

School District of Osceola County, FL

Sunrise Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Sunrise Elementary School

1925 HAM BROWN RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Albright

Start Date for this Principal: 6/5/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Sunrise Elementary School

1925 HAM BROWN RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Sunrise Elementary School is dedicated to meeting the needs of its diverse population through academics, character development, and community involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a unified school, Sunrise Elementary staff and students will work collaboratively as lifelong learners utilizing all available educational resources to develop critical thinking skills for college and career readiness.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Honeycutt, Wendy	Principal	The Principal is responsible for highly effective instruction and safety at the school level.
Albright, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal is responsible for highly effective instruction and safety at the school level.
Stevens, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	Rebecca is the MTSS Coach and is responsible to ensure that the students academic needs are being met.
Dupuis, Beth	School Counselor	Beth is responsible to ensure that the students social and emotional needs are met.
McFarland, Wendi	Instructional Coach	Wendi is responsible to ensure the effectiveness of our school's Reading and Writing instruction.
Henry, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Melissa is responsible to ensure the effectiveness of our school's Math and Science Instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/5/2017, Jennifer Albright

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

31

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

36

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

68

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	60	72	69	63	62	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
One or more suspensions	1	0	4	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	5	6	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/18/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	124	135	143	141	140	179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	862
Attendance below 90 percent	18	25	35	34	27	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	8	20	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	18	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	4	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	124	135	143	141	140	179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	862
Attendance below 90 percent	18	25	35	34	27	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	8	20	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	18	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	4	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	53%	57%	52%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	55%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	51%	53%	51%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	55%	63%	55%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	59%	62%	54%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	45%	51%	37%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	49%	53%	58%	54%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	51%	6%	58%	-1%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	51%	-2%	58%	-9%
	2018	40%	48%	-8%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	45%	48%	-3%	56%	-11%
	2018	47%	50%	-3%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	54%	9%	62%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	53%	4%	64%	-7%
	2018	50%	53%	-3%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	51%	48%	3%	60%	-9%
	2018	53%	52%	1%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
	2018	48%	49%	-1%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25	49	50	33	54	50	33				
ELL	38	50	52	52	70	59	42				
ASN	72	69		83	77						
BLK	51	63	40	57	63	36	33				
HSP	49	54	56	57	67	56	50				
MUL	75			67							
WHT	62	71	90	70	69		68				
FRL	47	56	58	54	62	51	46				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	31	35	33	51	48	32				
ELL	31	41	45	35	39	42	30				
ASN	67	60		67	47						
BLK	41	46	33	49	53	50	38				
HSP	45	42	44	51	49	46	56				
WHT	51	61	53	61	61	60	53				
FRL	42	47	47	51	56	59	51				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	23	26	14	23	25	15	29				
ELL	41	53	61	44	53	47	41				
ASN	59	64		59	53						
BLK	45	49	45	49	50	21	42				
HSP	53	58	50	54	55	49	54				
WHT	54	54	53	58	54	21	73				
FRL	45	53	53	46	51	33	49				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	461
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

FSA ELA SWD

VE teachers and schedules sometimes hinder math push in instruction. ESE students were not always included into the MTSS math interventions. Mindset is that ESE students are treated with lower expectations. Number of VE students not adequate for the amount of services needed. Not adequate collaborative planning time between all classroom teachers and VE push-in teacher.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Science Achievement

Only 54% of our students are reading proficiently which hinders students ability to read and answer science questions. Students do not have prior knowledge on Science skills. Science is taught at the end of the day and is often the subject that it cut short.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA Achievement

Tier 1 instruction is not consistent through all the classrooms. Teachers need more training in ELA instruction. Instruction not necessarily to the depth of the standard.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Math Learning Gains

4th grade teachers utilized TenMarks and collaboratively planned lessons. Implementation of new Math curriculum. Utilization of district created plans and materials. Implementation of learning scales.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Potential areas of concerns are Course Failure in ELA and Math for fourth grade and Level 1 on statewide assessment in fifth grade.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. ELA Achievement
2. Science Achievement
3. Math Lowest 25th Percentile
4. Math Achievement
5. ESE students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2018-19 and 2019-20 school data, ELA proficiency is 54% which is below the state average of 57%. The district average is 53% however the goal is to increase to 60%, surpassing district and state averages, while focusing on all ELL, ESE, Black, Hispanic, and FRL students.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome of the 2020-21 FSA is to increase ELA Proficiency by 6%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Albright (jennifer.albright@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Also, collaborative analysis of both formative and summative data used to modify and guide instructional decisions provides significant learning gains for our most struggling students. The MTSS process also has been identified as having great results in improving student achievement. Differentiation within the classroom and intervention process will provide students the necessary supports to improve their achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows a correlation between student achievement and rigorous curriculum that is aligned. Additionally schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented can effectively double the speed of learning (William, 2007) (Marzano, 2003).

Action Steps to Implement

Grades Pre-K-5 teachers will be trained in Jan Richardson's Guided Reading.
 Provide additional standard-based professional development on the BEST standards.
 Provide additional planning time for grade level teams to collaboratively plan for upcoming instruction.
 Utilization of the district provided CUPS.
 Ensure teachers are utilizing Read, Write, Talk, and Solve in their daily instruction.
 Provide additional planning and professional development to ensure the full implementation of AVID strategies within ELA instruction.
 Continue to focus on our MTSS program to ensure that the Problem Solving Team collaborates and provides intensive instruction for students.
 Continue the efforts of the ELL and ESE task force to identify student barriers and break them down.
 Ensure the use of common formative assessments and analysis of data to guide instruction and interventions.
 Ensure teachers are utilizing ELA scales and students are tracking their progress.
 Ensure teachers are utilizing the resources and instructional strategies provided by Core Connections.

Person Responsible Jennifer Albright (jennifer.albright@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	From the 2018-19 and 2019-20 school data 64% of students are proficient in mathematics which is above the state average of 63%. The district average is 53% but we want to surpass the district and state with a goal of 64% proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	The outcome for the 2020-21 school year is to increase math proficiency by 3% which will surpass the district and state proficiency levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaboratively we will analyze both formative and summative assessments. We will utilize this data to guide our instruction and differentiate learning for all students. Research also shows that the MTSS model has a large effect size on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a crucial role in differentiating the needs for a diverse group of learners. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to guide instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including students with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

Action Steps to Implement

Staff will teach problem solving and higher order thinking concepts.
 Coaching cycle will focus on applying mathematical shifts.
 Supplemental learning opportunities offered to students who are identified as not proficient and those students that need advancements to extend their learning.
 Students engaged in lesson with high quality questioning and discussion techniques.
 Utilization of the district provided CUPS
 Teachers will utilize Read, Write, Talk, and Solve.
 Provide teachers standards based professional development and planning sessions.
 Provide planning and PD on the integration of AVID strategies into classroom instruction.
 Continue to focus on our MTSS program to ensure that the Problem Solving Team and teachers collaborate to provide interventions for all students.
 Continue the ESE and ELL task force to review data, monitor subgroups, and align instruction based on need.
 Implementation of SuccessMaker for Mathematics interventions.
 Ensure the use of common formative assessments and analysis of data to guide instruction and interventions.
 Utilize NWEA assessment data to guide small group instruction.
 Ensure teachers are utilizing scales and students are tracking their progress.

Person Responsible Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus	Science allows students to explore the natural world and discover new things. Science is an important part of the foundation for all students and builds curiosity and interest in the world around us.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2018-19 FSA science achievement was 52%. In 2020-21 Science achievement will increase 5% to 57% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaboratively we will analyze both formative and summative assessments. We will utilize this data to guide our instruction and differentiate learning for all students. Research also shows that the MTSS model has a large effect size on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a crucial role in differentiating the needs for a diverse group of learners. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to guide instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including students with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)
Action Steps to Implement	
Analyze district wide assessments (NWEA) and utilize to guide instruction.	
Participate in weekly PLC meetings to plan utilizing the district Curriculum Unit Plans.	
Teachers will participate in PD for implementation of AVID strategies in classroom.	
PD offered for differentiation of science content.	
Ensure teachers are utilizing scales and students are tracking their progress.	
Utilization of the district provided CUPS	
Ensure the use of common formative assessments and analysis of data to guide instruction and interventions.	
ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through collaboration with ESOL compliance and RCS.	
Person Responsible	Melissa Henry (melissa.henry@osceolaschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ESSA data showed in 2018-19 that our two lowest performing subgroups are our Black and African American students performing at 49% and our ESE students performing at 42%.

Measurable Outcome: ESSA 2020-21 data for ESE will increase from 42% to 45% and Black and African American will increase from 49% to 53%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rebecca Stevens (rebecca.stevens@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will differentiate instruction and teach small group instruction to provide challenging learning experiences for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum:
 Content- the information and skills that students need to learn
 Process- how students make sense of the content being taught
 Product- how students demonstrate what they have learned
 Affect- The feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in weekly PLC meetings to analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction. Instructional coach's will support PLC's.

Teachers will utilize Ellevation for strategies to differentiate instruction and scaffold instruction.

Students in both subgroups will participate in the MTSS process.

Students will receive interventions based on data from NWEA, DIBELS, and NSGRA.

Teachers will participate in professional development for implementing AVID strategies into instruction.

School Stocktake and MTSS will each take place monthly to analyze data and monitor the progress of these subgroups.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Stevens (rebecca.stevens@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Programs that focus on the whole child by focusing on SEL are proven to foster better test scores and higher graduation rates. By providing a safe environment that focuses on relationship building our students will develop all of the necessary skills to be productive citizens.
Measurable Outcome:	The 2019-20 Panorama survey showed that 39% of our students perceive that they are able to regulate their own emotions well. For the 2020-21 school year 50% of our students will regulate their emotions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beth Dupuis (beth.dupuis@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are diverse in their learning and Social Emotional needs. By providing differentiated SEL instruction we will access their individual learning needs regardless of their prior experiences, knowledge, trauma, etc.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Social and Emotional learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will plan engaging lessons.

Teachers will intentionally plan for team and relationship building lessons.

Teachers will utilize the district provide lesson plans on SEL that are integrated into the curriculum plan.

Teachers and staff will receive training on SEL.

Teachers and staff will participate in Kognito training.

Teachers and staff will participate in cultural bias training's to support the implementation of culturally responsive practices.

Provide classroom guidance lessons that assist with emotional regulation, social awareness, and self-management.

Implementation of school-wide PBIS.

Identification of Tier 2 and 3 students in need of SEL support.

Provide small group, individual, and mental health counseling.

Implementation of Threat team.

Provide professional development on traumatic induced behaviors and trauma informed best practices.

Panorma survey given and data analyzed to guide SEL instruction.

Person Responsible Beth Dupuis (beth.dupuis@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all students

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A culture that fosters the idea that there is something after high school whether it is college-bound or career based is a culture where students succeed in having the necessary skills to thrive in our world.
Measurable Outcome:	For the 2019-20 school year only 34% of our classrooms were AVID. For the 2020-21 school year 100% of classrooms will be AVID.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Albright (jennifer.albright@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use the integration of AVID to provide our students with the necessary skills to be successful post secondary.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students should be supported in their efforts to reflect on their future and should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to promoting students' aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lesson students alone (Poliner & Lieber 2014.)

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development to grades K-5 on the implementation of AVID strategies.
 Students will be immersed in an environment that foster post secondary college and career readiness.
 Participate in career exploration.
 Teachers will utilize AVID strategies to enhance study skills and promote goal setting.
 Administration and guidance will plan activities where students can develop their voice.
 Teachers will implement team building activities into classroom instruction to provide necessary skills for students' futures.
 Students will explore different college and career opportunities.

Person Responsible Jennifer Albright (jennifer.albright@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The team will be meeting monthly to complete the Stocktake process and then we will be meeting weekly during leadership meetings to discuss all areas of focus.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created by the district. Teachers meet in weekly PLC's where they discuss student progress and plan for instruction as a collaborative team.

Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures and provide feedback to students.

All of our faculty and staff work together to ensure that our students are rewarded for actively demonstrating our STARS expectations; Safe at all times, Take Responsibility, Active Listeners, Respect Yourself and Others, and Strive for Success. Furthermore, all faculty and staff at Sunrise Elementary consistently model and practice our expectations towards each other, our students, and all stakeholders. We work to include all stakeholders via yearly events such as Kindness/Respect family nights, academic exploration nights, holiday events, newsletters, and social media. Upon doing so, we as a community are assisting all of our students to be successful at achieving our STARS expectations, which are lifelong skills while also creating a positive school culture. ISS/OSS and referral data is analyzed by both the Problem solving team and the PBIS team and utilized to make intervention decisions.

Administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support necessary for success. The school has many opportunities for staff to assume leadership roles. Examples, PLC Lead, Grade level chair, model for other teachers, PBIS team, etc.

The school has a parent engagement plan that was created as a staff. Parents are able to participate in the SAC council as well. By seeking input from the families and communities we can utilize this information and form a bond with the stakeholders by earning trust. It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically undeserved students.

Teachers and staff receive multiple training's on Social Emotional learning as well. Teachers participate in an interactive simulation called Kognito. Guidance counselors teach SEL and safety lessons in all classrooms throughout the year.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$13,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	700-Other Expenses	0958 - Sunrise Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$13,000.00
			<i>Notes: Teachers will receive training on Guided Reading. Corrective Reading Materials purchased for classroom teachers. Targeted students will receive remediation based on needs.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$8,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	700-Other Expenses	0958 - Sunrise Elementary School	Title, I Part A	860.0	\$8,000.00
			<i>Notes: Math Manipulatives to support math instruction to help ensure high math learning gains. Targeted students will receive math remediation identified by need provided by instructional personnel.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0958 - Sunrise Elementary School	General Fund		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Training on science standards and instruction for 5th grade teachers.</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$4,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	700-Other Expenses	0958 - Sunrise Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: Remediation provided by classroom teachers.</i>			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	700-Other Expenses	0958 - Sunrise Elementary School	General Fund		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Materials purchased for SEL curriculum.</i>			
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all students				\$9,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	700-Other Expenses	0958 - Sunrise Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$9,000.00
			<i>Notes: Training provided for K-5 teachers on AVID strategies.</i>			
Total:						\$37,000.00