Sunrise Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sunrise Elementary School

375 MARION OAKS CRSE, Ocala, FL 34473

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Catherine Balius

Start Date for this Principal: 11/26/2018

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: C (42%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Marion 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

Sunrise Elementary School

375 MARION OAKS CRSE, Ocala, FL 34473

[no web address on file]

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	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	77%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

At Sunrise Elementary, staff, parents, and the Marion Oaks Community work together to empower all students to apply their acquired skills and knowledge. By providing a safe and optimum learning environment, promoting high standards and expectations, and engaging in meaningful, active, lifelong learning through authentic literacy, students will learn the skills and tools needed to become successful and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Sunrise Elementary is to provide the foundation necessary using rigorous learning through critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and communication, in order to prepare students to be successful, lifelong learners of the 21st century.

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
Robledo, Natalia	Principal	Instructional leader
Woods, Shawn	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader
Adams, Veva	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader
Brown, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Coach and mentor teachers, provide professional development, assist with small group instruction - math
Davis, Gillian	Dean	Oversees discipline
Gallagher, Teresa	School Counselor	Meets with students and families, MTSS process, mental health
Davis, Jane	Instructional Coach	Coach and mentor teachers, provide professional development, assist with small group instruction - reading and writing

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 11/26/2018, Catherine Balius

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.*

1

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

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: C (42%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	76	141	139	145	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	16	89	75	82	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
One or more suspensions	8	15	8	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	1	14	21	26	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
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	

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	0	18	19	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	1	9	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/23/2020

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	84	157	147	188	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	726
Attendance below 90 percent	0	50	34	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	1	10	16	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	36	24	29	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

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	0	46	42	53	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195

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	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	84	157	147	188	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	726
Attendance below 90 percent	0	50	34	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	1	10	16	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	36	24	29	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

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	0	46	42	53	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195

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	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	41%	47%	57%	49%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	56%	58%	61%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	52%	53%	55%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	40%	51%	63%	55%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	58%	62%	61%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	49%	51%	55%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	47%	53%	0%	51%	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	37%	44%	-7%	58%	-21%
	2018	37%	46%	-9%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	49%	-9%	58%	-18%
	2018	37%	43%	-6%	56%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	33%	49%	-16%	62%	-29%
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	62%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	54%	-10%	64%	-20%
	2018	41%	47%	-6%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
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	21	35	20	29	59						
ELL	30	40	50	35	42	36					
BLK	31	31		31	47						
HSP	41	46	47	40	44	31					
MUL	53			64							
WHT	48	50		44	53						
FRL	40	43	45	38	46	42					
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	26	26	8	26	21	15					
ELL	28	36		29	16						
BLK	28	37	32	39	35	25					
HSP	38	47	33	42	30	11					
WHT	47	43		56	33						
FRL	36	41	26	45	31	18					
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	14	45	36	21	53	46					

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
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
ELL	33	50		42	44						
BLK	43	57		49	53						
HSP	48	53	50	56	56	50					
MUL	60	70		80	80						
WHT	55	68	55	58	71	58					
FRL	43	56	50	52	59	46					

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	315
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	59
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	49
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	45
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.

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile - Last year, changes in teachers created shuffling of students. This lead to identified student movement, creating instability and high class sizes.

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

Math Achievement SNE dropped from 46% to 40% -This was due to students with academic gaps from previous grade levels. Also changes in teachers created shuffling of students, instability, high class size, and mobility of students. in particular low performance in 3rd grade caused average to be low with the other grades with increase
percentages.

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.

Math Achievement has the biggest gap. As stated above, changes in teachers created shuffling of students, instability, high class size, mobility of students.

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

Math Lowest 25th Percentile - We were able to identify students early and were able to obtain a strong math teacher. Our focus was the retained students. We saw results.

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

With 134 students at less than 90 percent attendance this would be our area of concern.

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

1. Math Achievement
2. ELA Achievement
3. Lowest 25th Percentile
4. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Developing and delivering authentic literacy across all curriculums: The federal subgroups, African Americans (35%) and students with disability (40%) will reach the target federal index of 41%, as measured by the 2019-2020 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	If we focus on developing and delivering quality, authentic literacy across all curriculums, with differentiated strategies then the federal subgroups, Blacks/African American (35%) and students with disability (40%) will reach the target federal index of 41%, as measured by the 2020-2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shawn Woods (shawn.woods@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Learning Focused Strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Learning Focused Model developed by Max Thompson, utilizes strategies from Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J.(2001) Classroom instruction that works: research-based strategies for increasing student achievement. ASCD (www.learningfocused.com)

Action Steps to Implement

1. CKLA multi-cultural and multi-curricular stories and activities will be used to connect content areas of Math and Science to authentic literacy experiences in ELA.

Person Responsible	Shawn Woods (shawn.woods@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Literacy and Math CASs will use the Transformation Coaching Model and provide planning support to teachers in core content areas.

Person Responsible	Shawn Woods (shawn.woods@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improving the MTSS process and providing interventions with fidelity: ELA will increase in 3rd grade from 37% to 40% and 4th grade from 40% to 43%, and Math will increase in 3rd grade from 33% to 36% and 4th grade from 44% to 47% as measured by the 2020-2021 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	If we utilize the MTSS process and provide interventions with fidelity, then student proficiency in the areas of ELA will increase in 3rd grade from 37% to 40% and 4th grade from 40% to 43%, and Math will increase in 3rd grade from 33% to 36% and 4th grade from 44% to 47% as measured by the 2020-2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Veva Adams (veva.adams@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	District approved MTSS interventions such as Corrective Reading, Reading Mastery, EIR, CKLA ARG, and Phonics for Reading.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	District approved MTSS interventions

Action Steps to Implement

1. During ongoing PMP meetings, data will be collected by the MTSS Teachers and analyzed for efficacy and next steps/needs assessment.

Person Responsible	Veva Adams (veva.adams@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Teachers will have a 50-minute common planning time daily to review items such as: MTSS data, classroom observation data, student portfolio work, and formative assessment data to determine efficacy of instruction and interventions to apply any necessary instructional adjustments based on student needs.

Person Responsible	Veva Adams (veva.adams@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Fund supplemental curriculum, materials, and resources to implement ongoing interventions based on student need.

Person Responsible	Veva Adams (veva.adams@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Building engaging hands-on activities through the STEAM initiative: ELA learning gains will increase in retained 3rd grade and 4th grade from 43% to 46% and Math learning gains will increase in retained 3rd grade and 4th grade from 49% to 52% as measured by the 2020-2021 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	If we continue to build engaging hands on activity through the STEAM initiative, ELA learning gains will increase in retained 3rd grade and 4th grade from 43% to 46% and Math learning gains will increase in retained 3rd grade and 4th grade from 49% to 52% as measured by the 2020-2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Natalia Robledo (natalia.robledo@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	STEAM inquiry-based learning allows students to explore learning utilizing the 4 C's - Communication, Collaboration, Creativity, and Critical Thinking.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	STEAM inquiry-based learning allows students to explore learning utilizing the 4 C's - Communication, Collaboration, Creativity, and Critical Thinking.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Literacy and Math CASs and Instructional Coach will provide coaching and professional development to teachers in the STEAM process (collaboration, creativity, communication, and critical thinking), as well as creating engaging hands-on STEAM activities.

Person Responsible	Natalia Robledo (natalia.robledo@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Students will have access to the STEAM based, 21st CCLC after school and summer program, giving priority to students who are 3rd grade retention and/or insufficient learning gains in the areas of ELA, Math and Science.

Person Responsible	Natalia Robledo (natalia.robledo@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, volunteers and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:
• A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
• Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
• Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
• Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;
• Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
• Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
• Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different modalities (online and paper based) of communication with to our families such as phone, email, Dojo and/or Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal and school marquee.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**