![Lake Washington School District logo]

Rush Elementary School

School Improvement Plan

Annual Update: 2020-21

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

SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Description: Benjamin Rush Elementary is a school where all students are provided a rich academic program in a safe, nurturing environment. Rush is situated in South-Redmond and most students who graduate from Rush Elementary go on to attend Rose Hill Middle School and then Lake Washington High School. Rush was first opened on April 27, 1970 with over 600 students and 20 teachers. The first school building served the community for over 40 years until students and staff moved into our current building in January 2013. Since then, four portables have been added to accommodate our growing student population. One of our strengths as a community is the diversity of our students who bring rich knowledge and experiences from many cultural backgrounds. Our students and families speak more than 40 languages and come from all over the United States and the world. We have the largest English Language program in the district and provide a differentiated model to support each student. The PTA is active in supporting the educational process and provides enriching programs which further enhance the positive school climate and culture for our students and their families. We are confident that Rush provides a strong academic and social learning experience where children can thrive. Our teachers spend considerable time in staff development to continuously improve their practices and meet the needs of each child. We believe that every student can achieve high standards and we work hard to ensure success for each of our students.

Mission Statement: *Accept where students are, then inspire, engage and challenge to reach personal success.*

Demographics:[1]

		2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Student Enrollment (count)		614	651	669	681
Racial Diversity (%)	American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.1
	Asian	45.6	52.1	54.7	57.4
	Black/African American	1.5	1.1	1.0	1.2
	Hispanic/Latino of any race(s)	6.8	6.6	5.4	5.1
	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
	Two or more races	6.7	7.8	6.6	7.0
	White	39.3	32.0	32.0	28.9
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Meals (%)		7.0	4.9	5.4	4.6
Students Receiving Special Education Services (%)		11.9	10.3	10.3	6.5
English Language Learners (%)		26.7	29.2	29.6	30.0
Students with a First Language Other Than English (%)		51.2	55.2	56.9	62.0

---

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

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DATA: LITERACY

READING: By Grade Level, DIBELS Assessment[2]

Grade	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Kindergarten	81	82	88	n/a
1st Grade	86	84	90	n/a
2nd Grade	81	90	86	n/a

ELA: By Grade Level, Smarter Balanced Assessment

Grade		Percent at or above standard		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
3rd Grade	74	78	85	n/a
4th Grade	82	80	86	n/a
5th Grade	82	83	82	n/a

READING: By Group/Program, DIBELS Assessment[3]

Group/Program	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Asian	88	91	93	n/a
Black/African American	-	-	-	n/a
Hispanic/Latino	68	53	69	n/a
Two or more races	75	78	76	n/a
White	80	81	84	n/a
English Learner	76	82	84	n/a
Low Income	53	23	53	n/a
Special Education	50	48	48	n/a

ELA: By Group/Program, Smarter Balanced Assessment[4]

Group/Program	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Asian	84	85	88	n/a
Black/African American	-	-	-	n/a
Hispanic/Latino	59	53	83	n/a
Two or more races	87	76	87	n/a
White	79	84	84	n/a
English Learner	43	42	54	n/a
Low Income	57	35	41	n/a
Special Education	52	28	55	n/a

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DATA: MATH

MATH: By Grade Level, Smarter Balanced Assessment

Grade	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
3rd Grade	84	78	91	n/a
4th Grade	81	79	85	n/a
5th Grade	71	73	69	n/a

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DATA: SCIENCE

SCIENCE: By Grade Level, WCAS[5]

Grade	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
5th Grade	n/a	79	80	n/a

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

Group/Program	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Asian	91	82	89	n/a
Black/African American	-	-	-	n/a
Hispanic/Latino	59	53	56	n/a
Two or more races	80	76	83	n/a
White	72	77	82	n/a
English Learner	69	48	71	n/a
Low Income	41	30	24	n/a
Special Education	32	28	30	n/a

SCIENCE: By Group/Program, WCAS

Group/Program	Percent at or above standard			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Asian	n/a	86	79	n/a
Black/African American	n/a	-	-	n/a
Hispanic/Latino	n/a	-	-	n/a
Two or more races	n/a	-	-	n/a
White	n/a	76	86	n/a
English Learner	n/a	-	-	n/a
Low Income	n/a	-	-	n/a
Special Education	n/a	-	-	n/a

↘ = cohort track
n/a = not available

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

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

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

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

ATTENDANCE DATA

ATTENDANCE: By Grade

Grade	Percent avoiding chronic absenteeism			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Kindergarten	85	80	75	n/a
1st Grade	88	79	83	n/a
2nd Grade	92	88	88	n/a
3rd Grade	93	96	92	n/a
4th Grade	93	93	93	n/a
5th Grade	92	96	93	n/a

ATTENDANCE: By Group/Program[6]

Group/Program	Percent avoiding chronic absenteeism			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Asian	88	85	84	n/a
Black/African American	--	-	-	n/a
Hispanic/Latino	89	83	74	n/a
Two or more races	97	95	91	n/a
White	92	90	93	n/a
English Learner	85	81	81	n/a
Low Income	92	78	69	n/a
Special Education	89	89	84	n/a

WASHINGTON SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FRAMEWORK (WSIF) DATA

MOST RECENT WSIF 3-YEAR SUMMARY[7]

	All Students	Asian	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino	Two or more races	White	English Language Learners	Low income	Students with disabilities
ELA Proficiency Rate (%)	83	87	-	63	85	84	46	47	49
Math Proficiency Rate (%)	81	88	-	55	79	80	61	33	36
ELA Median Student Growth Percentile[8]	62	63.5	-	57	66.5	60.5	74	47	55.5
Math Median Student Growth Percentile	56	56	-	57.5	58	55	62.5	50	52
EL Progress Rate (%)	92	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Regular Attendance Rate (%)	89	87	-	82	94	93	83	82	90

↘ = cohort track
n/a = not available

---

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

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

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

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PRIORITIES

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

Priority #1	
Priority Area	English Language Arts/Literacy
Focus Area	Informational Writing
Focus Grade Level(s)	K – 5
Desired Outcome	Students in grades 3-5 will score an average of 2.5 (out of 4) on the organization/purpose and evidence/elaboration rubric on the Smarter Balanced Performance Task for Informational Writing in Spring, 2022.
Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives	Multi-Tiered Systems of Support - Academics (MTSS-A)
Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area	Students are assessed on three types of writing on the English Language Arts/Literacy Smarter Balanced Assessment (ELA SBA): informational, narrative, and opinion. Students receive scores on a four-point rubric for organization/purpose and evidence/elaboration. They also receive a score on a three-point rubric for conventions. Data from the 2019 spring writing performance task is as follows:

Writing Type	Average Score of Students in Grades 3-5 (out of 4)		Average Score Students in Grades 3-5 (out of 2)
	Organization/ Purpose	Evidence/ Elaboration	Conventions
Informational	2.11	2.07	1.68
Narrative	2.63	2.59	1.64
Opinion	2.29	2.17	1.75

Overall, Rush students scored significantly lower in informational writing in both organization/design and evidence/elaboration. This trend has been consistent over the past two years.

Strategy to Address Priority

Action	Measure of Fidelity of Implementation
Teachers will review the standards and proficiency scales for informational writing (organization/design and evidence/elaboration) to create a progression of learning for students in K-5.	Document showing the progression of learning for organization/design and evidence/elaboration in informational writing for K-5.
All grade-level teams (K-5) will identify critical lessons that teach organization/purpose and evidence/elaboration in	% of grade-level teams that have identified critical lessons

informational writing as well as possible supplemental resources to use as needed.	% of grade level teams that have developed supplemental resources.
All grade-level teams (K-5) will review the scoring rubric in the district's informational writing curriculum. Teachers will then score student writing together in grade level teams. The focus will be in the areas of organization/purpose and evidence/elaboration.	% of teacher teams that have scored student informational writing pieces together.
All teachers (K-5) will collaborate to develop common language to use when teaching informational writing.	% of teachers that use the common language.
All teachers in grades 3-5 will review the Smarter Balance Informational Performance Tasks Writing Rubrics. Teachers will also practice scoring the Informational Annotated Anchor papers.	% of teachers that have scored the anchor papers.
All grade-levels teams (K-5) will collaborate to understand the standards and rubrics of the other grade levels, specifically the grade above and below their grade level.	% of teachers that access and align writing curriculum.
Grade 3-5 students will complete a post-assessment using Smarter Balanced Interim Assessment Block (IAB) for informational writing.	% of students completing SBA IAB.
Grades K-5 students will participate in small group instruction to target skill deficits in informational writing after the initial unit.	% of teachers that perform small group instruction.
Additional instruction will be planned as needed based on data analysis.	

Timeline for Focus	Winter, 2019 - Spring, 2022
Method(s) to Monitor Progress	• After each informational writing unit, on-demand writing prompts will be given and scored. • After each informational writing unit, the Smarter Balanced IAB will be given to student in grades 3-5. • Each spring, the English Language Arts/Literacy Smarter Balanced Assessment will be given to students in grades 3-5.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3" align="center">Priority #2</td></tr>
<tr><td>Priority Area</td><td colspan="2">Mathematics</td></tr>
<tr><td>Focus Area</td><td colspan="2">Representing and Interpreting Data</td></tr>
<tr><td>Focus Grade Level(s)</td><td colspan="2">K-5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Desired Outcome</td><td colspan="2">80% of 5th graders will be proficient on the Mathematics SBA by Spring, 2022.

Specifically, scores in the area of representing and interpreting data will increase compared to the rest of the assessment.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives</td><td colspan="2">Multi-Tiered Systems of Support - Academics (MTSS-A)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area</td><td colspan="2">The Mathematics SBA is divided into three claims: Concepts and Procedures, Problem Solving and Modeling & Data Analysis, and Communication and Reasoning. The Concepts and Procedures claim is further divided into targets. In all grades, the target, "Represent and interpret data," is one of the lowest claims. Also, in 5th grade, the added target, "Graph points on the coordinate plane to solve real-world and mathematical problems," is lower than the other claims. By increasing student learning in the area of representing and interpreting data, SBA scores should increase. This will also support students as we implement the new science curriculum that is aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS).</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="5">Strategy to Address Priority</td><td align="center">Action</td><td align="center">Measure of Fidelity of Implementation</td></tr>
<tr><td>Teachers will review the standards and proficiency scales to create a progression of learning for interpreting and representing data for students in K-5.</td><td>Document showing the progression of learning for interpreting and representing data for K-5.</td></tr>
<tr><td>All grade-level teams (K-5) will review current curriculum for topics which cover representing and interpreting data in math. Teachers will identify gaps in the curriculum and develop supplemental lessons to fill the gaps.</td><td>% of grade-level teams that have identified which topics involve representing and interpreting data.

% of grade-level teams that have developed supplemental lessons.</td></tr>
<tr><td>All teachers (K-5) will collaborate to develop common vocabulary to use when teaching representing and interpreting data.</td><td>% of teachers that use the common vocabulary, and have it posted in their classrooms.</td></tr>
<tr><td>All grade-level teams will develop three common formative assessments that will assess students understanding of</td><td>% of grade-level teams that have developed and given three formative assessments on interpreting and representing data.</td></tr>
</table>

	interpreting and representing data throughout the year.	
	As teachers implement the new Amplified science, they will identify and prioritize the lessons/units that focus on data interpretation.	% of teachers that are using Amplify to teach science.
	Additional instruction will be planned as needed based on data analysis.	
Timeline for Focus	Fall, 2019 - Spring, 2022	
Method(s) to Monitor Progress	• Three common formative assessments on interpreting and representing data in each grade level. • Each spring, the Mathematics Smarter Balanced Assessment will be given to students in grades 3-5.	

<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>K-5</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Desired Outcome**</td><td>70% of students in grades 3-5 will self-report that they are able to regulate their emotions based on the Panorama Survey.</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>The Panorama Survey asks students to reflect on their own social-emotional learning as well as the school culture around belonging and safety.

All students in grades 3 through 5 take the survey twice a year, once in the fall and once in the late spring. The data reports the number of favorable responses based on a five-point scale. In order to be a "favorable answer", students must respond in one of the top two categories.

Topics	Percentage of Favorable Answers
Emotion Regulation	55%
Social Awareness	74%
Sense of Belonging	71%
School Safety	70%

Based on the 2019 Spring Panorama Survey, emotional regulation was significantly lower than the other three topics.</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Strategy to Address Priority**</td><td>

Action	Measure of Fidelity of Implementation
Teacher will use the district SEL resources.	% of teachers using the lessons.
Teachers will be trained to teach the emotion management unit from Second Step (21-22 school year).	% of teachers trained.
Teachers will teach the Emotion Management unit from Second Step (21-22 school year).	% of teachers who teach all the lessons.
Teachers will have a calm-down area in their classroom and will teach students how to use it (21-22 school year).	% of classrooms with a calm-down area.
Counselor will provide small-group instruction for students who need tier 2 support in learning and practicing emotional skills.	Number of students referred to the counselor and number students who completed the tier 2 instruction.
Staff will develop a common language around emotion management.	% of classrooms with the common language posted.

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

	Counsellor will provide Tier 1 lessons on emotional management to classes.	% of classrooms who receive the lessons.
	School will partner with PTA to provide family education and resources on emotional management.	Number of education opportunities for families.
Timeline for Focus	Fall, 2019 - Spring, 2022	
Method(s) to Monitor Progress	• Second step summative knowledge assessment for Emotion Management given twice a year. • Panorama Survey results (Fall and Spring).	

Priority #4	
Priority Area	Focused Professional Development
Focus Area	Feedback on Instructional Practices
Focus Grade Level(s)	K-5
Desired Outcome	Based on the Nine Characteristics of Highly Effective Schools Survey, question 47, "Staff members get help in areas they need to improve," will increase from a weighted average of 3.07 to an average weighted score of 3.37 on the 2019-2020 survey. To accomplish this goal, we will also work to increase the score on question 44 of the Nine Characteristics of Highly Effective Schools Survey: "Teachers provide feedback to each other to help improve instruction." This score will increase from an average weighted score of 2.9 to an average weighted score of 3.2.
Alignment with District Strategic Initiatives	Professional Learning
Data and Rationale Supporting Focus Area	The Nine Characteristics of Highly Effective Schools Survey requires staff to rate their perception of a variety of areas impacting teaching and learning at Rush Elementary. The survey includes 60 statements that staff report if they: don't agree, agree slightly, agree mostly, or agree completely. The results are reported as a weighted average by assigning each answer a value of 1 (don't agree) through 4 (agree completely). Staff looked at the statements that had a weighted score lower than 3.2 and then chose an area to focus on that would have a large impact on students learning. The Nine Characteristics Survey from 2019 showed a weighted average score of 3.07 on the statement, "Staff members get the help they need to improve." Only 11 out of 41 staff members agreed completely with this statement.

Strategy to Address Priority	Action	Measure of Fidelity of Implementation
	Survey staff to determine professional development needs.	% of staff that complete the surveys.
	Provide targeted professional development based on the survey results.	% of staff who participate in the professional development. Feedback on the professional development to determine effectiveness.
	Organize peer observation cycles; teachers will observe each other and provide feedback.	% of teachers who participate in at least one observation cycle.
	Organize observations of highly skilled teachers in specific content areas.	% of teachers who participate in the observations.

Timeline for Focus	Fall 2019 - Spring, 2022

| Method(s) to Monitor Progress | We will survey staff to determine their upcoming professional development needs as well as how effective the professional development has been so far this year.

The summative measure will be the results of our Nine Characteristics of Effective Schools Survey. |
| --- | --- |

TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION PLAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PARTICIPATION

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

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

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN

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

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

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

Strategy to Engage Students, Families, Parents and Community Members in the development of the SIP	Action	Timeline
	Run data meetings to allow families and community members to provide input on SIP goals for next year. These meetings will also allow families to provide feedback on this community engagement plan. Data meetings will be held at various times (e.g., before school, during school, and in the evening). They will also be at varying locations including our large apartment complexes and interpreters will be provided as needed. Childcare will also be provided as needed.	June and September 2021 (depending on restrictions)
	Gather priorities from our families on goals for next year. This will include email surveys, paper feedback forms at Open House, face-to-face conversations at conferences and school events, and paper surveys that can be returned to the school.	October in 2021
	The Equity Team, including community members, will develop ways to engage families that are traditionally marginalized in our SIP process.	Ongoing

---

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

Strategy to Inform Students, Families, Parents and Community Members of the SIP	Action	Timeline
	Include articles in our school newsletter to inform families about our SIP goals as well as progress towards the goals. We will create a "School Improvement Corner" in the newsletter with information about our SIP.	November 2020 to June 2021
	Share SIP information with small groups of 4th and 5th graders.	November and December 2021
	Share SIP information with families and students during January conferences.	January 2021
	Present information about our SIP at school events (e.g., Principal Chats) that include a method for families to provide input and feedback.	Ongoing
	The Equity Team, including community members, will develop ways to communicate SIP goals and progress to families that are traditionally marginalized.	Ongoing