2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Sunrise Elementary School

1925 HAM BROWN RD
Kissimmee, FL 34746
407-870-4866
www.osceola.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type	Title I	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
Elementary School	Yes	70%

Alternative/ESE Center	Charter School	Minority Rate
No	No	72%

School Grades History

2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11
C	B	A	A

SIP Authority and Template

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

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, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridacims.org. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

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. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. 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: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
    - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
    - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
    - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
    - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
    - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School
Sunrise Elementary School

Principal
John Campbell

School Advisory Council chair
Heidi Dawson

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
John Campbell	Principal
Amy Layton	Assistant Principal

District-Level Information

District
Osceola

Superintendent
Mrs. Melba Luciano

Date of school board approval of SIP
10/15/2013

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

Heidi Dawson (Chairman) - Teacher
Samantha Lee (Secretary) - Parent
Jennifer Rice Palmer - Parent
Marangelie Aviles - Parent
Larry Payne - Parent
Victoria Acevedo - Parent
Debra Edgcomb - Parent
Katrina Moore - Parent
Aleke Sharpe - Parent
Cara Sleik - Parent
John Campbell - Principal
Katie McKenna - Teacher
Christine Diaz - Teacher
Tiffanie Brown - Teacher
Katy Anich - Teacher
Christine Baggett - Teacher
Marilyn Scott - Teacher

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

The SAC starts looking at the coming year with the AdvancED survey results published in the Spring. Parent involvement, student engagement, staff reflection, etc. are looked at and ideas floated. As the data starts coming in, additional feedback comes as to what goals need to be addressed for the coming school year.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

Not involved in activities other than supporting staff development and school-wide student behavior incentives.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

What funds?

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC
In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

Highly Qualified Staff

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

# of administrators
2

 # receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

John Campbell		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 18	Years at Current School: 8
Credentials	B.S. Psychology M.S. Educational Administration	
Performance Record	History at current school reflects 4 years as a "B" and 4 years as an "A"	

Amy Layton		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 0	Years at Current School: 0
Credentials	B.S. Elementary Education M.S. School Counseling, Educational Leadership	
Performance Record	New administrator	

Instructional Coaches

# of instructional coaches

2

 # receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Diane Turner		
Part-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 7	Years at Current School: 7

Areas	Reading/Literacy
Credentials	B.S. Elementary Education M.S. Elementary Education Ph.D. Ed. Leadership E.D. Ed. Leadership
Performance Record	Part of team that has experienced 4 "B's" and 4 "A's" during the last 8 years.

Erin Cummings		
Part-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 1	Years at Current School: 1

Areas	Mathematics, Science
Credentials	B.A. Elementary Education M.A.Elementary Education
Performance Record	Assisted in a school that earned a "B" as state grade.

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers

59

 # receiving effective rating or higher

100, 169%

 # Highly Qualified Teachers

93%

 # certified in-field

59, 100%

 # ESOL endorsed

49, 83%

 # reading endorsed

10, 17%

 # with advanced degrees
10, 17%

 # National Board Certified
3, 5%

 # first-year teachers
4, 7%

 # with 1-5 years of experience
15, 25%

 # with 6-14 years of experience
35, 59%

 # with 15 or more years of experience
9, 15%

Education Paraprofessionals

# of paraprofessionals
22

 # Highly Qualified
22, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel

# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above
1

 # receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies
This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

District Human Resources allocates the units, advertises available positions, and school administrators interview only the Highly Qualified individuals.

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan
This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

Once a teacher is hired, I give the name to my Learning Resource Teacher to conference with to determine what further training or in-servicing will be needed. If they applicant is a graduate from a Florida accredited university, they can be fast tracked with the on-line district requirements. If they are from outside of Florida there are some other state requirements to meet. The grade level chair will take any new hire regardless of experience level to orient them to the particulars of said school. In essence, the chair serves as a peer teacher. This method has served us well at Sunrise Elementary School.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI)

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

1. The Intervention Assistance Team (IAT), composed of the Guidance Counselor, Learning Resource Specialist, Literacy Coach, School Psychologist and Assistant Principal, reviewed the FCAT, SAT and STAR Reading data. The IAT reviewed school wide data in addition to grade level data. Data is reviewed after each test administration by the IAT. Students in the lowest quartile of each grade level were identified to receive interventions. Diagnostic reports were reviewed for each of the students in the lowest quartile in an effort to target the area of weakness and identify the appropriate intervention. Students in Tier 2 receive interventions during the Block Period. Tier 3 students receive interventions during iii time in addition to the tier 2 interventions.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

2. IAT Members, function and responsibilities:
Guidance Counselor- MTSS Coach. The MTSS coach maintains documentation, parent and teacher communication and oversees the development of the MTSS program. The MTSS coach also serves as a grade level contact for 4th and 5th grade, in addition to reviewing and preparing data for monthly reviews.
Literacy Coach- Curriculum Specialist. The Literacy Coach assists in the selection of the intervention curriculum. She serves as a liaison between core curriculum and intervention needs. The Literacy coach also serves as a grade level contact for 1st and 2nd grade, in addition to reviewing and preparing data for monthly reviews.
Learning Resource Specialist- The Learning Resource Specialist serves as a grade level contact for Kindergarten and 3rd grade, in addition to reviewing and preparing data for monthly reviews.
School Psychologist- The School Psychologist serves as a behavior expert and a liaison between District and school communication.
Assistant Principal- The Assistant Principal assists all grade level contacts in a supportive role as well as assists in accountability on behalf of the teachers.

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

3. The IAT meet two times a month to review individual student data and school wide data, if available. Teachers are required to track all data in the MTSS binder that is handed in before the assigned meeting for review. The grade level contacts prepare the binder before the MTSS meeting, notifying the Assistant Principal if support is needed. As identified Tier 2 and Tier 3 students are reviewed the team determines if additional interventions are needed. Through review of the schoolwide data, teachers or the IAT can refer additional students for tier 2 interventions.

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

4. Tier 1 - All students will receive the STAR Assessment four times during the school year to provide information regarding the rate of progress for students in each class and grade level. Additionally, this information provides comparison group data. All students will also be given the Journeys Benchmark/ Unit Assessment administered bi-monthly and the Progress Monitoring Assessment bi-weekly. All class data is maintained in the MTSS binder. Input the Progress Monitoring Assessment scores into the class

level tracker for your class.

Tier 2- In addition to the bi-monthly Benchmark/Unit Assessment and bi-weekly Progress Monitoring Assessment, all students receiving reading interventions will receive the STAR Assessment bi-weekly. This will serve as a basic progress monitoring tool. Instead of the bi-weekly STAR, kindergarten teachers will track letter names and sounds and sight words.

Tier 3 - Students receiving Tier 3 interventions will receive the bi-monthly Benchmark/Unit Assessment, bi-weekly Progress Monitoring Assessment and bi-weekly STAR Assessment, and will also receive weekly progress monitoring specific to their area of difficulty.

Behavior- Behavioral interventions often include a daily behavior chart/folder, reward systems, counseling, etc. Data is tracked and reviewed at the MTSS Monthly meetings. Some classrooms have implemented Class Dojo, an online behavior management system. All class data is maintained in the MTSS binder and reviewed monthly by teacher.

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

5. The IAT reviewed the MTSS Intervention Program with each teacher, including the ESE teachers. The IAT communicates through the MTSS Grade Level contact. Teachers are invited to the MTSS meetings and provide input through the Grade Level Contact. Parents receive written communication in addition to teachers asking for a parent conference as each student is identified for interventions.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Extended Day for All Students

Minutes added to school year:

Based on FCAT testing results for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade, the Level 1 and 2 students are given ELO in Reading using the Journeys Reading Tool Kit, Options, Leveled Readers, FCRR and Ticket to Read Excellence Labs. In addition, our Occupational Therapist works with our kindergarten to address fine motor skills. For Math we are using Think Central, DreamBox, Math Fluency through Excellence Labs.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Progress monitoring occurs bi-weekly. ELO and homeroom teacher track progress through STAR diagnostic reports. Teachers review data monthly through PLCs in addition to the Leadership team's monthly review.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Our school's Assistant Principal is responsible for coordination and the Leadership team is involved as well.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
Diane Turner	Literacy Coach
Jessica Santiago	Kindergarten teacher
Yesenia Marquez-Jimenez	First grade teacher
Yanitza Flores	First grade teacher
Sherry Kruse	Second grade teacher
Wanda Hernandez	Third grade teacher
Ana Cuevas	Fourth grade teacher
Janice Liptak	Fifth grade teacher

How the school-based LLT functions

The LLT is a valuable council that meets monthly to develop reading themes or initiatives. They also review school-wide reading benchmark data which is used for PLCs.

Major initiatives of the LLT

They plan one evening family literacy night to involve the whole family. They also do a couple of school-wide initiatives to promote reading with "Vocabulary Parades" and "Read Across SRE" to name a few.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Preschool Transition

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(G) and 1115(c)(1)(D), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs

We are fortunate to have a VPK program at Sunrise Elementary. There are 36 students in the program. The Lead Teacher works closely with district Early Literacy program specialist to provide a quality pre-school program. Students who enter kindergarten from this program are markedly ready for our curriculum.

College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future

How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

Expected Improvements

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	63%	55%	No	67%
American Indian				
Asian	85%	73%	No	87%
Black/African American	73%	43%	No	75%
Hispanic	56%	52%	No	60%
White	68%	61%	No	71%
English language learners	50%	45%	No	55%
Students with disabilities	33%	21%	No	39%
Economically disadvantaged	60%	50%	No	64%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	113	24%	35%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	96	24%	32%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		20%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		40%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)		68%	80%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)		73%	85%

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	140	63%	70%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	74	33%	40%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	68	30%	35%

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.			

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	92	77%	80%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		25%

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	58%	51%	No	63%
American Indian				
Asian	81%	73%	No	83%
Black/African American	60%	41%	No	64%
Hispanic	54%	45%	No	59%
White	59%	63%	Yes	63%
English language learners	53%	47%	No	57%
Students with disabilities	30%	36%	Yes	37%
Economically disadvantaged	55%	46%	No	60%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	111	28%	35%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	47	12%	20%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		50%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		20%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains			
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)		56%	65%

Area 4: Science

Elementary School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	23	19%	30%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	11	9%	15%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		33%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		33%

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

Elementary School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	78	9%	4%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	20	13%	4%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	33	21%	5%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	18	2%	1%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	31	4%	2%

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

Our PTO growth has been on an upswing last year. We want to maximize involvement by offering relevant activities to enhance participation. From our September Family Night, November Science Night and March Math Night we hope to grow the participation to a place where we may have to split primary and intermediate grades to two night events.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Improve participation at the Family Nights	225	15%	20%

Goals Summary

G1. With the new Journeys Reading curriculum, teachers will be able to better differentiate instruction and address MTSS concerns methodically.

G2. Math instruction will be enhanced by school-wide Professional Development through Math Solutions.

G3. Implementation of MobyMax and DreamBox to address math deficiencies school-wide.

Goals Detail

G1. With the new Journeys Reading curriculum, teachers will be able to better differentiate instruction and address MTSS concerns methodically.

Targets Supported
- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)

Resources Available to Support the Goal
- New curriculum, leveled readers, kits

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Grade level meetings to review process

Person or Persons Responsible
Literacy Coach

Target Dates or Schedule:
Monthly

Evidence of Completion:
Survey results and classroom walk-throughs

G2. Math instruction will be enhanced by school-wide Professional Development through Math Solutions.

Targets Supported

- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains, Middle School Acceleration, High School, High School AMO's, High School FAA, High School FAA, High School Postsecondary Readiness)

- Algebra 1 EOC

- Geometry EOC

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- District professional development initiative for school-wide math instruction.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Scheduled training for all staff vertically.

Person or Persons Responsible
Math Coach

Target Dates or Schedule:
Scheduled training for year

Evidence of Completion:
Classroom instruction enhanced by methods and strategies learned. Classroom walk-throughs scheduled.

G3. Implementation of MobyMax and DreamBox to address math deficiencies school-wide.

Targets Supported

- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains, Middle School Acceleration, High School, High School AMO's, High School FAA, High School FAA, High School Postsecondary Readiness)

- Algebra 1 EOC

- Geometry EOC

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- MobyMax and DreamBox learning will be available during math instruction, triple i, Extended Learning, etc.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Monitoring fidelity during math instruction.

Person or Persons Responsible
Principal

Target Dates or Schedule:
Daily and weekly

Evidence of Completion:
Reports from each on-line system

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal   **B** = Barrier   **S** = Strategy

Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Sunrise will incorporate state funds for the Summer Reading Remediation(3rd grade) required by the state. The ELO (Extended Learning Opportunities) continue throughout the year supported by local funds to remediate those students in the lower 25% quartile in Math and Reading.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals