

Marion County Public Schools

Sunrise Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Sunrise Elementary School

375 MARION OAKS CRSE, Ocala, FL 34473

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Catherine Balius

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Sunrise Elementary School

375 MARION OAKS CRSE, Ocala, FL 34473

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Sunrise Elementary, staff, parents, and the Marion Oaks Community are committed to providing a safe learning environment that focuses on academic excellence to build a solid foundation so that our students will develop into successful members of a global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Striving for Excellence

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
Balius, Catherine	Principal	Instructional Leader engage stakeholders coordinate professional development supervise all staff maintain facilities oversee all Title 1 expenditures Oversee school budget
Sanford, Troy	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction Leader Provide professional development Data analysis MTSS PMPs Teacher evaluations
Adams, Veva	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction Leader Curriculum and Instruction Leader Provide professional development Data analysis MTSS PMPs Teacher evaluations
Davis, Jane	Reading Coach	Classroom Coaching, support to early career teachers, collaborative planning facilitator, provider of professional development, oversees MTSS for ELA, data analysis
Davis, Gillian	Dean	Classroom Coaching, support to early career teachers, provider of professional development, PBIS Coordinator
Gallagher, Teresa	School Counselor	Classroom Coaching, SEL professional development provider, classroom, small group and individual Counseling, engages stakeholders and community
Rivera, Juan	Magnet Coordinator	Classroom Coaching, provider of professional development in teh area of science and technology, TEAM Coordinator
Goff, Nicholas	Math Coach	Classroom Coaching, support to early career teachers, collaborative planning facilitator, provider of professional development, oversees MTSS for Math, data analysis
Simmons, Katelyn	School Counselor	Classroom Coaching, SEL professional development provider, classroom, small group and individual Counseling, engages stakeholders and community

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ward, Sara	Instructional Media	Supports literacy development, provides input in Leadership Team Meetings, Supports Instructional Technology and STEAM

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/1/2021, Catherine Balias

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.*

0

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Total number of students enrolled at the school

719

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

6

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

10

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	151	148	140	150	193	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	782
Attendance below 90 percent	62	67	58	59	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316
One or more suspensions	8	15	13	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in ELA	24	51	48	44	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	221
Course failure in Math	10	27	35	32	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	13	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	28	43	46	44	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223

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	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	76	141	139	145	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	16	89	75	82	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
One or more suspensions	8	15	8	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	1	14	21	26	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	18	19	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	9	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	76	141	139	145	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	16	89	75	82	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
One or more suspensions	8	15	8	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	1	14	21	26	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	18	19	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	9	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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				41%	47%	57%	38%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				43%	56%	58%	43%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	52%	53%	28%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				40%	51%	63%	46%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	58%	62%	33%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	49%	51%	17%	35%	47%
Science Achievement					47%	53%		51%	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	37%	44%	-7%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	49%	-9%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	33%	49%	-16%	62%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:

- English Language Arts, Grades 1-4: iReady Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Mathematics, Grades 1-4: iReady Diagnostic-Math Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Science, Grade 5: Grade 5 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25 / 19%	25 / 18%	38 / 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17 / 17%	18 / 17%	24 / 22%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	3 / 25%	3 / 20%	3 / 19%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18 / 14%	14 / 10%	33 / 22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14 / 14%	8 / 7%	22 / 20%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 11%	1 / 6%	4 / 22%
	English Language Learners	3 / 25%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23 / 17%	28 / 20%	32 / 23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19 / 18%	24 / 22%	26 / 23%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 6%	1 / 5%	1 / 5%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17 / 13%	14 / 10%	29 / 21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14 / 13%	11 / 10%	24 / 22%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 6%	4 / 21%	2 / 11%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 3					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		41 / 29%	26 / 18%	42 / 28%
	Economically Disadvantaged		27 / 26%	17 / 15%	27 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities		0 / 0%	0 / 0%	2 / 18%
	English Language Learners		1 / 3%	1 / 3%	1 / 3%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		11 / 8%	11 / 7%	29 / 19%
	Economically Disadvantaged		5 / 5%	6 / 6%	18 / 16%
	Students With Disabilities		1 / 13%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners		0 / 0%	2 / 6%	2 / 6%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 4					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		38 / 22%	24 / 13%	39 / 21%
	Economically Disadvantaged		22 / 16%	14 / 10%	23 / 16%
	Students With Disabilities		1 / 5%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners		0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		20 / 11%	22 / 12%	38 / 21%
	Economically Disadvantaged		10 / 7%	13 / 9%	24 / 17%
	Students With Disabilities		0 / 0%	1 / 5%	1 / 5%
	English Language Learners		1 / 4%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	7			24							
ELL	30			34							
BLK	30			29							

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
HSP	40			45							
MUL	29			71							
WHT	35			55							
FRL	29	70		38	68						
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	35	20	29	59						
ELL	30	40	50	35	42	36					
BLK	31	31		31	47						
HSP	41	46	47	40	44	31					
MUL	53			64							
WHT	48	50		44	53						
FRL	40	43	45	38	46	42					
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	26	8	26	21	15					
ELL	28	36		29	16						
BLK	28	37	32	39	35	25					
HSP	38	47	33	42	30	11					
WHT	47	43		56	33						
FRL	36	41	26	45	31	18					

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	250
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
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	35
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	30
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	42
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	45
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

40% of students have attendance below 90%.
 28% of students had a course failure in ELA and 19% in math.
 ELA 3 Year Proficiency data : 2018 @ 38%, 2019 @ 41%, 2021 @ 36%
 Math 3 Year Proficiency data: 2018 @ 46%, 2019 @ 40%, 2021 @ 44%
 SWD and BLK students are still performing under 41% on the Federal Index.

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

Improvement in ELA and Math proficiency.
 Focus on SWD and BLK student proficiency.
 Improve student attendance.

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

Improvement in ELA and Math proficiency contributing factors are attendance of students and teachers, teacher knowledge of depth of the standard and skill level in ELA and Math. Only 1 teacher has a Effective state VAM indicates lack of teacher expertise in effective instructional practices that directly impact student achievement. In order to address this identified need for improvement students, staff and parents will be rewarded through fostering school attendance that follows within the district attendance guidelines. Students will also participate in reading and math remediation to help them catch up to grade level expectations. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning to develop grade level, standards aligned engaging student instruction. Teachers and staff will also participate in instructional strategies that have a high effect size for promoting student achievement.

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

The most improvement was made in 3rd grade math proficiency.

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

Contributing factors to a 7 point growth in 3rd grade math proficiency were due to ongoing remediation of grade level standards for students who were not successful with standard aligned summative assessments. These students were pulled into small groups and retaught the standards to mastery.

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

Teachers will need to deeply understand the rigor of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will also have to teach using vetted grade level materials and provide scaffolding so that students who are struggling with prerequisite skills can be successful with grade level standards. Teachers need to stay focused on the standard during daily instruction and plan for Tier 1 instruction as well as immediate (same class period) intervention to provide immediate support to struggling students.

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.

Teachers will be provided ongoing professional development in effective planning utilizing Charlotte Danielson's work as the guide to effective planning. Professional development will be provided in how to collect timely assessment and intervene immediately. Techniques for effective teaching (Teach Like a Champion) will be shared each week in the faculty focus meeting. Lastly, classroom walkthroughs will be conducted by administration looking for application of professional development knowledge.

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

Administration will take an active role in collaborative planning this year with plans to gradually withdraw facilitation and releasing the planning to teachers. Ongoing professional development on the instructional practices at Sunrise will be provided to any new teachers to quickly get them up to speed on expected instructional practices in the classroom. Ongoing professional development to experienced teachers and creating grade level teacher leader will ensure continuity of high level instructional practices.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Improving standards aligned instructional practices was identified as being an area of focus based on 2021 FSA data. Sunrise proficiency data in ELA was 36% and in math was 44%.

Measurable Outcome: Sunrise Elementary teachers will increase student proficiency in the area of ELA and Math to 50% on the 2022 Florida Statewide Assessment.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored using formative and summative assessment data, administrative walkthroughs with feedback and quarterly summative assessments. Collaborative planning will be facilitated and monitored by administration and Content Area Specialist.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Catherine Balius (catherine.balius@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative Planning

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Barnett Berry, Alesha Daughtrey, and Alan Wieder (2009) Collaboration: Closing the Effective Teaching Gap Analysis of survey and interview data from teacher leaders provides additional evidence on what existing literature has shown is true of all teachers: that collaboration among teachers paves the way for the spread of effective teaching practices, improved outcomes for the students they teach, and teacher retention.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ongoing, job embedded professional development in math and reading high impact instructional strategies provided to instructional staff and para professionals.

Person Responsible Catherine Balius (catherine.balius@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Teachers will actively participate in administrative facilitated collaborative planning 2x's a week.

Person Responsible Catherine Balius (catherine.balius@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Teachers will use formative assessment to plan and deliver standards aligned instruction.

Person Responsible Catherine Balius (catherine.balius@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: EWS indicate that 40% of Sunrise students attendance rate is less than 90%. If students are not at school, come late or leave early they are missing valuable instructional time thereby resulting in course failures and low performance on district and state assessments.

Measurable Outcome: Sunrise Elementary School will increased student attendance rates to 90% or higher during the 2022 school year.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored by the Guidance Department by sharing monthly attendance data with the administrative team and using the data to identify students and families that need assistance with improving their child's attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Teresa Gallagher (teresa.gallagher@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: To improve student attendance the school will focus on bridging the gap between home and school by building relationships with families and effective two-way communication.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Henderson, Anne T. and Mapp, Karen, A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement, Southwest Education Development Lab, Austin, TX, 2002

Evidence is clear that there is a positive and convincing relationship between family and community involvement and improved student academic achievement, including higher gradepointaverages and scores on standardized tests, more classes passed, higher enrollment in more challenging academic classes, better attendance and improved behavior at home and at school. This holds across families of all economic, racial/ethnic and educational backgrounds and for students at all ages.

Action Steps to Implement

Home School Liaison will foster parent engagement.

Person Responsible Catherine Balius (catherine.balius@marion.k12.fl.us)

Sunrise Elementary will use newsletters, Dojo, SkyLert, You Tube, planners, and school website to effectively communicate with parents to build a bridge between home and school. The school will host parent conference night 2xs per year in person, virtually, or by phone to communicate with parents on their child's academic progress, attendance and social emotional learning.

Person Responsible Catherine Balius (catherine.balius@marion.k12.fl.us)

Parents who send their children to school on a regular basis will be rewarded with "parent bucks" to be redeemed at the parent thrift store located on the Sunrise Campus.

Person Responsible Catherine Balius (catherine.balius@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will create classroom cultures that are friendly and safe and have high student engagement and peer connections so that students find attending school irresistible thereby increasing their desire to attend school.

Person Responsible Catherine Balias (catherine.balias@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our 2021 ELA progress monitoring data show the following percent of grades K-2 students not on track to secure a level 3 are: 98 % of Kindergarten, 96% of 1st grade, 93% of 2nd grade.
Our 2021 ELA FSA data show the following percent of grades 3-4 students scored below a level 3: 62% of 3rd grade and 70% of 4th grade.

Measurable Outcome: On the 2021 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement, 11% of our kindergarten students were proficient, 8% of our 1st grade students were proficient, and 8% of our 2nd grade students were proficient. On the 2022 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement 2% of kindergarten, 3% of 1st grade, and 7% of 2nd grade students will be proficient.
On the 2021 ELA FSA, 46% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 45% of our 4th grade students scored 3 or higher, and 52% of our 5th grade students scored 3 or higher. On the 2022 ELA FSA , 51% of 3rd grade, 50% of 4th grade, and 57% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher.

Monitoring: In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:
K-5: i-Ready Diagnostic AP1 August 2021, AP2 January 2022, and AP3 May 2022
K-5: i-Ready Growth Monitoring November 2021 and March 2022
3-5: District QSMA's Q1 October 2021, Q2 December 2021, Q3 March 2022
Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results. During classroom walk throughs levels of student engagement will be noted by administration and feedback will be provide to teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Catherine Balias (catherine.balias@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Scaffolding: Teachers build support for students in learning and gradually take away supports as needed. Teachers model, offer feedback and coaching as students are learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: K-5 teachers will collaborate each week to plan phonics and vocabulary instruction and use of scaffolding reading strategies within the ELA block. Teachers should show evidence of scaffolding at the beginning of a learning task and as needed when students need support. Classrooms will be monitored regularly to ensure that ELA instruction is consistently administered with fidelity.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly ELA Collaborative Planning.

Person Responsible Jane Davis (jane.davis@marion.k12.fl.us)

Professional Development provided to support the development of teacher skill in teaching reading and providing scaffolding during ELA instruction.

Person Responsible Jane Davis (jane.davis@marion.k12.fl.us)

Regular monitoring of ELA instruction through classroom walkthroughs with feedback by administration.

Person Responsible Catherine Balias (catherine.balias@marion.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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.

Sunrise Elementary reported 0.6 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools in the state of Florida, it falls into the moderate category.

Primary area of concern is creating safe classrooms where students build meaningful relationships with peers and school staff. School Culture and environment will be monitored through monthly administrative data (discipline referrals and calls for service) meetings to identify students that are in crisis and in need of support as well as classrooms that are identified as needing intervention as well.

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.

1. Classroom implementation with fidelity of a schoolwide SEL curriculum, Caring School Community.
2. Training of all staff members on Trauma Informed practices when dealing with students in crisis.
3. Use of sensory, cozy corners in each classroom for students to use as needed.
Infuse mindfulness practices throughout the school day (circling up, music, breathing, yoga, etc..)
4. Emphasis on the power of positive phrasing when talking with students about behavior.
5. Communication and connections with families via novel communication practices and improved customer service.

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

Administration- provide training to staff and set expectations for class and school culture. Conduct classroom walkthroughs regularly and provide staff and student coaching as needed. Secure any needed

resources to promote a positive classroom and school culture.

Guidance Counselors- provide training to teachers on Caring School Community. Provide individual, small group and classroom counseling as needed.

Student Services Manager- assist with writing and implementation of behavior plans, providing assistance in the classroom as needed for students in crisis, communicate and engage parents as needed.

Teachers and Staff- treat all students respectfully, create learning environments that value each child equally, create classroom opportunities that connect students with their peers. Involve parents in supporting their child's SEL learning in the classroom.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00