelity of Implementation | | | | | | | | | | |
| K-2 scoring calibration of <i>All About Book</i> and continued professional development for informational writing. | Number of K-2 who calibrated grading for <i>All About Books</i> . | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade level teams K-5, and support staff will take the SBA IAB practice test for informational text <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAB for grades 3-5 | Percentage of teachers and support staff who have taken the Reading Informational Text SBA IAB | | | | | | | | | | |
| All K-5 teachers will collaboratively plan their assessment calendar with a focus on Informational Text Key Ideas and Details | All teachers will give the Key Ideas & Details sections of all the end of unit Wonders assessments and track proficiency per classroom | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | Grade levels will modify End of Unit Wonders assessments to reflect SBA format. | Number of tests modified to reflect SBA format |
| | K-5 targeted academic vocabulary instruction to support Research and Inquiry. | Shared location of grade-level academic vocabulary and routine progression. |
| | K-5 teachers will commonly implement RACE as our information text analyses protocol and strategy. K-1: focus on R-A 2-3: focus on R-A-C 4-5: focus on R-A-C-E | Principal and Associate Principal will track implementation of common language via walkthroughs. |
| | Peer-to-peer learning walk. | Percentage of teachers who participate in a peer-to-peer learning walk. |
| | All new staff will attend CORE Reading Fundamental training. | 100% of all new teacher attendance |
| Timeline for Focus | Fall, 2019 – Spring, 2022 | |
| Method(s) to Monitor Progress | Method(s) to Monitor Progress Grade levels K-5 use of Wonders End of Unit Assessments and grade levels 3-5 will administer Reading Informational Text, Research, and Brief Write IAB's, as well as Smarter Balanced Assessment. | |

Priority #2

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Priority Area | Mathematics | |
| Focus Area | Concepts and Procedures | |
| Focus Grade Level(s) | Grade 3-5 | |
| Desired Outcome | By Spring 2022, students in grades 3-5 who scored below standard on the SBA Procedure and Concepts will decrease from 18% below standard to 9% below standard, and increase 51% of students above standard to 60% students above standard, as measured by the SBA math Concepts and Procedures. | |
| Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives | Multi-Tiered Systems of Support - Academics (MTSS-A) | |
| Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area | <p>3rd grade SBA from 2018-19 shows an area growth in Target A, solve problems using multiplication and division, along with Target C multiply and divide within 100.</p> <p>4th grade SBA from 2018-19 shows an area of growth in Target A use the four operations with whole numbers to solve problems.</p> <p>5th grade SBA from 2018-19 shows an area of growth in Target D perform operations with multi-digit whole numbers and decimals to hundredths.</p> <p>As a result of finding common areas of growth amongst the target skills within Concepts and Procedures, our goal will be to focus on place value and mathematical operations.</p> | |
| Strategy to Address Priority | Action | Measure of Fidelity of Implementation |
| | Grade level teams K-5, and support staff will take the SBA IAB practice test for Procedures and Concepts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IAB for grades 3-5 | Percentage of teachers who have taken an SBA IAB with a focus on Procedures and Concepts. |
| | K-5 targeted academic vocabulary instruction to support Procedures and Concepts. | Access and 100% implementation. |
| | Develop common academic vocabulary routine and response structure for solving word problems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> K-5 consistent teaching practices | Grade K-5 scope and sequence of aligned academic vocabulary as well as a complete set of defined routines. |
| | On-boarding new staff members on previous teaching and continuing training. | 100% of new teachers will receive onboarding support from grade level teams. |
| | Data reports from 3-5 SBA IAB's presented to ALL staff. | Yearly data review. |
| Timeline for Focus | Fall, 2019 – Spring, 2022 | |
| Method(s) to Monitor Progress | Grade K-5 will use LWSD math CDSA's and grades 3-5 will use Operation Algebraic Thinking and Numbers Operations Base 10 IAB's, as well as Smarter Balanced Assessment. | |

Priority #3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Priority Area | Social and Emotional | |
| Focus Area | Emotional Regulation | |
| Focus Grade Level(s) | Grades K-5 | |
| Desired Outcome | The results of the 2022 Spring Panorama Survey will show an increase from 53% of students responding favorably to Emotional Regulation questions to 60% of students responding favorably to Emotional Regulation questions. | |
| Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives | Multi-Tiered Systems of Support - Behavioral, Social and Emotional Support (MTSS-B) | |
| Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area | The results from the Fall 2018 Panorama survey showed that 53% of students responded favorably to the questions regarding Emotional Regulation. The decision to make Emotional Regulation a priority was made through a collaborative process gathering input from all Certificated staff members. | |
| Strategy to Address Priority | Action | Measure of Fidelity of Implementation |
| | Second Step lessons delivered by counselor in each classroom 2-5. | Schedule of lessons delivered to each classroom. |
| | Kelso's Choices lessons delivered by counselor in K-1 classrooms. | Schedule of lessons delivered to each classroom. |
| | Support staff (IA, para, SN, ELL, etc.) trained in Second Step strategies. | Attendance data collected from training sessions in Fall 2019. |
| | ACES Training. | 100% of staff attend ACES training in August 2019, 2021, and 2022. |
| | OT and SPED provide training around sensory-seeking behaviors. | 90% of staff attend training. |
| | Teachers have a written plan to support students who are dysregulated. | By Spring 2020 all Certificated staff will have submitted their plan. |
| | Students will participate in the paper SEL survey provided by LWSD. | 95% of students will participate in the survey. |
| | Parent communication - training/workshop/videos on Second Step curriculum. | Outreach opportunities are provided a minimum of three times per year. Parent feedback is collected. |
| | Teachers have access to resources to support emotional regulation. | Resources are sent out in the principal newsletter and stored on OneNote. |
| Timeline for Focus | Fall, 2019 - Spring, 2022 | |
| Method(s) to Monitor Progress | Progress will be monitored after each Fall and Spring administration of the Panorama Survey. | |

Priority #4

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Priority Area | Supportive Learning Environment | |
| Focus Area | Student discipline problems are managed well. | |
| Focus Grade Level(s) | Grade K-5 students and staff | |
| Desired Outcome | The results of the 2022 Spring Characteristic Survey will show an increase from 65% agree completely or agree mostly to 85% staff agree completely or agree mostly agreeing that discipline problems are managed well. | |
| Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives | Multi-Tiered Systems of Support - Behavioral, Social and Emotional Support (MTSS-B) | |
| Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area | The results of the 2019 Spring Nine Characteristic Survey indicated that 65% of staff agree completely or agree mostly to discipline problems are managed well. The decision to make discipline a priority was made through a collaborative process gathering input from all Certificated staff members. | |
| Strategy to Address Priority | Action | Measure of Fidelity of Implementation |
| | ACES Training | 100% of staff will attend ACES training in August 2019. |
| | De-escalation/Behavior Intervention Training | All certificated staff will attend De-escalation training in October 2019. |
| | Establish SIT (Student Intervention Team) | Number of teachers signing up/attending SIT meetings. |
| | Create/update PBIS flow chart | 100 % of staff members trained in utilizing the flow chart. Number of staff members utilizing flow chart process as measured by referral data. |
| | Implement discipline tracking system as determined by district resources and PBIS Team | Review of discipline data reflected in the minutes of PBIS Team meetings. Share out of school-wide discipline data at least four times yearly as reflected in staff agendas. |
| | PBIS Implementation | Implementation of schoolwide PBIS systems as measure yearly using the Tiered Fidelity Inventory. PBIS training as reflected in staff meeting/LEAP agendas and measured by attendance data. Staff feedback on PBIS systems gathered at least yearly. |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>Common understanding of "managed well" and shared learning on effective practices</p> | <p>100% of staff will participate in professional learning around discipline best practices.</p> <p>100% of staff will participate in creating a common understanding of "managed well" that is in alignment with best practices.</p> |
| Timeline for Focus | Fall, 2019 - Spring, 2022 | |
| Method(s) to Monitor Progress | <p>Annual Nine Characteristics Survey</p> <p>Number of office discipline referrals measured over time</p> | |

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 not met for ELA and not 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.

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.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 |
| | Collaboration with PTSA, Natural Leaders, and district Family Engagement Coordinator. | Meet three times per year |
| | School Sponsored family literacy night. | Annually |
| | Safety Net Parent Meeting. | Annually |
| | Family Advisory Group. | Meet three times per year |
| | Work with community partners to coordinate parent programs that build ties between parents and schools. | Regular meetings with Admin and Family Liaison |
| | Parent feedback survey regarding shared responsibility as detailed in the John Muir Student Family Compact. | Fall, Annually |
| Strategy to Inform Students, Families, Parents and Community Members of the SIP | Action | Timeline |
| | Finalized SIP posted on the website and translated to top three used languages. | Annually in January |
| | Monthly Newsletters. | Monthly |
| | Share SIP at PTSA meeting. | Annually |
| Align parent engagement events such as conferences, literacy night, etc. to school goals. | Annually | |

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