

Volusia County Schools

Sunrise Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Sunrise Elementary School

3155 PHONETIA DR, Deltona, FL 32738

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/sunrise/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Tracy Buckner A

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 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 (47%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (39%) 2014-15: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

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 Volusia 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Sunrise Elementary School

3155 PHONETIA DR, Deltona, FL 32738

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/sunrise/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	80%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	D

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Sunrise Elementary School, learning is a lifelong journey, Dream It, Believe it, and Achieve It!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sunrise Elementary is working together to build 21st century leaders.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Alejandro, Efrain	Principal	To lead the leadership team to identify school based resources (both materials and personnel) to determine the continuum of academic and behavioral supports available to students at the school site.
Harper, Kahlin	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal will guide the leadership to review schoolwide data.
Asmussen, Kim	Teacher, ESE	To provide updates on the Leader in Me program at Sunrise Elementary.
Morley, Karen	Other	To support curriculum at the school site.
Saccone, Julienne	Teacher, K-12	To provide information about core instruction and participate in student data collection.
Verdi, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	To provide information about core instruction and participate in student data collection.
Taylor, Maureen	Teacher, K-12	To provide information about core instruction and participate in student data collection.
Engstrom, carlie	Teacher, K-12	To provide information about core instruction and participate in student data collection.
Pettit, Angela	Teacher, K-12	To provide information about core instruction and participate in student data collection.
Philyaw, Caryl	Teacher, Career/ Technical	To provide information about core instruction and participate in student data collection.
Dolce, Marianne	Teacher, Career/ Technical	To provide information about core instruction and participate in student data collection.
Rankin, Angela	Instructional Coach	To provide information about core instruction and participate in student data collection.
Kelty, Kamesha	School Counselor	To provide information about core instruction and participate in student data collection.

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	83	54	81	74	93	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	463
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

45

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/10/2019

Prior Year - As Reported
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	1	1	4	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	3	1	1	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	3	1	1	4	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	53%	56%	57%	50%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	58%	49%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	53%	40%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	59%	63%	62%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	56%	62%	56%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	18%	43%	51%	27%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	57%	53%	45%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	83 (0)	54 (0)	81 (0)	74 (0)	93 (0)	78 (0)	463 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	2 ()	5 ()	8 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	11 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	6 (0)	8 (0)	19 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	58%	1%	58%	1%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	54%	-7%	58%	-11%
	2018	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	60%	-6%	62%	-8%
	2018	53%	58%	-5%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	59%	-7%	64%	-12%
	2018	51%	60%	-9%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
	2018	47%	57%	-10%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	20	35	40	14	18	10	20				

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
ELL	48	56	55	50	44		44				
BLK	33	43		41	40		50				
HSP	53	46	42	53	45	15	40				
MUL	31			46							
WHT	64	73	57	58	63	21	61				
FRL	46	51	50	47	46	20	47				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	18	14	15	31	29	20				
ELL	44	20		44	30						
BLK	37	42		41	40		40				
HSP	42	32	31	50	45	41	54				
MUL	46			54							
WHT	56	48	21	60	41	25	64				
FRL	47	41	26	52	42	34	58				
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	33	33	23	27	21	13				
ELL	28	33	17	36	33	25	8				
BLK	52	58		55	37						
HSP	41	49	35	53	57	31	33				
MUL	42	10		58	55						
WHT	55	52	50	69	62	35	57				
FRL	46	45	38	61	57	28	42				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 Math Lowest 25th percentile was the data component that showed the lowest performance. The school average was 18%, the district was 43% and the state was 51%. Contributing factors include the trend of two consecutive years of students with disabilities below 32%. Other factors include that in 2018 Math learning gains for SWD in the lowest 25th percentile was 29% and the Math learning gains for students with disabilities in the 25th percentile was 10%, dropping 19 percentile points.

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

The Math lowest 25th percentile was the data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The school average in 2019 was 18% and 2018 was 34%. From 2018 to 2019, Sunrise dropped 16 percentage points. Factors contributing to the decline include that in 2018 Math learning gains for SWD in the lowest 25th percentile was 29% and the Math learning gains for Students with Disabilities in the 25th percentile was 10%, dropping 19 percentile points.

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 Math lowest 25th percentile had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The school average was 18% and the state average 51%. Some factors may have included a new math program in grades three and five. Other factors may have been differentiated instruction not being implemented with fidelity.

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 was the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. In 2018, 25% of the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile met proficiency on FSA and in 2019 48% of the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile met proficiency. New actions the school implemented were Learning Walks using the IPG Skinny, grade level planning sessions (Extended PLCs) with district support and scheduling for small group with district support.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

One area of concern was there were 50% more suspensions in the intermediate grades (3-5) than the primary grades (K-2). An additional area of concern is that there was an increase in students identified by Early Warning System scoring a level one on statewide assessment (there were 16 students in 2018 and 19 students in 2019).

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

1. Math learning gains
2. ELA learning gains
3. Training on differentiated instruction
4. ELA focus on IPG Skinny to support small group instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title ELA Proficiency

Rationale According to our 2018-2019 school Report Card, 55% of our students met proficiency on FSA

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Increase ELA proficiency on FSA from 55% to 60%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Efrain Alejandro (ealejan1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

Differentiated instruction in small group

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Small group instruction allows us to differentiate and individualize by content, process and product. Small group instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie.

Action Step

Description

1. Provide teachers opportunities for Extended PLCs and collaborative planning.
2. Provide professional learning on differentiated instruction through webinars, faculty meetings, ERPLs and PLCs.
3. Analyze student data on formative and summative assessments to determine student needs at PLCs and SLT. Focus on ESSA subgroups of multiracial and Students with Disabilities using data walls to monitor progress.
4. Coaching cycles on differentiated instruction and collaborative practices

Person Responsible

Efrain Alejandro (ealejan1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Mathematics proficiency on FSA for the lowest quartile
Rationale	According to our 2018-2019 school Report Card, 18% of the lowest quartile met proficiency on FSA in mathematics.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase FSA Mathematics lowest quartile proficiency on FSA from 18% to 30%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Efrain Alejandro (ealejan1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Problem Solving Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Problem solving teaching has a .68 effect size according to John Hattie. Classroom discussion has a .82 effect size according to John Hattie. Asking Questions has a .48 effect size according to John Hattie. Graham Fletcher recommends using problem solving instruction to increase conceptual math understanding through problem solving based lessons by modeling with mathematics.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. District training/PDD on Three Act Tasks to support student engagement, discussion and problem solving 2. Review data during PLCs and grade level extended planning. Using data walls to progress monitor, address PLC Essential questions 3 and 4(address instructional strategies for students who are not responding to core instruction) in the ESSA subgroups of multiracial and students with disabilities. 3. Coaching cycles on the Three Act Tasks 4. Learning Walks during specific math instruction time
Person Responsible	Efrain Alejandro (ealejan1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Math Lowest Quartile for Students with Disabilities (SWD)
Rationale	According to our 2018-2019 ESSA school Report Card, 10% of the lowest quartile of SWD made learning gains on FSA in mathematics.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase FSA Mathematics lowest quartile for SWD proficiency on FSA from 10% to 25%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Efrain Alejandro (ealejan1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Visual Representations
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Problem solving teaching has a .68 effect size according to John Hattie. Classroom discussion has a .82 effect size according to John Hattie. Asking Questions has a .48 effect size according to John Hattie. Visual representations is an evidenced based strategy to help students learn abstract mathematics concepts and solve problems. The purpose of the visual is to reflect a student's understanding of the problem so they can successfully solve it. During Number Talks by Sherry Parrish, students exhibit computational fluency when they demonstrate flexibility in the strategies they choose. Through problem solving discussions, students demonstrate their understanding by explaining these methods and producing accurate answers efficiently.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Academic Coach will provide professional learning during PLCs. Teachers will be instructed on how to use visual representats to support student achievement. 2. Coaches will provide coaching cycles with individual teachers and support at PLCs 3. Learning walks during math whole group sessions in the classrooms focusing on the math core actions 4. Review data during PLCs and grade level extended planning. Using data walls to progress monitor, address PLC Essential questions 3 and 4 (address instructional strategies for students who are not responding to core instruction) in the ESSA subgroup of students with disabilities.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

N/A

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Sunrise completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP) which is accessible through the Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS). Sunrise also invites community members and parents to attend and offer input on the School Improvement Plan (SIP) at monthly School Advisory Committee (SAC) meetings. Sunrise actively seeks business and community partnerships throughout the year by personal contacts throughout the year. Sunrise works with Kona Ice to provide refreshments at school events and the local skating rink to host family skate nights to promote family involvement. In our Project Heat and She to She Programs, community members are invited to participate, mentor and contribute to the well being of our students. In the Spring, community members and district personnel are invited to attend our Leader in Me Leadership Day to attend performances and interact with students in the classroom setting.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The school offers a student mentoring programs such as Project Heat, She2She and FB Honors. The school also offers a crisis training program, suicide prevention and bullying programs. Sunrise is a Leader in Me School and has daily instruction of social emotional learning for all students. The Exceptional Student Education classrooms utilize the RULERS program. The guidance counselor offers small groups teaching social skills. Sunrise offers teachers book studies on literature such as Teaching with Poverty in Mind, Restorative Practices and Hacking School Discipline to provide teachers with best practices to use with their students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Sunrise has a student classroom leader in each classroom to welcome the student and provide a tour of the classroom and school. Student advance from one grade level to the next with their Leadership Binder to help transition students between grade levels using the Leader in Me common language and 7 Habits of Happy Kids. Fifth grade ESE students have an articulation meeting with a middle school representative to assist them in selecting electives and class placement for the following school year. Sunrise provides information about the Open House at Heritage Middle School for our outgoing fifth grade students to tour Heritage. Each year for Sunrise holds a Meet the Teacher event where families can come to meet their new teacher and locate their new classroom.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making by promoting the Volusia Proficiency Model. He ensures that educators are implementing the district's Progress Monitoring Plan (PMP), accessible through the K-12 curriculum link of the webpage and the VCS Problem Solving/Rtl model (i.e. Problem Identification, Analysis of the problem, Intervention Implementation and Response to Intervention) for those students who do not respond effectively to core instruction. For those students who do not respond positively to interventions beyond core, ensure that the school's Problem Solving Team (PST) is accessed as needed. The principal will arrange for professional development be provided for the faculty. The principal will provide time for Professional Learning Communities (PLC).

The school psychologist will assist schools in interpreting individual, class-wide, grade-level and school wide data in order to develop appropriate targeted interventions linked to the emotional/behavioral problem.

The general education teacher (primary and intermediate) provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collections, delivers Tier 1 Instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials with Tier 2/3 activities.

The Exceptional Student Education teacher will participate in student data collection, integrate core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through activities such as co-teaching. The ESE teacher will use problem solving/Rtl practices when addressing the needs of ESE students with a focus on potential reintegration into General Education based on data.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Sunrise Elementary is a Leader in Me School. Through campus wide leadership opportunities such as clubs, Student Leadership Team and Leadership events, students gain skills to be 21st century leaders. Qualifying students participate in mentoring programs such as Project Heat and SHe2SHe to create career awareness.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Proficiency	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Mathematics proficiency on FSA for the lowest quartile	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest Quartile for Students with Disabilities (SWD)	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00