



Fernwood Elementary School Action Plan

Northshore
School District

SECTION 1: THE BACKGROUND

School Name: Fernwood Elementary

Year: 2026–27

The Central Vision (North Star) School Mission-Vision: At Fernwood Elementary, we create and maintain a safe and consistent learning community by establishing positive behavioral supports and a culture where all students achieve social, emotional, and academic success.

We believe that the best education doesn't just give answers, it inspires curiosity, celebrates unique backgrounds, and thrives when every student feels a deep sense of inclusion and belonging. It is our vision that all students thrive within a supportive, inclusive school-wide community where students feel safe, valued, and inspired to learn by:

- **Cultivating Joy & Curiosity:** Fostering a lifelong love for learning and growth as they build confidence and mastery across all academic standards.
- **Collaborating & Building Community:** Working collaboratively with diverse peers to nurture meaningful friendships, practice empathy, and ensure every student experiences a true sense of belonging.
- **Problem-Solving & Critical Thinking:** Engaging thoughtfully with complex challenges, exercising critical thinking, and making responsible choices that uplift themselves and others both academically and social/emotionally.

Focus Population:

Multilingual Learners in grades K–5: Multilingual Learners navigate English language acquisition while simultaneously tackling grade-level content. Data from WIDA, i-Ready ELA, and classroom assessments show that our multilingual learners' productive language skills (speaking and writing) lag significantly behind in their receptive language skills (listening and reading), with the gap most pronounced in the primary grades K-3. This disparity creates a hurdle as students enter 4th and 5th grades, where text complexity increases and demonstrating reading comprehension relies more heavily on written expression.

Learning Problem (Big Picture):

Multilingual learners are expected to engage with and demonstrate grade-level content knowledge across all four language domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. However, a comprehensive analysis of i-Ready ELA, WIDA ACCESS, Panorama, curriculum-based assessments, and student voice surveys reveals a persistent disparity. While students demonstrate relative strength in receptive language skills (listening and foundational reading), productive skills, specifically speaking and written expression, lag significantly behind.

When writing lags, it creates a barrier to measuring student understanding, effectively masking a student's comprehension of complex texts and discussions. Without targeted support in productive language skills, speaking and writing standard assessments will continue to understate our multilingual learners' actual academic capabilities.

SECTION 2: THE SYSTEMIC NARRATIVE

ROOT CAUSE

The central node or pattern that connects your academic, behavioral, and cultural challenges.

The Holistic Inquiry	Response
The Surface Symptoms <i>(What data points are flashing red?)</i>	<u>WIDA</u> WIDA Writing is the single greatest area of need school-wide: 100% of 1st and 2nd graders and 70–83% of 3rd graders did not pass the writing portion although it is acknowledged that the assessment is not a binary meets/does not meet standard, there is a continuum of proficiency. WIDA Speaking proficiency drops sharply after Kindergarten and remains a lagging skill through 3rd grade. <u>PANORAMA</u> Panorama student survey data (grades 3-5) shows two different stories when comparing our multilingual students to their non-multilingual students. On one hand, students are developing strong personal tools: their confidence and ability to manage stress are growing across the board. On the other hand, their sense of connection is slipping. This is especially true for our multilingual students, who report feeling significantly less like they belong and seeing less purpose in school, even as they put in more effort every day. A student with a high sense of self-efficacy might know <i>how</i> to tackle a problem, but without a sense of belonging, the fear of judgment or looking "foolish" stops them from participating. This is especially critical for our multilingual students: when belonging drops, students are much more likely to stay silent during speaking and writing activities—the exact productive skills they need to practice most. <u>Panorama Screening</u> Belonging: Whole School- 64% (decrease by 1 point) ML- 56% (decrease by 7 points)

Self Efficacy:

Whole School- 62% (increase by 5 points)

ML- 52% (increase by 6 points)

Emotional Regulation:

Whole School- 59% (increase by 5 points)

ML-52% (increase by 5 points)

Valuing of School:

Whole School- 71% (decrease by 2 points)

ML-71% (decrease by 7 points)

Classroom Effort:

Whole School- 81% (decrease by 1 point)

ML- 75% (increase by 6 points)

QUANTITATIVE DATA

What happens to multilingual learners as they move through our instructional system according to longitudinal data in i-Ready (fall 2024-fall 2026)?

- Informational-text comprehension is the weakest reading sub-skill across grade levels according to iReady
- Current Grade 3 Cohort is showing sustained improvement.
 - Fall 2024 (1st Grade)- 30% of ML students were on/above in informational text.
 - Fall 2025 (2nd Grade)- increased to 33%
 - Fall 2026 (3rd Grade)- 45% of ML students were on/above in informational text.
- Current Grade 4 Cohort presents the clearest concern.
 - Fall 2024 (2nd Grade)- 35% of ML students were on/above grade level in informational text.
 - Fall 2025 (3rd Grade)- increased to 39% of ML students on/above grade level in informational text.
 - Spring 2026 (3rd Grade)-increased to 65% of ML students on/above grade level in informational text.
 - Fall 2026 (4th Grade)-decreased to 21% of ML students on/above in informational text.
 - The overall cohort also declined 12 points fall-to-fall, suggesting both a broader Grade 3 to Grade 4 transition issue and an amplified challenge for multilingual learners.

	● Current Grade 5 has experienced persistent difficulty. ○ Fall 2024 (3rd Grade)- 30% of ML students were on/above grade level in informational text. ○ Fall 2025 (4th Grade)- fell to 0% of ML students on/above grade level in informational text. ○ Fall 2026 (5th Grade)- 17% of ML students are at/above grade level in informational text. ● The current Grade 2 cohort shows a widening ML/non-ML difference. ○ Fall 2025 (1st Grade)- 38% of ML students were at/above grade level in informational text. ○ Fall 2026 (2nd Grade) 38% of ML students are at/above grade level in informational text, while their non-ML peers increased from 53% to 69%.
The Systemic Root <i>(What are the causes? Are they interconnected and how?)</i>	Instruction: Instructional support needs to focus on clearly defined tiers of support, shared understanding of the flexible service delivery model and increasing effective instructional practices. ● Listening and reading skills get the most practice through intervention groups and core instruction, using district adopted HMH curriculum, while speaking and writing receive far less individualized, targeted support. ● GLAD and SIOP strategies that are evidence based, effective supports and practices for multilingual students are known to some staff. The level of knowledge is not at a level of depth that is effectively implemented across all classrooms. ● There is variability in how tier 2 instruction is implemented across classrooms. This is due to an inconsistent and individualized understanding of the differences between the tiers within our MTSS implementation. Decisions on when to shift from tier 2 to tier 3 are unclear. Culture: Collaboration across grade levels and with related service providers continues to be a key area of focus and growth. ● While structures for collaboration are increasingly in place, our next step is to deepen the purpose and impact of that time. We are shifting from collaboration centered primarily on coordinating content and pacing to instructionally focused conversations around data that identify barriers to learning, examine student needs, and determine how instructional practices and delivery can be adjusted to increase access for every learner.

	• There are misconceptions around who implements tier 2 instruction. Some see this as the role of ML/LAP teachers while others are viewing tier 2 instruction as a routine practice of the classroom teacher. • When Tier 2 instruction is viewed solely as the domain of ML/LAP specialists, instead of experiencing a seamless extension of core instruction, student learning may become fragmented. For multilingual learners who are already spending high cognitive energy processing grade-level content and language, this lack of alignment may increase mental fatigue and make learning feel disconnected. • In grades K–2, young students build foundational reading and writing skills. As academic complexity shifts in grades 3-5, expectations for producing complex texts increase alongside a growing developmental awareness of peer differences. During this transition, a student’s sense of belonging <i>as a learner</i> often declines. While children may feel socially connected to their school community, comparing their progress to peers achieving at a faster rate or acceleration, can weaken their self-efficacy, leading to decreased engagement and effort in the classroom. Structure: Common collaborative planning times are built into the building schedule for related services and classroom teachers to meet. There needs to be consistent school wide tools and protocols in place to foster collaborative meetings. • Structurally, we do not have an operational way for teams to organize student data/groupings/ shared planning. This impacts the ability to efficiently analyze student data to inform teams of student needs on a larger scale across grade levels and the school. • Although Tier 2 support is intended to occur during both core instruction and dedicated WIN time, this practice is not yet consistently applied across all classrooms. • Flexible Service Delivery is a misunderstood term for staff, causing confusion and misconceptions for how related services work together to meet the needs of students on their caseloads.
--	---

SECTION 3: THE INTERCONNECTED ACTION MAP

THEORY OF ACTION

(Instruction) If Fernwood strengthens core instruction with more scaffolding that affirms student identity, centers student voice, and gives multilingual learners real opportunities to produce expressive language and show their thinking; consistently embeds GLAD/SIOP strategies, UDL practices into core ELA instruction aligned with intentional and targeted instruction in writing strategies that support informational reading comprehension;

AND

(Culture/Structure) **If** we create clarity around what Flexible Service Delivery looks like in practice and establish collaborative and consistent systems for shared data collection, student progress monitoring and instructional groupings that foster collaboration across grade levels and with related services;

then students, particularly multilingual learners in K-3, will experience more consistent access to rigorous, grade-level learning and receive the scaffolded speaking and writing practice needed to demonstrate their understanding. Consequently, students across all classrooms will strengthen their productive and expressive language skills, comprehension of informational text, academic confidence, voice, and sense of belonging. This growth will boost long-term achievement, ensuring students enter grades 4 and 5 with stronger foundational skills.

SYSTEMIC GOAL:

Fernwood will strengthen inclusive and responsive instruction that increases student agency and academic mastery, with a focus on multilingual learners, especially K-2. Through explicit writing instruction connected to informational reading, meaningful opportunities to produce language, and responsive scaffolds, students will use writing to show their thinking, deepen informational reading comprehension, and take greater ownership of their learning.

Multidimensional Systems	Strategic Activities (The "Work")	Resource Inputs (The "Fuel")
Instruction <i>(Instructional & Academic)</i>	Activity: Build daily, structured writing practice for K–1, using short stamina-based routines (start at 5 minutes, then review work) rather than infrequent, high-stakes writing tasks. For primary grades, intentional focus on building fine motor skills (handwriting, cutting skills, pencil grip) to support small muscle strength that supports writing stamina over time. Align Mystery Writing, a supplementary writing resource, which staff identified as highly effective and more accessible for ML students, alongside explicit instruction in how to start any piece of writing before teaching specific genres. Increase informational-text integration, high leverage vocabulary instructional practices, into science and social studies	Resources: Mystery Writing supplementary resource materials and grade-level training. HMH - Into Reading Protected PLC time for grade-level teams to identify what existing curriculum content can be condensed or skipped without creating gaps. Partnership and consultation with OT/PT for fine motor skill development. WIDA writing scaffolds/rubrics; WIDA Language Charts

	so comprehension and content knowledge build together. Implement GLAD and UDL instructional practices within writing and reading instruction. Spotlight high leverage practices in staff PD for students to share thinking • Turn and talk • Task not ask • Close Reading and annotating reading • Notice and Note (HMH) Intermediate • Reading Journals • Vocabulary Development	ELD coach and support-staff time. Writing Strategies- Jennifer Serrevallo Assistive Technology to support increasing student access: • Clicker Writer • Read and Write- Chrome Extension • Proloquo Classroom
Culture (Cultural & Emotional)	Activity: Build accessible writing routines where mistakes are viewed as opportunities to grow (SEL focus), building student confidence and skill acquisition to initiate and sustain through writing tasks. Develop practices to support student reflection, goal setting and feedback loops. Celebrate student growth in writing/reading through collaborative sharing with peers, displays, student conferences, parent engagement, Collaboration focused on staff calibrating grading practices and success criteria when assessing student written work.	Resources: Parent Square & SeeSaw - showcase student work with families; build student pride, ownership, and home- school parent connection. WA-ELA Standards WIDA Standards Common Core Essential Elements Standards (for students who require modified criteria for writing skill development). Templates for student feedback and self reflection/rubrics. Student Growth Goal Setting Template (OSPI)
Structure (Structural & Policy)	Activity: Become tight with PLC data cycles that strategically review progress data to inform flexible groupings and refine targeted tier 2 small group instruction.	Resources: SDLT/Principal Days/Team Days: Utilized and encouraged for PLC data review checkpoints and PD.

	Define and create clarity around what a flexible service delivery model is so the strength of our ML and related service teams reach students consistently school-wide. Provide staff training in GLAD practices. Deepen our Equity-Based MTSS: continue Universal Design for Learning (UDL) implementation, increase use of GLAD strategies, an inclusive master schedule with a protected intervention/acceleration block (WIN Time), and tiered small-group instruction matched through resource mapping.	- Staff wide use of shared collaborative tools for tracking groupings. Fernwood: Collaborative Team Commitments Wednesday Collaboration Time/Building Schedule - Dedicated collaboration/co-planning time between grade-level and related-service staff (co-planning, shared data review, aligned scaffolds) Fernwood- Shared ELA Intervention Grouping tool MTSS Implementation Plan UDL Guidelines 3.0 Project GLAD- Resources
--	---	--

SECTION 4: THE RIPPLE EFFECT SCAN

SYSTEMS THINKING

Potential Negative Ripple	The Mitigation Strategy	Cross-System Connection
Unclear focus on various genres of writing based on teacher preference (poetry, narrative, informational, argumentative etc).	Building-wide focus on informational writing genres to connect to increasing reading informational comprehension.	Connects to <i>instruction</i> : Planning for instruction aligned with ELA standards, targeted learning objectives, and student need.
An increased focus on higher level literacy skills (reading comprehension and written expression) may unintentionally decrease the focus on foundational literacy	Naming and being clear about some key school wide commitments: Progress monitoring data must continue to be a focus for all areas of reading.	Connects to <i>instruction</i> : Bringing an increased focus on writing and speaking within literacy and across content areas should not replace other aspects of core instruction but instead enhance them and scale skill complexity in tier 1.

skills. This could create gaps, especially for our youngest students, in decoding and reading fluency which are essential prerequisite skills for reading comprehension and written expression	• K-2 Structured Literacy (HMH) supports foundational skills in core instruction. Targeted tier 2 and 3 instruction will still need to occur for students not yet at standard in foundational literacy skills. • Foundational instruction can occur while including opportunities for comprehension, vocabulary, and written expression (encoding).	
Too much focus swings to writing without connecting it to reading comprehension.	Set clear goals and commitments school wide to focus on connecting writing prompts to literary experiences (instead of This weekend I...)	Connects to <i>Culture</i> : Teachers need to share a common understanding of the practices and have clarity around the systemic goal. It is not about stopping certain practices but about refining and becoming more intentional.
In order to increase a focus on writing, teachers seek supplemental resources outside of what has already been approved to use (HMH & Mystery Writing).	Continuously ground instructional planning and team collaboration around approved materials and provide opportunities for professional development in vertical teams to ensure system-wide alignment.	Connects to <i>Structure</i> : curriculum pacing and teacher workload decisions have to move together with any new instructional task. Ask these guiding questions: Instead of continuing to add, what can be exchanged? How does it all align across our system for our students?

SECTION 5: MONITORING THE WHOLE

LEAD INDICATORS

<i>Metric Type</i>	<i>Indicator Description</i>	<i>Frequency of Review</i>
<i>The Process Metric</i> (Are we doing it?)	Short, weekly formative checks (about 10 questions) on reading/writing comprehension and figurative language, replacing an end-of-module-only approach, so we can intervene early rather than after the fact. Include student reflection questions around their experience and mind set as a learner.	Weekly, reviewed monthly

	Common Writing Assessments across grade levels and school wide	Quarterly
<i>The Experience Metric</i> <i>(How does it feel?)</i>	Structured teacher check-ins and walkthroughs around WIN time and writing routines to understand instructional impact in the classroom, Collaborative planning audits to determine team functionality and efficiency and support teaming structures. Student input/surveys on how they feel as a writer through the year. Teacher input/survey around their writing and informational reading instruction and practices.	Monthly Quarterly
<i>The Outcome Metric</i> <i>(Did it work?)</i>	Growth in WIDA writing and speaking proficiency for K–5 multilingual learners; decrease in the percentage of 1st and 2nd graders not yet passing the WIDA writing portion. iReady Winter and Spring Inform (K-5) SBA - ELA (Grades 3-5) Panorama - (Grades 3-5)	Semester/Yearly Fall and Spring

Summary of the Changes

(How has the work articulated in the SAP changed the learning experience for your focus population? What are the next logical steps to address your learning problem?)