Marion County Public Schools

Sunrise Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| | |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| | |
| School Information | 7 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| | |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| | |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| | _ |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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 | Active |
|---|--|
| (per MSID File) School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type | K-12 General Education |
| (per MSID File) 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2021-22 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 | 2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (34%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | rmation* |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | <u>Cassandra Brusca</u> |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | ATSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo | or 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 | 12 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Sunrise Elementary School

375 MARION OAKS CRSE, Ocala, FL 34473

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID | | 2021-22 Title I Schoo | l Disadvan | 2 Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|--|
| Elementary S KG-5 | School | Yes | | 100% |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 78% |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | |
| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |

C

C

School Board Approval

Grade

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

В

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|------------------------|---|
| Balius, Catherine | Principal | To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. The employee in this position supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school and reports to the assigned administrator. |
| Adams, Veva | Assistant Principal | To aid the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school. |
| Sanford, Troy | Assistant Principal | To aid the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school. |
| Davis, Jane | Reading Coach | The Content Area Specialist serves specific identified school(s) as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on need, for the specific area of content. Reports to assigned administrator. |
| Davis, Gillian | Dean | To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. Reports to Principal and/or Assistant Principal and supervises assigned support staff. |
| Gallagher, Teresa | School Counselor | To coordinate a Comprehensive School Counseling Program for all students leading to academic success, career awareness, social/personal development, community involvement and multicultural/global citizenship development. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|------------------------|---|
| Rivera, Juan | Math Coach | The Content Area Specialist serves specific identified school(s) as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on need, for the specific area of content. Reports to assigned administrator. |
| Goff, Nicholas | Instructional Coach | The Content Area Specialist serves specific identified school(s) as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on need, for the specific area of content. Reports to assigned administrator. |
| Ward, Sara | Instructional Media | Ability to read, interpret, and follow State Board rules, Code of Ethics, School Board policies, and appropriate state and federal statutes. Ability to demonstrate effective skills of listening, speaking, and writing. Ability to use skills necessary in curriculum design and alignment, planning, organizing, and analyzing data, supervision, problem-solving, and public relations. Ability to select, organize, administer, and utilize instructional media, equipment, and technology. Ability to integrate the resources and services of the library media program with the ongoing instructional program. Ability to assist students and school personnel in the effective use of media. Ability to use group dynamic skills in the context of cultural diversity. Knowledge of subject content, teaching theories, methods and practice, current research, and trends. Knowledge of the unique needs, growth patterns, and characteristics of the students served. |
| Bright, Tierwanda | School Counselor | To coordinate a Comprehensive School Counseling Program for all students leading to academic success, career awareness, social/personal development, community involvement and multicultural/global citizenship development. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/1/2021, Catherine Balius

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.

15

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

865

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

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | | | | G | rade | Le | eve | I | | | | | | Total |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|----|-----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled | 196 | 181 | 163 | 175 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 865 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 96 | 92 | 82 | 81 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 426 |
| One or more suspensions | 33 | 24 | 15 | 37 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| Course failure in ELA | 48 | 31 | 39 | 22 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |
| Course failure in Math | 32 | 30 | 35 | 24 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 6 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | | | | | Gra | ade | Le | eve | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| illuicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 51 | 42 | 45 | 37 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| 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

Monday 8/22/2022

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

| Indicator | | | | G | rade | Le | ve | I | | | | | | Total |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | | | | | Gra | ade | Le | eve | I | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| 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 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| illulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| 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 | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| 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 |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | |

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).

| Sahaal Crada Component | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | 2019 | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| ELA Achievement | 41% | 46% | 56% | | | | 41% | 47% | 57% | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 60% | | | | | | 43% | 56% | 58% | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 68% | | | | | | 39% | 52% | 53% | |
| Math Achievement | 45% | 50% | 50% | | | | 40% | 51% | 63% | |
| Math Learning Gains | 60% | | | | | | 49% | 58% | 62% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | | | | | | 42% | 49% | 51% | |
| Science Achievement | | 53% | 59% | | | | | 47% | 53% | |

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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 37% | 44% | -7% | 58% | -21% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 49% | -9% | 58% | -18% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -37% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -40% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 49% | -16% | 62% | -29% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0% | | | • | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 54% | -10% | 64% | -20% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -33% | | | ' | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -44% | | | | |

| | | | SCIEN | CE | | |
|------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2022 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 16 | 42 | 64 | 39 | 63 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 38 | 67 | 75 | 38 | 50 | 40 | | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 65 | 70 | 32 | 53 | 55 | | | | | |
| HSP | 44 | 63 | 68 | 47 | 63 | 56 | | | | | |
| MUL | 23 | | | 46 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 44 | 38 | | 51 | 53 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 62 | 68 | 45 | 55 | 54 | | | | | |
| | | 2021 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | | | 45 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 29 | | | 71 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 35 | | | 55 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 29 | 70 | | 38 | 68 | | | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 58 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 382 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 45 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 52 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 52 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 57 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 35 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| | |
| 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% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 47 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 55 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

3rd Grade ELA Proficiency @ 42% and 4th Grade ELA Proficiency @ 39%.

3rd Grade Math Proficiency @ 43% and 4th Grade ELA Proficiency @ 43%.

Multiracial students were at 35% proficiency.

85% of students have attendance below 90%.

133 students with 1 or more suspensions from school.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Improvement in ELA and Math proficiency.

Focus on Multiracial student proficiency.

Improve student attendance.

Improvement in classroom management skills of staff to increase time on academic tasks and decrease student suspensions.

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. . In order to address this identified need for improvement students, staff and parents will be rewarded through fostering school attendance that falls 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.

Professional development in classroom management, conscious discipline and restorative practices will be ongoing throughout the school year to provide teachers with skills to create classroom which are conducive to learning. A Content Area Specialist will provide classroom coaching and support to assist teachers with the development of these skills.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The most improvement was made in overall reading proficiency with an increase of 5 points in state reporting.

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

Contributing factors to a 5 point growth in reading 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?

Class rosters were carefully constructed with an emphasis on students with similar learning profiles being in the same class. This will allow opportunities for the teacher to accelerate learners because they are similar in skill level. Strategies to accelerate learning will also be discussed in collaborative planning and included in lesson plans.

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

Professional development will occur weekly for staff. Embedded professional development will also be available during the school day to give teacher the tools needed to accelerate learning.

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.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Engaging students in benchmark aligned instruction was identified as being an area of focus based on 2022 FSA data. Sunrise students were 41% proficient in ELA and 45% proficient in Math.

Measurable Outcome:

the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

State the specific measurable outcome Sunrise Elementary School teachers will increase student proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math to 50% on the 2023 State Assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

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:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Collaborative Planning

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Create a Master Schedule that supports 100 minute Collaborative Planning blocks for teachers.

Person Responsible

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

2. Provide opportunities in Collaborative Planning for teachers to discuss how to teach a benchmark, integrate structures engage students, identify common formative assessments for each learning target, identify common summative assessments, and have opportunities to examine data and be reflective on teaching practices.

Person Responsible

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

3. Provide professional development on structures to engage students in learning, facilitate learning walks for staff and facilitate book studies to increase student engagement.

Person Responsible

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

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Behavior & Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

EWS indicate that 85% of students have attendance below 90% and 133 students with 1 or more suspensions from school. If students are missing instruction due to behavior or poor attendance student achievement will be impacted.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Sunrise Elementary School will increase the percentage of students attending 90% or higher from 15% to 50% and decrease the number of students being suspended from school from 133 to 75.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. This area of focus will be monitored by the Student Services Manager, CAS, Guidance Department and Administrative Team. Monthly behavioral and attendance data will be used to identify students and families that need additional support with behavior and attendance.

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

To improve student behavior and increase attendance teachers will focus on creating engaging lessons in well managed classrooms that foster relationships and student goal setting.

Becky Bailey - Conscious Discipline increases academic achievement through adding personal meaning to

academic task. The classroom becomes a school family where emotions are integrated with

cognitive demands on a daily basis. This not only increases school success, but also fosters the

development of the frontal lobes of the child's brain. This healthy brain development then imbues

increased success both academically and emotionally

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

According to educational neuroscience expert Dr. David Sousa, student engagement can be defined as "the amount of attention, interest, curiosity, and positive emotional connections that students have when they are learning, whether in the classroom or on their own" (2016, p. 17).

Dr. Sousa goes on to note that engaged students:

Have more motivation to participate in class Enjoy achieving their learning goals Are more likely to persist through challenges in learning Feel intrinsically motivated to gain new and deeper understanding

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Provide professional development to staff on student engagement structures, classroom management, conscious discipline, and restorative practices.

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

2. Provide classroom coaching and modeling on classroom management and engaging instruction to teachers.

Person Responsible Nicholas Goff (nicholas.goff@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Provide training to parents on how to support student attendance and behavior in school as well as how to engage in their child's education.

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
 Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

K-2 teachers will utilize UFLI Foundational Reading program to deliver high quality foundational skills reading instruction.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

3-5 teachers will deliver engaging benchmark aligned ELA instruction, intensive reading intervention as well as regular remediation in benchmark skills.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50
 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% or more of the K-2 students at Sunrise will be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% or more of the 3-5 students will be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Ongoing progress monitoring will take place during Collaborative Planning using formative and summative assessments. The state progress monitoring data will be used to identify students who are not on track to be proficient in ELA and these students will receive intervention in ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Balius, Catherine, catherine.balius@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidencebased Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

K-2 UFLI K-4th Savvas myView K-4th Fluency Practice SIPPS Language Power Heggerty Lexia Core Read 180 Top Score i-Ready

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

These are district selected resources based on the review of research.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|---|
| Instructional staff will participate in ongoing professional development, coaching and modeling on evidence based programs identified for use by the district. | Davis, Jane, jane.davis@marion.k12.fl.us |
| Teachers will participate in Collaborative planning where effective reading instruction is planned and modeled under the leadership of the literacy coach. | Davis, Jane, jane.davis@marion.k12.fl.us |
| Fidelity checks during ELA instruction will occur on a regular basis to guarantee effective delivery of reading instruction. | Davis, Jane, jane.davis@marion.k12.fl.us |

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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
- 6. Conscious Discipline and Restorative Practices professional development for all staff.
- 7. Implementation of schoolwide PBIS.

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

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.

Behavior CAS- provide classroom modeling, coaching and professional development.