

Broward County Public Schools

Sunshine Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Sunshine Elementary School

7737 LASALLE BLVD, M IR Amar, FL 33023

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Denise Dorsett

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2007

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Broward 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	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Sunshine Elementary School

7737 LASALLE BLVD, M IR Amar, FL 33023

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

School Grades History

	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Year				
Grade		C	C	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

Our Sunshine Family will provide meaningful learning communities, staff development, and parent trainings to increase authentic engagement and student achievement.
Together we learn. Together we thrive.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Sunshine Elementary School is to unlock the full potential of every student to succeed in tomorrow's world.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Aaron, Donna	Principal	Principal duties and responsibilities consist of overseeing the curriculum and instruction of the school. As the instructional leader, the principal will ensure that teachers are teaching grade level standards in all content areas with rigor and student engagement. The principal will also oversee the safety and security of the building. Ms. Aaron will also evaluate curriculum and instruction of all instructional staff members. Ms. Aaron will also use coaches to help teachers improve their teaching practices. Ms. Aaron will work with Assistant Principal, team leaders, and support staff to plan for curriculum in all subject areas, help with progress monitoring. She is also charged with creating a school climate that is conducive to learning.
Dorsett, Denise	Assistant Principal	Ms. Dorsett will assist the principal with overseeing all curriculum expectations and progress monitoring. Ms. Dorsett will also assist with plans for safety and security of the building. Ms. Dorsett works in conjunction with the facilities staff to ensure that the school building is clean and conducive to learning. Ms. Dorsett will work with support team to create needs assessments then help plan PLC, curriculum focus calendars, and professional development to enhance instruction.
Juste, Lindsley	Teacher, ESE	ESE Specialist works with ASD and ESE support facilitator to monitor all ESE students. She ensures that all students in ASD classrooms are receiving grade level content. Mrs. Brown also ensures adherence to each student's EIP plan and tracks progress toward student goals. She creates and maintains high expectations and enthusiasm for learning by infusing critical thinking skills, application skills, interpersonal skills, and technology into an aligned curriculum and assessment process, resulting in measurable student achievement gains for all students in order to meet district and state standards. She serves as a member of the school's RTI team and works to ensure that students receive the support they need to be successful academically, behaviorally and socially.
Motes, Albertha	Reading Coach	Literacy Coach responsibilities-To create and maintain a classroom atmosphere that generates high expectations and enthusiasm for learning by infusing critical thinking skills, application skills, interpersonal skills, and technology into an aligned curriculum and assessment process, resulting in measurable student achievement gains for all students in order to meet district and state standards. She provides professional development, models lessons, assist with scaffolding of standards, conduct data analysis and ensure that literacy block is implemented with fidelity. She serves the leader of the school's RTI team and works to ensure that students receive the support they need to be successful academically, behaviorally and socially.
Miller, Chelsea	School Counselor	Provides support to ESOL and retained students. Assist students with social emotional and behavior needs of the school. She serves as a member of the school's RTI team and works to ensure that students receive the support they need to be successful academically, behaviorally and socially.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2007, Denise Dorsett

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

428

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	73	79	85	90	94	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	521
Attendance below 90 percent	27	25	16	22	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	10	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	2	2	8	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/10/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				53%	59%	57%	59%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	60%	58%	59%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	54%	53%	57%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				67%	65%	63%	70%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	66%	62%	74%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	53%	51%	54%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	46%	53%	59%	49%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	62%	-15%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	59%	-2%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	65%	-3%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	67%	-7%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	77%	64%	13%	60%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	45%	49%	-4%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready Reading and Mathematics were used as our schools progress monitoring tool for students in Kindergarten to fifth grades.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41.1	53.4	52.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	39.7	50.8	44.8
	Students With Disabilities	30	50	40
	English Language Learners	29.4	52.9	33.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	34.7	24.7	39.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	35.1	22	19
	Students With Disabilities	30	40	30
	English Language Learners	35.3	11.8	38.9
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23.4	32.1	41.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.3	28.1	38.7
	Students With Disabilities	8.3	8.3	9.1
	English Language Learners	8.3	8.3	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24.4	14.3	31.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.9	9.5	30
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	9.1
	English Language Learners	25	8.3	33.3

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57.3	53.1	61.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	54.7	49.2	58.7
	Students With Disabilities	16.7	8.3	16.7
	English Language Learners	50	30	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15.9	30	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	15.6	29	44.4
	Students With Disabilities	8.3	0	8.3
	English Language Learners	10	10	33.3
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29.4	25	45.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	24.6	41.7
	Students With Disabilities	25	20	37.5
	English Language Learners	0	0	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17.6	20.9	43.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	15.9	18.6	43.1
	Students With Disabilities	20	18.8	31.3
	English Language Learners	0	25	50

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25.5	27.6	39.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.4	24.4	36
	Students With Disabilities	5.9	5.9	5.9
	English Language Learners	0	0	15.4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22.4	31.6	31.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.5	29.3	32.9
	Students With Disabilities	0	11.8	12.5
	English Language Learners	7.7	15.4	15.4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	11			11	6						
ELL	34	29		27	17	10	22				
BLK	34	26	14	27	13		24				
HSP	45	45		42	30		24				
FRL	34	27	14	31	16		21				
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	30	34	23	37	54	58	28				
ELL	43	43	41	61	70	69	47				
BLK	47	42	38	67	59	59	37				
HSP	64	56		70	75		67				
FRL	52	44	39	66	61	60	44				

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	37	68	79	49	72	67					
ELL	41	43	33	54	75	70					
BLK	56	60	62	67	74	50	48				
HSP	64	55		79	74		76				
WHT	73			82							
FRL	59	60	58	70	75	53	59				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	29
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	232
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	4
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	28
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	24
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	25
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The ELA Progress Monitoring Assessments indicates an increase in proficiency from assessment period 1 to assessment period 2. The School Data Review indicates school average proficiency below the District and the State.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The ELA SWD component showed the lowest proficiency of all subgroups and in need of improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors for ELA SWD improvement are the lack of proficiency and learning gains. Targeted and individualized instruction would be required to help gain proficiency and learning gains. We will support, provide specific feedback, and ensure that we participate in collaborative planning with staff members in order to help them understand and plan standards-based instruction through the use of content specific, complex texts and standards aligned tasks, close-reads, use of text-dependent questions, as well as academic discourse.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data component that showed the most improvement based on the 2019 assessment data was Math learning gains of the lowest 25%. The number of students in this sub-group increased their learning gains from 50% in the 2018 school year to 59 % in the 2019 school year.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Students received targeted instruction. Improvement in this area was accomplished by providing additional support, feedback, and collaborative planning with staff members in order to help them understand and plan standards-based instruction, remediation of deficient standards and enrichment for students.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Use formal and informal assessments to regroup students based on need to identify those students in order to accelerate learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities will include how to plan for and gather resources for accelerated learning.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Professional development will be ongoing with the goal to continuously build capacity to ensure improvement each year. Professional development will be individualized based on teacher need.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: During the 2020 -2021 school year there was a significant decline in students ELA proficiency at our site across all grade levels and socio-economic subgroups in comparison to the 2019 school year. Students also lacked exposure to FSA testing response mechanisms due to virtual instruction. Although historically SWD students have struggled with obtaining an ELA proficiency rate of 41% or higher, the COVID -19 pandemic created a greater divide due to technology concerns and lack of structure and focus of students who primarily received virtual instruction.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, 42% of SWD will score a level 3 or higher on the English Language Arts.

Monitoring: Students will be monitored via i-Ready Diagnostic Assessments and Benchmark Unit Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Albertha Motes (albertha.motes@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: All students will receive grade level appropriate standards based instruction. During instruction we will utilize the five major components of evidenced based reading instruction which are phonemic awareness, systematic phonics instruction, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students must be instructed utilizing grade level standards in order to be successful on all local and state assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will receive professional development on how to effectively scaffold standards based instruction to increase student proficiency.

Person Responsible: Albertha Motes (albertha.motes@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2020 -2021 school year there was a significant decline in students ELA proficiency at our site across all grade levels and socio-economic subgroups in comparison to the 2019 school year. Students also lacked exposure to FSA testing response mechanisms due to virtual instruction. Based upon the 2019 school data less than 41% of our African American students who are in the schools lowest quartile demonstrated learning gains. The COVID -19 pandemic created a greater divide due to technology concerns and lack of structure and focus of students who primarily received virtual instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, 47% of our African American students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.
Monitoring:	Students will be monitored via i-Ready Diagnostic Assessments and Benchmark Unit Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Albertha Motes (albertha.motes@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All students will receive grade level appropriate standards based instruction. During instruction we will utilize the five major components of evidenced -based reading instruction which are phonemic awareness, systematic phonics instruction, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students must be instructed utilizing grade level standards in order to be successful on all local and state assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Sunshine Elementary will build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a positive culture for social and emotional learning, we will see an increase in student achievement and a decrease in student discipline. The specific measurable outcome we would like to see decrease is unruly disruptive behavior. With an increased focus on social skill groups and the new SEL initiative, we anticipate a 10 percent drop in reports of Unruly disruptive behavior from 8 to 7 referrals.

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.

Sunshine Elementary school plans to enhance positive relationships with all stakeholders (parents, community members, students and staff) to fulfill the school's mission. We will support our families through implementing parent night events that focuses on core curriculum such as literacy, math and science. We will also offer activities that are centered around students and families social and emotional well-being. We will also work collaboratively with stakeholders on school beautification projects to promote pride in our school and in our community.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

All stakeholder have a role in promoting a positive school culture. The school administration - provides all stakeholders with the vision for the school, ensures that the school environment is safe and is welcoming and conducive to to learning for all stakeholders. They are also charged with creating academic and social events for families (Parent Night events) to assist families on how they can support student learning outside of the classroom. We invite our parents to actively participate in all school leadership positions such as School Advisory Council, School Advisory Forum, Parent Teacher Organization, Volunteering or by becoming a partner in education.

Instructional staff - forges a personal relationship with parents. They utilize multiple modalities to ensure that there is an open line of communication. They conference with parents at least two times a year. They also participate in school sponsored parent night events.

Non Instructional - The paraprofessional support the classroom teacher by assisting with small groups. The facilities staff ensure that the school is kept clean and is conducive to learning. The office staff - serves as our first line of communication with parents. They ensure that the phones are answered with a cheerful voice, they work expeditiously to guide parents in the right direction when assistance is needed.

Students - our students have many opportunities to be acknowledged in school. We acknowledge students for improved and /or positive behavior, for academic success and/or academic improvements, for exhibiting good character traits to name a few.

Parents - our parents serve as our partner in ensuring that their child receives a quality education. They attend school sponsored parent night events. They serve on school based committees.

Business Partners - we spotlight business partners in our monthly newsletter for their support to the school.

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				\$11,859.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	319-Technology-Related Professional and Technical Services	1171 - Sunshine Elementary School	Title, I Part A	600.0	\$11,859.00
			<i>Notes: i-Ready Site License</i>			
					Total:	\$11,859.00