

The School District of Lee County

Sunshine 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	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	28

Sunshine Elementary School

601 SARA AVE N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://sun.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Erin Brandao

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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 (50%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Lee 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	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

Sunshine Elementary School

601 SARA AVE N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://sun.leeschools.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 PK-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	89%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

To ensure the development of successful lifelong learners who are dedicated to bright futures.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sunshine, Where Bright Futures Begin

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
Gibson, Cherry	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in the building. * Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development. * Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible. * Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process. * Conduct classroom walk-throughs to monitor fidelity. * Analyze schoolwide data to determine areas of need.
Petrekin, Teri-Ann	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in the building. * Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development. * Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible. * Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process. * Conduct classroom walk-throughs to monitor fidelity. * Analyze schoolwide data to determine areas of need.
Eaton, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, and differentiated instruction. * Implement supplemental and intensive interventions. * Model lessons. * Teach small groups daily. * Collect school-wide data for teams to use in determining at-risk students. * Coach teachers in effective teaching skills * Leads weekly PLC's
Farmer, Michele	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, and differentiated instruction. * Implement supplemental and intensive interventions. * Model lessons. * Teach small groups daily. * Collect school-wide data for teams to use in determining at-risk students. * Coach teachers in effective teaching skills * Leads weekly PLCs
Beasley, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, and differentiated instruction. * Implement supplemental and intensive interventions. * Model lessons. * Teach small groups daily. * Collect school-wide data for teams to use in determining at-risk

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		students. *Coach teachers in effective teaching skills
Hart, Mary	SAC Member	Volunteer that comes in and helps with various tasks.

Brandao, Erin	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in the building. * Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development. * Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible. * Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process. * Conduct classroom walk-throughs to monitor fidelity. * Analyze schoolwide data to determine areas of need.
---------------	---------------------	--

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/26/2017, Erin Brandao

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.*

3

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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 (50%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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	159	156	136	163	160	195	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	969
Attendance below 90 percent	15	26	14	16	26	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	1	5	1	30	18	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Course failure in Math	20	4	1	16	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	2	5	1	20	25	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 10/25/2020

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	150	154	151	196	196	211	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1058
Attendance below 90 percent	30	25	23	31	28	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
One or more suspensions	4	8	7	8	23	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	16	31	41	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	64	58	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199

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	7	10	10	44	37	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139

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	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	150	154	151	196	196	211	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1058
Attendance below 90 percent	30	25	23	31	28	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
One or more suspensions	4	8	7	8	23	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	16	31	41	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	64	58	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199

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	7	10	10	44	37	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139

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	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	45%	57%	57%	45%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	58%	51%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	50%	53%	53%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	52%	62%	63%	56%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	65%	62%	57%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	54%	51%	54%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	52%	53%	46%	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	49%	58%	-9%	58%	-9%
	2018	40%	55%	-15%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	55%	-12%	58%	-15%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
	2018	38%	52%	-14%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	61%	-6%	62%	-7%
	2018	35%	58%	-23%	62%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	62%	-6%	64%	-8%
	2018	49%	58%	-9%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
05	2019	42%	58%	-16%	60%	-18%
	2018	51%	57%	-6%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	37%	50%	-13%	53%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	38%	52%	-14%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	15	44	42	23	34	29	24				
ELL	34	53	47	43	54	44	22				
BLK	38	45	61	43	54	63	34				
HSP	42	53	48	51	57	50	35				
MUL	57	50		57	64		60				
WHT	53	60	57	63	63	47	49				
FRL	39	50	56	48	55	49	33				
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	10	31	27	15	30	19	15				
ELL	26	43	50	28	37	38	7				
BLK	36	44	48	38	42	36	33				
HSP	40	50	49	44	49	34	35				
MUL	42	35		75	56						
WHT	47	42	60	57	47	23	57				
FRL	38	46	49	44	47	34	37				
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	17	43	42	31	41	45	25				
ELL	21	38	43	35	60	60	25				
BLK	37	50	54	49	56	54	29				
HSP	41	50	56	53	57	55	43				
MUL	61	46		70	62						
WHT	59	54	46	65	54	42	66				
FRL	41	49	51	53	57	51	41				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
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	51
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	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
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	56
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	48
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.

The data components that showed the lowest performance in the 2018-2019 school year are Learning Gains in the lowest 25% in 4th Grade Math and Proficiency in 5th Grade English Language Arts. In the 2016-2017 school year, 57% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in 4th grade math. In the 2017-2018, 25% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in 4th grade math. We increased by 7 points in the 2018-2019 school, however we are significantly below compared to the district average and previous years' data. Students in the 1A and 1B Bucket in 4th grade math did not show gains. In the 2016-2017 school year 47% of 5th grade students were proficient. In the 2017-2018 school year, 38% of 5th grade students were proficient. In the 2018-2019 school year, 38% of 5th grade students were proficient. In 2018-2019, only 18% (12/66) of the level 2 students moved to a level 3 or higher in 5th grade ELA Proficiency. In both 2017-2018 & 2018-2019, Read 180 was taught to the level 2 students during the intervention block. This is a below-level intervention program that supports students in comprehension and vocabulary. In both school years, the trend data showed teachers

needed additional support in targeting specific grade level standards during the core and intervention block.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school year is Learning Gains in 3rd Grade ELA. Compared to previous years' data, we decreased 7 points from 75% to 68%. Also, in 5th grade Math Proficiency decreased 9 points from 51% to 42%. Learning gains in 3rd grade are compiled from a very small number of students. The drop in the percent is a difference of one student not making a learning gain. The biggest factor would be the tutoring attendance. Out of the five students not making learning gains, three did not attend tutoring. Fifth grade math proficiency declined due to twenty-four level three and four students who did not sustain proficiency. This amounted to 12% of the 5th grade students tested in math. The contributing factor of this decline is the lack of focus on conceptual understanding of math key concepts as opposed to the rudimentary practice of procedural skills. Another factor is the addition of science instruction in the math block. Fifth grade teachers continue to need support in incorporating both science and math in the allotted time for optimal results.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average is 5th Grade Proficiency in Math and ELA. Compared to the state's average there is an eighteen point difference in ELA and Math. The state average in ELA Proficiency is 56% whereas Sunshine's average is 38%. The state average in Math Proficiency is 60% and Sunshine's average is 42%. In ELA & Math, level two students did not make a learning gain move to proficiency and we did not sustain the proficiency of level three students. A factor contributing to this gap is our intervention focus. All school-wide structured intervention is in reading and tutoring is not offered to level three math and ELA students. ELA proficiency has been trending below the state average since 2014-2015. A contributing factor to this gap over the past five years is the lack of school readiness of students when they enter kindergarten and the need for more emphasis on standards-based instruction that builds towards proficiency.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement in the 2018-2019 school year are Learning Gains in 4th Grade Math and Learning Gains in the lowest 25% in 4th Grade ELA. In 4th Grade Math, we increased 18 points from 45% to 63% in the 2018-2019 school year. In 4th Grade ELA, we increased 15 points from 35% to 50% in the 2018-2019 school year. The new actions taken during the 2018-2019 school year were in the areas of tutoring and reading intervention. Subject area experts planned quality tutoring lessons based on heavily tested FSA standards. All students in levels 1 & 2 were invited to participate in tutoring, which was a change from the year before. Reading intervention began in August during the 2018-2019 school year rather than October in the 2017-2018 school year. This provided an additional two months for standards based reading intervention. Additional actions taken during the 2018-2019 school year were the implementation of AVID strategies in 3rd - 5th grade. Also, every teacher was trained in incorporating High Yield Strategies in their daily lessons. Teachers effectively utilized formative assessment data to enrich and extend standards.

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

An area of concern is the number of students that scored a level 1 on the FSA. There were 138 students that scored a level one the Florida Standards Assessments (FSA).

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

1. Increase proficiency in ELA
2. Increase proficiency in Math
3. Increase proficiency in Science
4. Increase learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA (5th grade and 3rd grade retention)
5. Increase learning gains for the lowest 25% in Math (5th grade)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the 2018-19 school year, 52% of students demonstrated improvement for ELA Learning Gains based on the Florida Standards Assessment. A major theme is that we need to improve student proficiency in all areas of English Language Arts. We will be focusing on the students below grade level. The root cause is lack of foundational reading skills such as decoding, phonics, comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency. Also, all students need to receive rigorous standards-based instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Sunshine Elementary will increase the percentage of students making learning gains in ELA from 52% to 54% as measured by the ELA portion of the Spring 2020 Florida Standards Assessment. The outcomes will be measured by quarterly i-Ready and STAR tests, district assessments, and grade level assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. High Yield Strategies - examples include: Higher Order Thinking, Distributed Summarizing, Numbered Heads Together, and Reading Comprehension Instruction 2. Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) 3. Standards-Based Instruction 4. Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) 5. Kagan Cooperative Learning 6. Researched-based Intervention programs (iReady, SRA, Read 180, System 44, ReadWell, Really Great Reading) 7. Professional Learning Communities (PLC)their progress 8. Monthly PLCs (Administration, ESe teachers, ESE chair) 9. Monthly meetings to track student progress
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The following strategies, High Yield Strategies, AVID, Kagan, and MTSS are researched-based and prove to raise student learning and achievement significantly. High Yield strategies has a greater than average influence on student achievement. Each intervention program has a systematic approach to target specific student need and includes the 5 components of reading.

Action Steps to Implement

1. High yield strategies - Examples include: Higher Order Thinking, Distributed Summarizing, Numbered Heads Together, and Reading Comprehension Instruction. High Yield are incorporated in daily lessons.
2. Designated Intervention Time - The master schedule includes an uninterrupted hour of intervention each day for Reading instruction. Students are grouped based on i-Ready and STAR data. Students are provided intervention and/or enrichment on the following intervention programs: Read180, System 44, SRA, i-Ready, ReadWell, and Really Great Reading.
3. Academic Coaching Team - Resource teachers provide support during the intervention block for ELL, ESE, Bottom 25%, and students performing below grade level.
4. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) - PLCs review formative and summative assessment data, discuss best practices, review the EWS, and plan for whole and small group instruction using the High Yield Strategies. Data is tracked in weekly PLC meeting and used to guide small-group intervention.
5. Standards-based data instruction - Curriculum maps and instructional guides are used in daily instruction. PLCs review the curriculum maps/guides in their weekly PLC and planning meetings. The

guides/maps are also attached to the teacher's lesson plan.

6. Research-Based Reading Strategies - Research based strategies are used in daily instruction by following the curriculum maps and instructional guides.

7. Data Conferences (Teacher & Administration) - Administration meets quarterly to discuss i-Ready and STAR data, as well as progress towards their goals.

8. AVID - All 2nd-5th grade classrooms use AVID strategies on a daily basis. AVID strategies include WICOR. (W - Writing, I - Inquiry, C - Collaboration, O - Organization, R - Reading to Learn)

9. MTSS - The process is streamlined so we can effectively use resources to increase student achievement and determine the areas of support based on Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. There is also a system in place to collect and track weekly data points.

Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, and differentiated instruction.

- * Implement supplemental and intensive interventions.

- * Model lessons.

- * Teach small groups daily.

- * Collect school-wide data for teams to use in determining at-risk students.

- *Coach teachers in effective teaching skills

Person Responsible Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	For the 2018-19 school year, 45% of students demonstrated proficiency in Kindergarten through 2nd Grade on the STAR Reading Assessment. A major theme is that the majority of our K-2 students are making learning gains, but are not proficient.. We will be focusing on the students below grade level. The root cause is the lack of school readiness and background knowledge in Kindergarten. Students in 1st and 2nd grade continue to need remediation in basic phonics skills.
Measurable Outcome:	Sunshine Elementary will increase the percentage of proficient KG-2nd Grade students, from 45% to 47%, as measured by the Spring 2020 STAR Reading Assessment. The outcomes will be measured by quarterly i-Ready and STAR tests, district assessments, and grade level assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. High Yield Strategies - examples include: Higher Order Thinking, Distributed Summarizing, Numbered Heads Together, and Reading Comprehension Instruction 2. Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) 3. Standards-Based Instruction 4. Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) 5. Kagan Cooperative Learning 6. Researched-based Intervention programs (iReady, SRA, Read 180, System 44, ReadWell, Really Great Reading) 7. Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The following strategies, High Yield Strategies, AVID, Kagan, and MTSS are researched-based and prove to raise student learning and achievement significantly. High Yield strategies has a greater than average influence on student achievement. Each intervention program has a systematic approach to target specific student need and includes the 5 components of reading.

Action Steps to Implement

1. High yield strategies - Examples include: Higher Order Thinking, Distributed Summarizing, Numbered Heads Together, and Reading Comprehension Instruction. High Yield are incorporated in daily lessons.
2. Designated Intervention Time - The master schedule includes an uninterrupted hour of intervention each day for Reading instruction. Students are grouped based on i-Ready and STAR data. Students are provided intervention and/or enrichment on the following intervention programs: Read180, System 44, SRA, i-Ready, ReadWell, and Really Great Reading.
3. Academic Coaching Team - Resource teachers provide support during the intervention block for ELL, ESE, Bottom 25%, and students performing below grade level.
4. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) - PLCs review formative and summative assessment data, discuss best practices, review the EWS, and plan for whole and small group instruction using the High Yield Strategies. Data is tracked in weekly PLC meeting and used to guide small-group intervention.
5. Standards-based data instruction - Curriculum maps and instructional guides are used in daily instruction. PLCs review the curriculum maps/guides in their weekly PLC and planning meetings. The guides/maps are also attached to the teacher's lesson plan.
6. Research-Based Reading Strategies - Research based strategies are used in daily instruction by following the curriculum maps and instructional guides.
7. Data Conferences (Teacher & Administration) - Administration meets quarterly to discuss i-Ready and

STAR data, as well as progress towards their goals.

8. AVID - All 2nd-5th grade classrooms use AVID strategies on a daily basis. AVID strategies include WICOR. (W - Writing, I - Inquiry, C - Collaboration, O - Organization, R - Reading to Learn)

9. MTSS - The process is streamlined so we can effectively use resources to increase student achievement and determine the areas of support based on Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. There is also a system in place to collect and track weekly data points.

Monitoring occurs at PLC's, via i-Ready data, formative assessments, and standards tracking.

Person Responsible Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

For the 2018-2019 school year, 52% of the students in third through 5th grade were proficient in Math. A major theme was that our level 2B math students did not make expected gains on the FSA and move to proficiency..

Measurable Outcome:

Sunshine Elementary will increase proficiency from 52% to 54% as measured by the Spring 2020 Math Florida Standards Assessment. The outcomes will be measured by quarterly i-Ready and STAR tests, district assessments, and grade level assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. High Yield Strategies - examples include: Higher Order Thinking, Distributed Summarizing, Numbered Heads Together, and Reading Comprehension Instruction
2. Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID)
3. Standards-Based Instruction
4. Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)
5. Kagan Cooperative Learning
6. Researched-based math Intervention programs
7. Professional Learning Communities (PLC)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The following strategies, High Yield Strategies, AVID, Kagan, and MTSS are researched-based and prove to raise student learning and achievement significantly. High Yield strategies has a greater than average influence on student achievement. Each intervention program has a systematic approach to target specific student need and includes the 5 components of reading.

Action Steps to Implement

1. High yield strategies - Examples include: Higher Order Thinking, Distributed Summarizing, Numbered Heads Together, and Reading Comprehension Instruction. High Yield are incorporated in daily lessons.
2. Designated Intervention Time - The master schedule includes an uninterrupted hour of intervention each day for Reading instruction. Students are grouped based on i-Ready and STAR data. Students are provided intervention and/or enrichment on the following intervention programs: Read180, System 44, SRA, i-Ready, ReadWell, and Really Great Reading. This improves math proficiency since students need to be able to read in order to solve math problems.
3. Academic Coaching Team - Resource teachers provide support during the intervention block for ELL, ESE, Bottom 25%, and students performing below grade level.
4. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) - PLCs review formative and summative assessment data, discuss best practices, review the EWS, and plan for whole and small group instruction using the High Yield Strategies. Data is tracked in weekly PLC meeting and used to guide small-group intervention.
5. Standards-based data instruction - Curriculum maps and instructional guides are used in daily instruction. PLCs review the curriculum maps/guides in their weekly PLC and planning meetings. The guides/maps are also attached to the teacher's lesson plan.
6. Research-Based Math Strategies - Research based strategies are used in daily instruction by following the curriculum maps and instructional guides. Other math strategies and research based REFLEX Math, SMATH Smarts, and HCPSS.
7. Data Conferences (Teacher & Administration) - Administration meets quarterly to discuss i-Ready and STAR data, as well as progress towards their goals.
8. AVID - All 2nd-5th grade classrooms use AVID strategies on a daily basis. AVID strategies include WICOR. (W - Writing, I - Inquiry, C - Collaboration, O - Organization, R - Reading to Learn)

9. MTSS - The process is streamlined so we can effectively use resources to increase student achievement and determine the areas of support based on Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. There is also a system in place to collect and track weekly data points.

Monitoring occurs at PLC's, via i-Ready data, formative assessments, and standards tracking.

Person Responsible Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In the 2018-19 school year, 65 students in the Early Warning System (EWS) received one or more out of school suspension. Students in the early warning system continue to need self-regulation skills and a major theme is lack of instruction due to being out of the classroom because of behavior.

Measurable Outcome: Sunshine Elementary will decrease the number of students in the Early Warning System (EWS) receiving OSS from 65 to 55 as measured by SESIR reported to District Support Application System by May 2020

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Positive Behavior Intervention & Supports (PBiS)
2. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Positive Behavior Intervention & Supports (PBiS) improves social emotional and academic outcomes for all students. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is a systemic, continuous-improvement framework in which data-based problem solving and decision-making is practiced across all levels of the educational system for supporting students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PBIS Supports are in place to promote school-wide positive behavior. Each student has a Scholar Card and will earn rewards when they display positive behavior. This will reinforce our school-wide expectations of being safe, respectful & responsible.
2. Behavior plans tied to MTSS are monitored with the MTSS team to ensure each student's unique needs are met and addressed for positive behavior supports socially, emotionally, and/or academically.
3. School Counselor meets with at-risk students during the school day and reviews social skills with students. The school counselor provides responsive services and referrals including individual and small group counseling. The school counselor also teaches whole group developmental lessons and bully prevention lessons. The school counselors teacher and parent collaboration support.
4. Save One Student (S.O.S) Mentoring Program - Adults at Sunshine mentors students with 5 or more discipline referrals the previous school year. Mentors check-in with students each week, which allows the mentor to develop a positive relationship with the students. There are also events held at various times throughout the year to celebrate the relationship. Mentors are encouraged to take a personal interest in the student and are attend events for the students outside of school to show support.
5. Child Study Team identifies students in the Early Warning System to develop school based social and emotional supports for students. The team consists of the social worker, MTTS intervention specialist, behavior specialist, guidance counselor, classroom teacher, and the administrator team.

Person Responsible: Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the 2018-2019 School Year, there were 80 students with 90% or less absences according to the EWS data. Student achievement is impacted when students are not in school. Teachers are required to contact parents when students miss three or more consecutive days. Also, the school social worker reaches out by contacting parents, sending home parent notices, conducting home visits, and wellness checks. Quarterly Perfect and/or Improved Attendance Celebrations are also used as an incentive for students.
Measurable Outcome:	Sunshine Elementary will decrease the percentage of chronically absent students (below 90%) from 8% to 7% as measured by the CASTLE early warning system by May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Positive Behavior Intervention & Supports (PBiS) 2. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Behavior Intervention & Supports (PBiS) improves social emotional and academic outcomes for all students. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is a systemic, continuous-improvement framework in which data-based problem solving and decision-making is practiced across all levels of the educational system for supporting students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Quarterly Perfect Attendance recognition/celebration
2. Parent Contact/Meetings held quarterly for those students that have too many absences
3. School Social Worker monitors attendance on a frequent basis and contacts parents to ensure the student attends school
4. School Social Worker's Lunch Bunch
5. Clear expectations for teachers to communicate/notify social worker and/or parents when students are absent 3 or more consecutive days
6. Engaging classroom instruction
7. Creating a welcoming and caring environment for students and parents
8. Full Time Intervention Support Specialist to monitor student attendance and academic progress
9. Morning Meetings with students to build character and growth mindset

Person Responsible Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Fifth grade math proficiency continues to be an Area of Focus, the most recent FSA results indicated a decline in proficiency due to twenty-four level three and four students who did not sustain proficiency. This amounted to 12% of the 5th grade students tested in math. The contributing factor of this decline is the lack of focus on conceptual understanding of math key concepts as opposed to the rudimentary practice of procedural skills. Another factor is the addition of science instruction in the math block. Fifth grade teachers continue to need support in incorporating both science and math in the allotted time for optimal results. The school leadership team will ensure teams continue to work with the Instructional Guides and Pacing to ensure students have standards-based instruction, concentrating on the Achievement Level Descriptors to assess where students are academically. Sunshine Elementary's 5th grade students also have an opportunity to receive weekly Science Lab instruction in addition to their daily Science block to support the teacher's allotted time for Science instruction within the Math/ Science block.

The school leadership team has also identified the data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average is 5th Grade Proficiency in Math and ELA. Compared to the state's average there is an eighteen point difference in ELA and Math. The state average in ELA Proficiency is 56% whereas Sunshine's average is 38%. The state average in Math Proficiency is 60% and Sunshine's average is 42%. In ELA & Math, level two students did not make a learning gain move to proficiency and we did not sustain the proficiency of level three students. By having teachers ensure students have standards-based instruction, concentrating on the Achievement Level Descriptors to assess where students are academically, and then a plan for differentiating instruction, learning gains will be monitored throughout the school year with iReady Diagnostic checks. Weekly PLCs will allow teams to analyze current data, plan for small group instruction, and address weak standards individually, as well as a grade level in both ELA and Math.

SWD subgroup is an area of Focus. Root Cause Analyses will be conducted to examine correlations between instructional practices and student performance data. Correlations between grades and iReady performance will be conducted every progress monitoring period to determine if daily student work (assignments, class assessments, etc.) matches the level of rigor required for success on iReady and FSA

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.

Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs' assessment by attending SAC meetings, curriculum nights, and AVID night. Monthly SAC meetings, comprised of teachers, staff members, parents, community and business members, are held to disseminate information to parents from the district as well as ongoing school-wide information. SAC Meetings are held at various times throughout the school year to accommodate parents. At the end of each SAC meeting, an exit slip is provided to all parents and stakeholders. They can comment on anything they feel needs to be improved and/or changed at the school.

Sunshine Elementary hosts two curriculum opportunities, Reading and Math nights, where teachers educate parents on standards students need to master throughout the school year.

Parents, students, teachers, and community partners are engaged in the needs assessment in a variety of ways. A survey is completed by parents and other stakeholders. The survey is available in English, Spanish and Haitian Creole. Newsletters, School Messenger Phone calls, and other communication is also translated.

Student group data for all student groups including regular ed, ESE, gifted, ELLs, L25, educationally disadvantaged and historically underserved, is shared and participants are asked to help identify school needs. Stakeholders will participate as the result of invitations through the school newsletter, School Messenger, Peach Jar, personal phone calls, personal invitations, flexible meeting times, and traditional flyers sent home in advance of the event. Business and community members are involved in the SAC meetings, as well as special events held at the school.

Input from stakeholders will be collected through surveys, exit tickets, open discussions, email, and Parent Messenger. These communications will be flexible in format such as online, in person or on paper, allowing for all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages and simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data will be used to identify school needs and create a plan.

Stakeholders are invited to planning meetings to help design schoolwide plans. Implementation of the plans happens during the school year. Evaluation of the school wide plans happen at the end of the year. The 1% set aside for parent involvement is determined with the help of parents, the parent involvement specialist, and administration.

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	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00