



Roseville Area Schools

Quality Teaching & Learning for All...Equity in All We Do

Table of Contents

[Name of School Title I Schoolwide Plan/School Improvement Plan-2020-2021](#)

[Stakeholder Engagement \(Continuous Improvement Leadership Team\)](#)

[2020-2021 District Areas of Focus](#)

[Comprehensive Needs Assessment or Annual Evaluation Summary](#)

[School Improvement Focus Area #1](#)

[School Improvement Focus Area #2](#)

[School Improvement Focus Area #3](#)

[Budget – How is the school using Title I funds and any other funds to improve the school program and student outcomes?](#)

[Communication Plan](#)

[2020-2021 SIP Calendar/Deadlines](#)

[SIP Resources:](#)

Edgerton Elementary School Title I Schoolwide Plan/School Improvement Plan-2020-2021

A Schoolwide program is a comprehensive school improvement effort designed to elevate the entire educational program of a Title I school. The Schoolwide program option is based on the premise that comprehensive reform strategies — rather than separate, add-on services — are most effective in raising the achievement level of students most at risk of not meeting academic standards. Multiple resources including Title I funds are used to strengthen the academic program in the school for all students and accelerate the progress of students who would otherwise be eligible for Title I Targeted Assistance services.

This document identifies the requirements to operate as a Title I schoolwide program.

School Name: Edgerton Elementary School

Principal Name: Brian Koland

Principal Phone and Email Address: 651-724-6359, brian.koland@isd623.org

Plan Contact (if different from principal):

Contact Phone and Email Address:

District Name and Number: Roseville Area Schools - 0623

Title I Coordinator Name: Florence Odegard

Title I Coordinator Phone and Email Address: 651-628-6451; florence.odegard@isd623.org

Superintendent/Director Name: Dr. Aldo Sicoli

How will the strategies and staff action specifically strengthen the school's academic program and address the learning needs of all students including but not limited to students at risk of not meeting standards? The embedding of common formative assessment in mathematics and shaping instruction based on student formative data is key in Edgerton's academic success. The system created below builds on weekly collaboration of the teams AND sharing cross teams for a full school experience and specifically measuring outcomes of our work in student achievement in mathematics. In the area of social, emotional learning, the school staff are shifting their focus to align our instruction and activities with the Minnesota state standards. In both goal areas, specific focus is targeted to changing our instruction to meet the needs of children identified as Black.

As a Schoolwide program, how will Title I funds be used in ways that are not possible with Targeted Assistance services? [Limit response to 100 words or 600 characters.]

There are two structures that the Title I schoolwide funds support that are not possible in a targeted approach. The first is the Professional Learning Community Coach who will spend time with each team focusing and tailoring their instruction and development to meet the needs of their children, specifically those who are not meeting state standards. The second structure is the use of additional social work and psychologist time to proactively and reactively support the social and emotional needs. In addition, the social worker and psychologist will meet with teams and build support plans for those children who are struggling.

Stakeholder Engagement (Continuous Improvement Leadership Team) ([Back to Table of Contents](#))

Identify family members, staff representation of all school groups, grade level representatives, curriculum specialists, and stakeholders such as community members, involved in guiding the process for the comprehensive needs assessment or annual evaluation, the development or revision of the plan,

and its implementation. Maintain supporting documentation such as meeting agendas, sign-in sheets, meeting minutes or notes which include the questions asked for input and decisions made.

| Team Member Name | Role |
|------------------|---|
| Brian Koland | Principal |
| Angela Froemming | ATPPS Lead Teacher |
| Sarah Johnston | PLC Lead (if applicable) |
| Kelly Wicklund | Teacher – Classroom |
| Sarah Johnston | Teacher – Interventionist |
| Barb Reckard | Special Education Representative |
| Marisa Knoss | Multilingual (EL) Learning Representative |
| Kellie Farina | Teacher |
| Stacey Whitwood | Teacher |
| James Hoskins | Cultural Liaison |
| Amy Woodruff | Paraprofessional |
| Carla Hines | Parent/Family of student at risk of not meeting standards |
| Rachel Coleman | Parent |
| Joan Froemming | Teacher |
| Laura Berkas | Teacher |
| Susan Collins | Teacher |
| Jakky Flanagan | Teacher |

| | |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| Mike Schroeder | Instructional Specialist |
| Lisa Fralish | Teacher |
| Lori Long | Secretary |

2020-2021 District Areas of Focus [\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

- PLC – Questions 3 and 4 and school culture (within an MTSS framework)
- [Educational Equity Curriculum and Instructional Compass](#) especially Collective Knowledge Co-creation and Absent Narratives
- SEL

How are stakeholders involved in the evaluation, planning and implementation process? [Limit response to 50 words or 300 characters.]

The large Edgerton Leadership School Improvement Team includes the instructional leadership team with a representative from each Collaborative Team in addition to the parent representatives and the School Improvement Oversight team (principal, PLC coach, ATTPS). This large team refined our goals based on the needs assessment process.

Comprehensive Needs Assessment or Annual Evaluation

Summary [\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

Identify the data sources used for each of the five different types of data:

1. Student Academic Data: The following data sets were available to each team member through the comprehensive needs assessment: Classroom formative assessments, Reading/FAST Screen, MCA 2019 Standardized results, MCA data for Black English speaking students

SPED MCA Data Trends

2. Student Non-Academic Data: The following data sets were available to each team member through the comprehensive needs assessment: Ethnicity, Gender, Student attendance, Student behavior, Multilingual Learners/EL, Special Education, Summer School Attendance

3. Perception Data: The following data sets were available to each team member through the comprehensive needs assessment: Parent /Caregiver attitudes - Survey 7/27/20

School/Teacher

4. Program, Process, Policy Data: The following data sets were available to each team member through the comprehensive needs assessment: PLC Expectations 20/21, CRCT, English Learner in Mainstream, MTSS, PBIS, SEL, Zones of regulation, CICO

5. Fidelity Data: Fidelity data sets were not collected in the 19/20 school year. This is an action step of the 2020/2021 school year.

What successes were identified?

1. Common formative assessment data was found to be a reliable data source for the instructional teams related to the goal areas identified in the SIP. Since we were unable to implement the MCA's this year due to COVID, these formative assessment data systems guided our individual student growth markers.

2. There was an overall reduction in the number of behavior referrals for the time period where we had in person instruction, as compared to the same time period last year (September - February). This was almost a 20% reduction (145 in 18/19 to 123 in 19/20).

3. A process outcome in teacher coaching and development was the voluntary choice of 14 licensed staff to receive instructional coaching in either English Learner in the Mainstream or Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Instruction.

What Area(s) of Greatest Need were identified?

1. The comprehensive needs assessment demonstrated to us that our students who are identified as black continue to be overrepresented in behavior referrals. Initial review indicates that our disproportionate representation for this group actually increased.

2. The lack of a consistent summative assessment (MCA) showed us that our common formative assessment system that is tied to our collaborative team needs additional resilience and dependability based on standard thread in mathematics. This will allow us to create a school-wide picture of forming instructional data rather than only depending upon the summative MCA data.

3. Our data demonstrated that our students lost ground on their fluency measures from fall to winter. A disaggregated analysis of this during the CNA process indicated that our intervention data was among the best in the district while our core instructional data showed a decline (although still not greater than the district average).

School Improvement Focus Area #1 [\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)- Mathematics Instruction and Growth.

Area of Greatest Need –What problem identified by the Comprehensive Needs Assessment or Annual Evaluation is the school trying to solve? If focusing on an academic area, be specific, yet concise, about the specific aspect, skill or knowledge that most needs to be addressed.

The area of greatest need in regards to instruction continues to mathematics instruction and student achievement. Our summative assessment data supports that this is the area of greatest concern (42% proficient from our 2019 MCA data). This is roughly 15 percent lower in percentage than our literacy. While our Formative Assessment System for Teachers showed us that we lost ground in some areas of literacy instruction (Fall- winter 2019), the MCA summative data continues to be below the district average. Initial strand analysis of common formative assessment showed indications of growth in some grade levels, however, the system of data collection with formative assessment data was not refined enough to provide concrete evidence of predicted outcomes on the MCAs. The development of this common formative data system is an action step in development over the summer for implementation in September with refinement each month. This year a subset goal was refined for our English Learners to focus on math instruction and growth, this will allow a tight and cohesive instructional support on mathematics across the academic focus of the school improvement plan.

Root Cause(s) of the need – *A root cause is an early controllable factor in a chain of factors which impact student learning.*

The root cause of the mathematics instruction was explored extensively in the school improvement for 2018/2019. The overall take away from the root cause analysis is that our instructional methodology needs to continue to adapt with culturally relevant instructional models based on race and the development of the English Language.

Strategy selected to address the root cause(s) – *A school improvement strategy is a plan of action designed to change school practice and improve student outcomes. The strategy should be based on evidence of improving outcomes when implemented with fidelity. [Note: The school could use more than one strategy to address an area of need. A school should not implement more than three strategies at one time.]*

The school improvement plan analysis from 2018/2019 led to the voluntary coaching opportunities that were presented in the 2019/2020 school year. Going forward into the 2019/2020, the focus will be on strategies from the English Learner in the Mainstream program and adapting this to a school-wide approach within a framework of our districts work. Culturally and Linguistically Responsive instruction will continue to be a part of our layered approach while we focus our development on ELM strategies with our district’s approach to equitable instruction through Culturally Responsive and Competent Teaching.

If using an evidence-based strategy, identify the specific source indicating the strategy’s likely effect on improved outcomes:

The ELM Project at Hamline, funded by a grant from the United States Department of Education, provides coursework for 225 teacher-coaches who will bring best practices in teaching English as a second language (TESOL) to thousands of in-service teachers in some of Minnesota’s largest school districts, as well as area charter and Twin Cities Archdiocese schools.

The strategy is based on [Choose one of the options to indicate the level of evidence]:

- strong evidence from an experimental study
- moderate evidence from a quasi-experimental study
- promising evidence from a correlational study
- a rationale using high-quality research findings or a positive evaluation

School Match – Briefly explain how the strategy is an appropriate match for the school’s needs, student population, capacity and other conditions.

From our demographic analysis, roughly 25% of our students are identified as English Language Learners. This setting factor was part of the decision to shift our teacher coaching towards supporting the ELM model of instructional delivery by placing a certified ELM coach in our lead teacher position for teacher improvement. All three of our EL staff are ELM trained in addition to 10 teachers. This year, we expect to work to implement some of these models and strategies from the ELM project in our staff development.

SMART Goal – State a goal which is **specific** about the area for improvement, **measurable** as an indicator of progress, **assignable** to staff primarily responsible for implementing the strategy, **realistic** about the outcomes that can be achieved, and **time-bound** for when outcomes can be achieved.

1. All students at Edgerton in grades 3-6 will experience a proficiency growth in math from 42.1% meeting standard to 48.1%, as measured by MCA.

Subset goals addressing the subsets demonstrating greatest need for achievement through our equity lens.

1. Students in grades 3-6 who are identified as Black will experience an increase in proficiency in math from 18% to 26%, as measured by MCA.
2. Through embedded practice with the framework of English Learner in the Mainstream coaching, we will increase the proficiency of children identified as EL in MCA math from 21% proficient to 29%.

Implementation Plan for Focus Area #1 -

| Action Step - name specific strategies | Position(s) Responsible (teacher, principal, social worker, psych, etc...) | Resources Needed | Start Date | End Date | Expected Outcome of the action and measure of whether it was achieved |
|--|--|--|------------|----------|---|
| Professional Learning Community Lead Coach | Sarah Johnston | Collaborative team meetings, Monthly review of documents | 8/31 /20 | 6/10 /21 | Specific tasks related to improvement with the CFA process at EDG: |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|------|------|---|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Research effective instructional strategies and skills; communicate these strategies with collaborative teams on a regular basis - Ensure Common Formative Assessments are rigorous and align to the Power Standards -Establish and communicate procedures for completing data analysis protocols and CFA data tracking tables |
| ELM Model initiative | Angela Froemming and EL Department | Opportunities to adapt whole school staff development opportunities while embedding ELM strategies. | 8/31 | 6/10 | Each staff development activity that is designed for instruction related to math will be reviewed for and work towards implementing ELM strategies. |
| Implementing CFA Data for Vertical Articulation | Edgerton Leadership Team | Expectation that all teams will enter math common formative data in a common system that is designed for strand analysis. | 7/1 | 6/10 | The School Implementation Team will review the data bi-weekly related to student performance on math strands. This smaller team (Angela, Brian, and Sarah) will make recommendations for the large leadership team use of the information. |
| Knowledge Co-construction | EDG Equity Team/ELM coaches | Embedded ELM strategies in district-wide training that occurs at Edgerton | 8/31 | 3/5 | Staff will embed ELM strategies into the district-wide approaches to knowledge co-creation and absent narratives. |
| Windows and Mirrors | EDG Equity Team | Staff development time related to our Absent Narratives approach known as windows and mirrors. Purchase more materials/books. | 8/31 | 3/5 | Staff will deliver at least monthly a targeted lesson that is designed from our Window and Mirrors curriculum. |

Annual Evaluation for Focus Area #1

Identify the **process** and **measures** (data, observation of developing skills or climate, other information as determined by the school improvement leadership team) that will be used to determine:

- The fidelity of implementing the strategy as intended.

The common formative assessment data tracking system will be the primary vehicle for implementation fidelity of culturally responsive learning strategies for increasing the learning of our children in math standard strands. There will also be fidelity measures created and implemented in coaching and teacher feedback process through formal and informal observations.

- Progress toward achieving the SMART goal of improved outcomes

School Improvement Focus Area #2 [\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#) Aligning SEL instruction (PBIS/Equity) with State Standards

Area of Greatest Need –What problem identified by the Comprehensive Needs Assessment or Annual Evaluation is the school trying to solve? If focusing on an academic area, be specific, yet concise, about the specific aspect, skill or knowledge that most needs to be addressed.

The area of greatest need is in the behavior referrals that are experienced by our children identified as black. A child who is Black is 3 times more likely to receive a behavior referral than their attendance percentage in the building. They are disproportionately represented at a rate of at least 3.0.

Root Cause(s) of the need – *A root cause is an early controllable factor in a chain of factors which impact student learning.*

Our instructional delivery and behavioral expectations are biased against children who identify as Black. The team approached a fishbone analysis in this area exploring the following causes: curriculum, instruction, equity, professional development. Curriculum causes determined to be an underrepresentation in our teaching materials of narratives resistant to oppression and inadvertent exclusionary practices for our fails that validate their lived experience. Instructional causes were determined to be non-inclusive activities in culturally responsive teaching and misinterpreting behavior of children in a negative way. Equity causes include students not feeling connected to their school and the staff in it. Professional development causes include the need of trauma informed teaching practices with the focus on institutionalized racism.

Strategy selected to address the root cause(s) – *A school improvement strategy is a plan of action designed to change school practice and improve student outcomes. The strategy should be based on evidence of improving outcomes when implemented with fidelity. [Note: The school could use more than*

one strategy to address an area of need. A school should not implement more than three strategies at one time.]

Edgerton Elementary will work with the newly created position of African American Liaison to implement a Leaders in Training program similar to that in place at the high school.

If using an **evidence-based strategy**, identify the specific source indicating the strategy’s likely effect on improved outcomes:

The strategy is based on [Choose one of the options to indicate the level of evidence]:

- _____strong evidence from an experimental study
- _____moderate evidence from a quasi-experimental study
- _____promising evidence from a correlational study
- _____a rationale using high-quality research findings or a positive evaluation

School Match – Briefly explain how the strategy is an appropriate match for the school’s needs, student population, capacity and other conditions.

Our children, specifically black children, do not see themselves present in our staff. The role of an African American Liaison will increase the visibility that our children see staff as leading in the learning community. With the race-based achievement gap and disproportionate representation of our black children with behavior, they do not experience school like students of other racial groups. The African American Liaison will be a systemic part of our school system and leadership.

SMART Goal – State a goal which is **specific** about the area for improvement, **measurable** as an indicator of progress, **assignable** to staff primarily responsible for implementing the strategy, **realistic** about the outcomes that can be achieved, and **time-bound** for when outcomes can be achieved.

Edgerton will decrease the disproportionate representation of children identified as black in behavior referrals from a level of over 3.0 to 2.0.

Implementation Plan for Focus Area #2

| Action Step - name specific strategies | Position(s) Responsible (teacher, principal, social worker, psych, etc...) | Resources Needed | Start Date | End Date | Expected Outcome of the action and measure of whether it was achieved |
|--|--|---------------------|------------|----------|---|
| Student Attendance (hybrid) - engagement | School Social Worker and | Committee formation | 8/31 | 6/10 | This committee will target supports to families who are |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|-----|------|---|
| | support team. | addressing attendance | | | experiencing lack of engagement and infrequent attendance in a supportive manner before implementing discipline practices. |
| Affinity Groups - African American Liaison | African American Liaison, School Social Worker, School Psychologist | At least bi-monthly affinity groups for students identified as Black. This will include a monthly parent engagement event as well. | 9/8 | 6/10 | This affinity group will have a chance to plan the African American History month activities for the school, if they choose. The Title I funded School Social Worker and School Psychologist will support the African American Liaison in partnership with affinity parent group. |
| Meld PBIS to State Standards | School Social Worker and School Psychologist funded with Title I as part of the Eagle Squad | Committee structure and ongoing work from last school year to shift to standards based approach to behavior as opposed to value (which supports disproportionate representation) | 9/8 | 6/10 | This group will increase our capacity to deliver behavioral instruction founded on state standards within the framework of PBIS. This will include the development and implementation of fidelity measures of implementation in instruction. |

Annual Evaluation for Focus Area #2

Identify the **process** and **measures** (data, observation of developing skills or climate, other information as determined by the school improvement leadership team) that will be used to determine:

- The fidelity of implementing the strategy as intended
- Progress toward achieving the SMART goal of improved outcomes

Budget – How is the school using Title I funds and any other funds to improve the school program and student outcomes?

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

| Focus Area # | Expense Item and Justification (How is this expense related to the strategy?) If a staff position, include the FTE. | Title I, Part A proposed FTE | Other funding source(s) proposed FTE |
|--------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1, 2 | Professional Learning Community Lead Teacher | 1.0 | |
| 2 | Social Worker - behavioral support focused on reducing disproportionate representation through proactive support | .25 | .3 Compensatory Ed |
| 2 | School psychologist - behavioral support focused on reducing disproportionate representation through proactive support | .50 | |

Communication Plan [\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

Complete the chart below to list how the plan will be communicated to staff, families of students, school board, and community members in a format and language that families can understand?

| When will the communication take place | What is the message | Who is the audience | How will it be communicated |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--|
| August 5 | Development of the Plan | School Leadership | Involvement Activity in building and refining |
| August 31 | Sharing the overview of the plan | School staff and families. | Meeting for staff and listserve for families |
| September 21 | African American students can join an affinity group | Black students and families | The African American Liaison will contact each family. |
| September 21 | Sharing the overview of the plan | Parent Teacher Association Meeting | Shared at the first meeting of the year. |

School Professional Development Calendar - See 2020-2021 district PD calendar link below for district dates.

| DATE (district PD SIP dates and other scheduled PD in the building) | Planned Activity | Persons Responsible | With which Focus Area does this activity align? (Ex. Focus Area 1, 2, 3) | Notes/outcome |
|--|------------------|---------------------|---|---------------|
|--|------------------|---------------------|---|---------------|

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Workshop Week | CFA Data analysis training | Kellie Farina/Brian Koland | 1 | |
| To be determined as fluid with COVID | ELM strategy instruction | EL Teachers | 1 | |
| | Windows and Mirrors retraining | Equity Team | 2 | |
| | SEL state standards and resources | PBIS team | 2 | |

2020-2021 SIP Calendar/Deadlines

| | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Important dates for SIP Process | Important dates for PLC and SIP data. |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|

| Deadline | Activity | Positions responsible | Notes |
|--|--|--|----------|
| June/July | Each principal meets with Assistant Superintendents to plan goals and agenda for building leadership team SIP meetings | Assistant Superintendents and Principals | |
| August 10 | Submit SIP to Dr. Favor | Principal | Complete |
| August 21 | Principal/Building Leadership Team receive Feedback on SIP | Assistant Superintendents | |
| August 28 | SIP revisions completed | Principal | |
| August - workshop week/early September | Share SIP overview with staff | Principal | |
| Mid September | ATPPS Site goal (aligned to SIP building SIP goal) due to Florence Odegard | Principal | |
| September/October | Learning walkthroughs to collect evidence of fidelity of implementation data (as defined in SIP) | Principal, ATPPS Lead Teacher, other key teacher leaders aligned to the focus area | |
| Mid to late October | Collect perception data from two groups: 1) staff regarding working towards Focus Area | Principal and teacher leaders | |

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | <p>goals and strategies.</p> <p>2) Family and community members regarding their experiences and perceptions of the progress toward goals.</p> <p>Create a fidelity of implementation report on focus area status to be shared with staff, school community and other district leaders.</p> | | |
| Early November | Report progress toward SIP goal attainment to Assistant Superintendents | Principal | |
| Early December | SIP review by building leadership team - report on process and outcome to Assistant Superintendents and receive feedback from Assistant Superintendents within two weeks. | School Leadership Team | |
| Mid-December | Learning walkthroughs to collect evidence of fidelity of implementation data (as defined in SIP) | Principal, ATPPS Lead Teacher, other key teacher leaders aligned to the focus area | |
| Late December/ Early January | <p>Collect perception data from two groups:</p> <p>3) staff regarding working towards Focus Area goals and strategies.</p> <p>4) Family and community members regarding their experiences and perceptions of the progress toward goals.</p> <p>Create a fidelity of implementation report on focus area status to be shared with staff, school community and other district leaders.</p> | Principal and teacher leaders | |
| Mid- January | Report progress toward SIP goal attainment to Assistant Superintendents | Principal | |
| February | Learning walkthroughs to collect evidence of fidelity of implementation data (as defined in SIP) | Principal, ATPPS Lead Teacher, other key teacher leaders aligned to the focus area | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| Late February/Early March | <p>Collect perception data from two groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5) staff regarding working towards Focus Area goals and strategies. 6) Family and community members regarding their experiences and perceptions of the progress toward goals. <p>Create a fidelity of implementation report on focus area status to be shared with staff, school community and other district leaders.</p> | Principal and teacher leaders | |
| Mid-March | SIP review by building leadership team - report on process and outcome to Assistant Superintendents and receive feedback from Assistant Superintendents within two weeks. | School Leadership Team | |
| Mid/Late March | Report progress toward SIP goal attainment to Assistant Superintendents | Principal | |
| Early April | Learning walkthroughs to collect evidence of fidelity of implementation data (as defined in SIP) | Principal, ATPPS Lead Teacher, other key teacher leaders aligned to the focus area | |
| Mid April/Early May | <p>Collect perception data from two groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7) staff regarding working towards Focus Area goals and strategies. 8) Family and community members regarding their experiences and perceptions of the progress toward goals. <p>Create a fidelity of implementation report on focus area status to be shared with staff, school community and other district leaders.</p> | Principal and teacher leaders | |
| Mid to late May | SIP review by building leadership team - report on process and outcome to Assistant Superintendents and | School Leadership Team | |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| | receive feedback from Assistant Superintendents within two weeks. | | |
| May | Report progress toward SIP goal attainment to Assistant Superintendents | Principal | |
| Early June | CNA data identified/collected for planning 2021-2022 SIP | Principal and School Leadership Team | |

SIP Resources :

[\(Back to Table of Contents\)](#)

[Implementation Science Tools](#)

[2020-2021 PD Calendar](#)