

Volusia County Schools

# Sunrise Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

# 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: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (47%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

## 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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

### School Grades History

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

### 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, leading 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kania, Kristina	Principal	To lead the leadership team to identify school based resources (both materials and personnel) to determine both academic and behavioral supports available to students at the school site. Process assessment data to determine SIP goals. Identify action steps and monitor implementation for effectiveness.
Brown, Michelle C.	Assistant Principal	To provide ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. To assist with the implementation and monitoring of action steps. To communicate the SIP and Mid-Year Review data with stakeholders.
Rankin, Angela	Other	To provide ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. To assist with the implementation and monitoring of action steps. To support social emotional learning implementation and data analysis school-wide.
Taylor, Maureen	Teacher, K-12	To provide ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. To assist with the implementation of action steps within grade level, and with the collection, interpretation, and reflection of data with grade level and school wide teams.
Verdi, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	To provide ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. To assist with the implementation of action steps within grade level, and with the collection, interpretation, and reflection of data with grade level and school wide teams.
Engstrom, carlie	Teacher, K-12	To provide ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. To assist with the implementation of action steps within grade level, and with the collection, interpretation, and reflection of data with grade level and school wide teams.
Philyaw, Caryl	Teacher, K-12	To provide ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. To provide updates of The Leader in Me program implementation.
Dolce, Marianne	Instructional Media	To provide ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. To support school-wide literacy initiatives through a media program that supports core instruction.
Saccone, Julianne	Teacher, K-12	To provide ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. To assist with the implementation of action steps within grade level, and with the collection, interpretation, and reflection of data with grade level and school wide teams.



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Garcia, Peggy	Instructional Coach	To provide ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. Assist in monitoring the implementation of the SIP, support teachers with resources and instructional strategies, analyze school wide data. To communicate the SIP and Mid-Year review data to all stakeholders.
Willis, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	To provide ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. To assist with the implementation of action steps within grade level, and with the collection, interpretation, and reflection of data with grade level and school wide teams.
Eby, Savannah	Teacher, K-12	To provide ongoing input and feedback regarding SIP development, implementation, and reflection. To assist with the implementation of action steps within grade level, and with the collection, interpretation, and reflection of data with grade level and school wide teams.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Tracy Buckner A

**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.*

**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.*

### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

### Total number of students enrolled at the school

536

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

2

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

6

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

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

**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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/20/2021

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

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	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	83	82	83	81	85	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	499
Attendance below 90 percent	48	21	8	15	16	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	16	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	27	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

**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	1	5	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

**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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				53%	56%	57%	48%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	56%	58%	42%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	46%	53%	25%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	59%	63%	54%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	56%	62%	44%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				18%	43%	51%	34%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				53%	57%	53%	58%	58%	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	59%	58%	1%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	54%	60%	-6%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	59%	-7%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

English Language Arts and Mathematics data show the percent of students who scored "Early On Grade Level" or "Mid Above Grade Level" on the i-Ready diagnostic assessment. Science data shows percent of students who scored a 70% or higher on the Science Assessments.

<b>Grade 1</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64/ 37.50%	68/ 36.76%	78/ 66.67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55/ 38.18%	60/ 35.0%	69/65.22%
	Students With Disabilities	11/ 18.18%	13/ 15.38%	14/ 50.0%
	English Language Learners	7/ 14.29%	8/ 37.50%	9/ 44.4%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	65/ 32.31%	70/ 32.86%	72/ 56.94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56/ 33.93%	62/ 30.65%	63/ 55.56%
	Students With Disabilities	11/ 9.09%	11/ 36.36%	12/ 41.67%
	English Language Learners	6/ 50.0%	8/ 25.0%	7/ 48.10%

  

<b>Grade 2</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	63/ 17.46%	70/ 22.86%	74/ 36.49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47/ 14.89%	54/ 20.37%	54/ 35.19%
	Students With Disabilities	19/ 5.26%	23/ 8.70%	22/ 18.18%
	English Language Learners	5/ 0.0%	5/ 0.0%	5/ 60.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	63/ 11.11%	72/ 18.06%	70/ 31.43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47/ 10.64%	54/ 14.81%	52/ 26.92%
	Students With Disabilities	18/ 11.11%	23/ 13.04%	19/ 21.05%
	English Language Learners	5/0.0%	5/0.0%	7/ 14.29%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	81/ 33.33%	86/ 59.30%	92/ 59.78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	72/ 27.78%	76/ 56.58%	82/ 57.32%
	Students With Disabilities	11/ 18.18%	12/ 16.67%	13/ 15.38%
	English Language Learners	14/ 21.43%	13/46.15%	17/47.06%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	88/ 10.23%	86/ 22.09%	84/ 47.62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	80/ 7.50%	76/ 19.74%	74/ 44.59%
	Students With Disabilities	11/ 9.09%	12/ 0.0%	11/18.18%
	English Language Learners	16/ 0.0%	15/ 0.0%	16/31.25%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	82/31.71%	84/36.90%	86/ 37.21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71/ 26.76%	71/ 29.58%	73/ 31.51%
	Students With Disabilities	22/ 4.55%	23/ 4.35%	22/ 9.09%
	English Language Learners	17/ 11.76%	17/ 17.65%	17/23.53%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	89/12.36%	84/25.00%	88/ 38.64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	77/ 12.99%	71/18.31%	72/ 32.43%
	Students With Disabilities	25/0.00%	22/9.09%	24/16.67%
	English Language Learners	18/ 5.56%	17/ 11.76%	18/ 22.22%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75/ 19.28%	80/ 26.09%	81/ 34.38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60/ 15.15%	64/ 22.37%	64/ 22.27%
	Students With Disabilities	19/9.52%	23/ 14.81%	23/ 0.0%
	English Language Learners	16/ 5.88%	18/ 10.00%	19/ 8.70%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79/ 17.72%	82/ 15.85%	85/ 52.94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63/ 11.11%	65/ 12.31%	68/ 48.53%
	Students With Disabilities	23/ 4.35%	23/ 4.35%	25/ 20.00%
	English Language Learners	18/ 5.56%	19/ 0.00%	19/ 42.11%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	318/47%	304/ 54%	238/ 75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	252/ 40%	242/ 48%	189/ 75%
	Students With Disabilities	72/ 18%	84/17%	65/ 50%
	English Language Learners	68/ 36%	70/ 32%	56/ 63%

## 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	19	43		18	14		33				
ELL	35	42		26	50		23				
BLK	41			33							
HSP	56	56		42	48		54				
MUL	50			25							
WHT	50	37		43	32		55				
FRL	48	49	60	35	28		46				
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				
ELL	48	56	55	50	44		44				
BLK	33	43		41	40		50				

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
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				

### 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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	332
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES



English Language Learners	
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	37
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	50
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	38
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 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	43
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

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

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

The overarching trends that are seen show that Math Achievement in Grades 3-5 is an area we need to focus on this school year. Our Lowest Quartile for Math and Students with Disabilities performance in Math are two subgroups that need the most improvement.

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

The data component with the greatest decline from 2019 to 2021 as evidenced by FSA scores was Math Lowest Quartile that went from 18% proficiency to 0% proficiency.

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

The three contributing factors we have found were student attendance due to quarantines and learning loss from virtual learning in the Spring of 2020, Math Whole Group instruction blending into intervention time which took away from LQ students and a lack of collaboration between Gen Ed teachers and Support Facilitation Teachers to ensure small group instruction was aligned to classroom instruction. The new actions that need to be taken for improvement are dedicated time for collaboration between Gen Ed and Support Facilitation Teachers and involvement in PLC's as needed to ensure aligned instruction, adherence with fidelity to the allocated minutes instructional block for Math and Intervention and continued focus and monitoring of our LQ students who have shown the most learning loss.

Mathematics

Fall Winter Spring

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1 Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 2

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 3

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1 Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 2

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 3

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1 Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 2

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 3

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1 Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 2

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 3

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1 Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 2

Tool: Math i-Ready Diagnostic 3

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

Overall, ELA learning gains data for our Lowest Quartile showed the most improvement. The FSA 2019 data demonstrated a 48% proficiency rate and 2021 data showed 63% proficiency rate. In our subgroups, Students with Disabilities Lowest Quartile in ELA showed improvement. The FSA 2019 data demonstrated a 31% proficiency rate and 2021 data showed 67% proficiency rate. Students with Disabilities Learning Gains in ELA showed improvement. The FSA 2019 data demonstrated a 18 % proficiency rate and 2021 data showed 43 % proficiency rate. Students with Disabilities in Science Achievement showed improvement. The FSA 2019 data demonstrated a 20% proficiency rate and 2021 data showed 33% proficiency rate. In our African American subgroup, ELA Learning Gains showed improvement. The FSA 2019 data demonstrated a 43% proficiency rate and 2021 data showed 83% proficiency rate.

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

The contributing factors that led to this improvement were targeted interventions by the classroom teachers and intervention teachers to support our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Some of the other actions that may have led to this increase include a school-wide focus on ELA small group instruction, learning walks with academic coach and administration, district support conducting classroom observations and joining PLC meetings, and district support in the development of ESE scheduling and review of progress monitoring data.

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

The strategies that will need to be implemented are a dedicated intervention and enrichment block and using Math i-Ready data to drive the intervention/enrichment lessons. In ELA, ensuring pacing guidelines are followed and ensuring the high level of use of student voice and collaborative structures.

**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.**

The professional development opportunities that will be provided are Interactive Student Notebook Training, Number Talks, Using i-Ready data and resources for intervention/ enrichment, Leader in Me Training, and Teacher Clarity.

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

As a school we will ensure the Intervention/ Enrichment block is utilized to provided targeted lesson to meet the students needs that were show in district assessment data to drive further instruction. We will also have strategic Learning Walks by administration, academic coach and district resource teachers to ensure individualized specific feedback is provided to the teachers to help drive future instruction within the classroom.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 39%, Math Learning Gains were at 34% and Lowest Quartile performed at 0% which was below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one or more of our two targeted ESSA Subgroups; SWD and AA that preformed below 33%.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase Math overall proficiency from 39% to 54%. Increase Math LQ learning gains from 0% to 54%, including ESSA subgroups, SWD and AA.

**Monitoring:** This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific Math look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kristina Kania (klkania@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Our evidence-based strategy is Response to Intervention. We will monitor it through the diagnostic assessments and the students progress on their instructional path.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29 (Hattie, 2009). The average effect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 1.29, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when Response to Intervention is monitored and used to plan instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Master Schedule includes dedicated math intervention/enrichment time.

**Person Responsible** Angela Rankin (atrankin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will ensure every student completes a minimum of 45 mins per week on i-Ready math.

**Person Responsible** Peggy Garcia (psgarcia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide professional learning on using i-Ready toolbox and data to plan for intervention/enrichment

**Person Responsible** Peggy Garcia (psgarcia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will engage in math focused PLCs to review data and plan for differentiated instruction

**Person Responsible** Peggy Garcia (psgarcia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will implement Number Talks daily

**Person Responsible** Peggy Garcia (psgarcia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide professional learning on Growth Mindset and implement beliefs as mathematicians

**Person Responsible** Peggy Garcia (psgarcia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor intervention/enrichment through learning walks and feedback

**Person**  
**Responsible** Kristina Kania (klkania@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a results of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 51% which was below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one or more of our two targeted ESSA Subgroups; SWD and AA that preformed below 33%.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase ELA overall proficiency from 51% to 62 %.

**Monitoring:** This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific ELA look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kristina Kania (klkania@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity with all classrooms utilizing a focus board to include standard, learning targets and success criteria

**Person Responsible** Peggy Garcia (psgarcia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Ongoing review of LQ data to develop and monitor instructional plan for tier 2 and 3 interventions

**Person Responsible** Kristina Kania (klkania@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implement a school-wide walk to intervention model to include interventions and enrichment

**Person Responsible** Kristina Kania (klkania@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implement Coaching Cycles to support teacher's growth in ELA standards-aligned instruction

**Person Responsible** Peggy Garcia (psgarcia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor standards-aligned ELA instruction through learning walks and feedback

**Person Responsible** Kristina Kania (klkania@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC Structure focused on data analysis and actionable next steps for instruction.

<b>Person Responsible</b>	Peggy Garcia (psgarcia@volusia.k12.fl.us)
---------------------------	---

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	The Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a results of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Student's with Disabilities Achievement was at 19% in ELA, 18% in Math, 33% in Science.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Increase ELA overall proficiency from 19% to 25%, Increase Math overall proficiency from 18% to 25%. Increase Science overall proficiency from 33% to 38%.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with ESE Lesson Gains Charts and Support Facilitation Logs, data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Kristina Kania (klkania@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Our evidence-based strategy is Intervention for Students with Learning Needs. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the program specialists. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Intervention for Students with Learning Needs has an effect size of .77 (Hattie,2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.77, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when intervention with fidelity.
<b>Action Steps to Implement</b>	
Master Schedule designed to meet the needs of SWD through inclusive scheduling	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Angela Rankin (atrankin@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Support Facilitation, Intervention and ESOL teachers will use Learning Targets and Success criteria with each small group	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Peggy Garcia (psgarcia@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Provide collaborative planning structure between General Education and ESE teachers	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Michelle C. Brown (mcbrown@volusia.k12.fl.us)
PLC Structure that ensures all subgroup data is reviewed and used to plan for further instruction	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Peggy Garcia (psgarcia@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Monitor standards- aligned instruction and program fidelity in ESE Separate Class and Support Facilitation groups through learning walks and feedback	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Michelle C. Brown (mcbrown@volusia.k12.fl.us)



Monitor ESE Lesson Gains Charts, OPM and Support Facilitation Logs Monthly

**Person Responsible** Michelle C. Brown (mcbrown@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implement Leader in Me Structures for student goal setting, tracking progress, and reflecting on accomplishments

**Person Responsible** Caryl Philyaw (clphilya@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implement Student Led Conferences to empower students to share their goals and accomplishments

**Person Responsible** Caryl Philyaw (clphilya@volusia.k12.fl.us)

### 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.

**After comparing our school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools across the state, we have identified as disruption on campus as our area of concern. It is ranked very high. Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:**

**School will:**

- train teachers in Leader in Me 8 Habits
- identify mentors for students with high incidents in disruption on campus
- provide incident data to teachers quarterly at faculty meetings

**Teachers will:**

- teach the 8 Habits and how to apply them to the students
- monitor student's behavior using Goal Sheets for habitual offenders

**Data chats will take place quarterly during faculty meetings to discuss the above implementation plan (what's working and what's not) based on data.**

### 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.**

Sunrise completes a Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) which is accessible through the school website as well as hard copies in the front office. Sunrise also invites community members and parents to attend monthly School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. Communications are sent to all stakeholders regarding school events and accomplishments. This is done through Messenger Calls, marquee, social media, and school website. Sunrise actively seeks business and community partnerships to support students.

As a Leader in Me School, Sunrise Elementary addresses the social and emotional needs of our students through this program. Our ESE classrooms also utilize the RULERS program to assist with self-regulation strategies. The school counselor provides social skills lessons, mentoring, and peer mediation sessions. Additionally, community members are invited to participate, mentor, and contribute to the well being of our students through the support of our Project Heat, FB Honors, She to She mentoring programs. The annual Leader in Me Leadership Day event allows stakeholders the opportunity to see The Leader in Me practices in action within the classroom setting. The Leader in Me practices on campus afford students the opportunity to participate in school-wide leadership roles such as participating in clubs, Student Leadership Team, Leadership Events, clubs, and mentoring. These opportunities promote community involvement, a focus on education, career awareness.

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

The stakeholders at our school are the administrators, faculty and staff within the school and our School Advisory Council. The administrators, faculty and staff promote a positive culture and environment at the school through our Leader in Me 8 Habits and teaching our students how to apply them in their lives at school and our community. We also strive to involve the parents and families in their children's lives through many different parent engagement events to create a strong home/school connection. The School Advisory Council serves as a bridge between the faculty and staff members and the parents. This group works collaboratively to ensure students are supported and we are meeting the needs within our school to ensure student's are successful.

## **Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>