Sunrise Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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: D (39%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-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	63%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D		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
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
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.
Saccone, Julienne	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 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.
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.
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.
Trinidad, 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, provide support with tier 1 instruction through

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		facilitating collaborative standards-aligned planning sessions, analyze school wide data, and conduct coaching cycles with targeted teachers.
Richards, Carol	Administrative Support	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.
Sytsma, Zoe	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.
Rollins, Frenchie	Teacher, ESE	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 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.*
0

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.*
20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
42

Total number of students enrolled at the school
545

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
15

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
16

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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	59	67	79	87	90	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	479
Attendance below 90 percent	10	24	20	20	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	39	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	48	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	0	25	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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 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	

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 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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	35%	53%	56%				53%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	45%						55%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						48%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	28%	42%	50%				53%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	44%						51%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						18%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	55%	59%				53%	57%	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 Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	59%	58%	1%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
01	2022						
	2019						
Cohort Comparison							
02	2022						
	2019						
Cohort Comparison		0%					
03	2022						
	2019	54%	60%	-6%	62%	-8%	
Cohort Comparison		0%					
04	2022						
	2019	52%	59%	-7%	64%	-12%	
Cohort Comparison		-54%					
05	2022						
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%	
Cohort Comparison		-52%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2022						
	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%	
Cohort Comparison							

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	8	30	29	6	28	33	13				
ELL	24	48		19	46		27				
BLK	16	38		18	41						
HSP	38	55	58	33	48	55	43				
MUL	44			33							
WHT	41	38	25	28	46	33	50				
FRL	31	44	39	22	43	45	37				

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							

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
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				
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				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
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	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	351
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	37
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
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?

Overall achievement in each content area demonstrated a decrease in proficiency. ELA went from 51% to 35%, Math 39% to 28%, and Science 49% to 44%. We demonstrated an increase in Math Learning gains from 34% to 44% and Math Lowest Quartile from 0% to 41%. The SWD subgroup continues to be a concern at 21% proficiency.

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

The data indicates the greatest need for improvement are ELA, Math, and Science achievement.

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 contributing factors for this need for improvement are new teachers with no certification or experience, a new academic coach, a need for professional development for tier 1 core instruction, a need for a schoolwide system to address student discipline and time needed to teach social emotional learning direct lessons. The new actions we will take to address this need for improvement are analyzing and responding to data through more structured PLCs, collaborative planning structure and protocols to focus on standards aligned instruction, and a tiered coaching support system.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement were Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest Quartile.

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

The contributing factors for improvement were a heavy focus on Math LQ students to included targeted interventions with progress monitoring, additional intervention groups formed using the academic coach, district support, and intervention teachers to support targeted students.

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

The strategies that need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning are a structured planning protocol for collaborative planning that is monitored, Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports to address discipline concerns, Leader in Me practices for social emotional learning skills and academic goal setting, professional learning and support for working with students with disabilities to include ESE and Gen Ed teachers. A structured planning protocol for grade level teams to use during collaborative standards-aligned planning of Tier 1 instruction in ELA, Math, and Science. Math Coach, ELA Coach, and Academic Coach will facilitate the collaborative standards-aligned planning sessions as content experts. Administration will participate in assigned planning sessions as well.

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 opportunities that will be provided include MTSS process, Leader in Me, PBIS, Curriculum Content Training for all subject areas, Collaborative Planning Protocol, and Working with students with disabilities. Ongoing professional development of standards-aligned planning will take place during PLCs as Math Coach, ELA Coach, and Academic Coach facilitate the collaborative planning sessions to maximize Tier 1 instruction.

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 ELA Intervention/ Enrichment block is utilized to provided targeted lessons to
meet the student needs demonstrated through classroom and district assessment data. We will also have strategic Learning Walks by administration, academic coach and district resource teachers to ensure individualized specific feedback based on the determined Look-fors in classroom instruction. We will support Reading Counts, Reflex Math, Penda, and weekly hands on science investigations.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The Area of Focus aligns to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning everyday. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was 35%, Math Proficiency was 28%, and Science Proficiency was 44%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Learner Outcome: Sunrise Elementary will increase ELA Proficiency from 35% to 45%, Math Proficiency from 28% to 38%, and Science Proficiency from 44% to 54%. Teacher Practice: By December 2023, 90% of classroom teachers will provide standards-aligned instruction and student tasks. Coaching Practice: By May 2023, the number of teachers receiving tier 2 and tier 3 coaching support will decrease by 75%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	-Administration/academic coach participate in collaborative planning -Learning Walks using classroom look-fors tool -PLC data analysis and next steps planning -Coaching Support Data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristina Kania (klkania@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Standards Based Instruction with Teacher Clarity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Standards Based Instruction with 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

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.

Collaborative Planning Protocol to be used in ELA, Math and Science

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

Train teachers on using the Collaborative Planning Protocol

Person Responsible	Peggy Trinidad (pstrinid@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Classroom Instruction Look-fors observation tool developed and understood by teachers

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

Learning Walks with feedback to teachers

Person Responsible	Peggy Trinidad (pstrinid@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly Leadership Touch Base Meetings with admin/academic coach to review visitation data and next steps

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

Focus Boards in each classroom to include Benchmark Learning Targets and Success Criteria for ELA, Math, and Science

Person Responsible   Peggy Trinidad (pstrinid@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly PLCs focused on progress monitoring and planning in ELA, Math, and Science

Person Responsible   Peggy Trinidad (pstrinid@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Support	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a safe, healthy, and supportive environment. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that Sunrise discipline data showed an increase in office discipline referrals during the 21-22 school year with a total of 802 processed referrals.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Learner Outcome: By May of 2023, the number of discipline referrals will be reduced by 25%. Teacher Practice: By December of 2023, Sunrise Elementary teachers, will increase effective Leader in Me social emotional learning instruction and practices within all classrooms. Coaching Practice: By April of 2023, the number of teachers receiving tier 3 classroom management support will decrease by 75%, through PLCs and monitoring of the PBIS Implementation Checklist data & Benchmarks of Quality data to progress monitor fidelity of implementation with a focus on reducing office discipline referrals of all student subgroups.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	-PBIS Implementation Checklists and Benchmarks of Quality surveys 3x per year -Leader in Me MRA Survey 2x per year -Office Discipline Referrals will be monitored and discussed at monthly PBIS and SLT meetings
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle C. Brown (mcbrown@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will use a multi-disciplinary approach through district-wide MTSS framework. Outcomes will be measured & monitored: Office Discipline Referrals will be monitored by the district MTSS team and by the school based PBIS and SLT teams monthly. Fidelity checklists will be monitored by the PBIS District Coordinator, Dr. Mandy Ellzey. This data will also be monitored by the PBIS Team to be used for progress monitoring and planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Based upon research, the PBIS Implementation Checklist is a quick checklist to assess the degree of implementation for actively implementing schools. It gives teams a sense of what has-been-done and what needs-to-be-done in the PBIS implementation process. The Benchmarks of Quality survey is intended to guide both initial implementation and sustained use of PBIS Tier 1. Kincaid, D., Childs, K., & George, H. (2010).

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.

Provide Tier 1 PBIS training to all staff in August 2022

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

Provide Leader in Me training to new staff in August 2022

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

Professional Learning through ERPLs on MTSS/PBIS systems and structures.

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

Ongoing Leader in Me professional learning and support through Action Teams and Sunrise Rookies monthly meetings.

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

Monthly PBIS and Leader in Me Lighthouse Team Meetings closely follow suggestion program Year-at-a-Glance recommendations for 22-23 school year

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

Monthly monitoring of student discipline & observation data
Fall- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist and Leader in Me MRA Survey
Spring- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist and Leader in Me MRA Survey
End-of-Year-Complete Benchmarks of Quality and Tiered Fidelity Inventory

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our Needs of Assessment and Analysis, it revealed that 21% of our lowest quartile reached proficiency in ELA and Math, well below the district and state average. Further analysis showed that most of the students in our lowest quartile are also in one or more of our four targeted ESSA subgroups, Students with Disabilities and African American.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By February of 2023, Sunrise Elementary will increase the percentage of our lowest quartile reaching proficiency (70%) from 21% to 31%, including our ESSA subgroups, Students with Disabilities and African American. We will utilize district Unit Assessments in ELA and Chapter Assessments in Math to monitor progress of our LQ and ESSA subgroups. By January of 2023, 90% of teachers will provide appropriate interventions to students receiving Tier 2 and 3 support, with integrity and fidelity. By February of 2023, teachers receiving Tier 3 coaching cycles in intervention will decrease by 85%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	District Assessments and FAST Assessment Data Analysis during PLCs. A focus on LQ and ESSA subgroups will be discussed to determine the effect of the interventions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Peggy Trinidad (pstrinid@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a district-wide Multi-tiered System of Supports. As a school we will be using SIPPS, Benchmark Advanced Interventions, Reflex Math and other interventions from Big Ideas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	MTSS is a careful analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-Based Decision Making. MTSS is a prevention based model for students who are in need of additional supports. A Multi-Tiered System of Supports has an effect size of 1.29 (Hattie).

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.

Review student data in ELA and Math to create targeted intervention groups

Person Responsible   Peggy Trinidad (pstrinid@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional Learning through ERPLs on MTSS systems and structures

Person Responsible   Peggy Trinidad (pstrinid@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implementation of Professional Learning of MTSS strategies following the District ERPLs utilizing the decision tree guidelines.

Person Responsible   Peggy Trinidad (pstrinid@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Bi-weekly PLC to determine progress of lowest quartile, including ESSA subgroups, making progress towards 70% proficiency on Unit/Chapter assessments in ELA, Math and Science. Bi-weekly checkpoints of targeted students - make adjustments to the intervention as needed, through data analysis, while considering ICEL. Monitoring fidelity of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions of LQ students through walkthroughs. Students that continue to need further support/intervention will be identified and monitored

Person Responsible   Kristina Kania (klkania@volusia.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

The Area of Focus aligns to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning everyday. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was 35%. Based on ELA district assessment data for students in Kindergarten 17%, 1st grade 33% and 2nd grade 53% of students are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

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

The Area of Focus aligns to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning everyday. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was 35%. Based on ELA district assessment data for students in 3rd grade 63%, 4th grade

75% and 5th grade 70% of students are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

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)

Increase the percentage of students in each grade level that are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment according to district ELA assessment data.
Kindergarten decrease 17% not proficient to 7%
1st grade decrease 33% not proficient to 23%
2nd grade decrease 53% not proficient to 43%

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase the percentage of students in each grade level that are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment according to district ELA assessment data.
3rd grade decrease 63% not proficient to 49%
4th grade decrease 75% not proficient to 49%
5th grade decrease 70% not proficient to 49%

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.

We will monitor district assessment data at weekly PLCs and monthly at School Leadership Team meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Trinidad, Peggy, pstrinid@volusia.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 Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Evidence-based practices/programs being implemented are ELA Benchmark Advanced Curriculum aligned to the BEST Standards, SIPPS in K-3 to address foundational skills, daily small group differentiated instruction utilizing ELA Benchmark Advanced Curriculum to also include the intervention and enrichment toolkit. Additionally, collaborative planning with grade level teams utilizing a planning protocol and Test Item Specifications.

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?

We will use the district approved ELA resources and curriculum for core instruction as well as interventions. These address the identified need and have a record to effectiveness for our population per the district.

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
ELA Collaborative Planning with grade level teams to include support teachers, administration, academic coach, and regional resource teachers. Academic Coach and regional resource teacher (Literacy Leadership and Literacy Coaching) will facilitate Professional learning on the Collaborative Planning Protocol. Formative and summative assessment data will be considered during planning.	Trinidad, Peggy, pstrinid@volusia.k12.fl.us
Monitor ELA assessment data during weekly PLCs and Monthly School Leadership Team Meetings. Academic Coach, regional resource teacher, administration, and support staff will participate as appropriate.	Trinidad, Peggy, pstrinid@volusia.k12.fl.us
Select teachers will participate in ongoing tier 1 and tier 2 level coaching support in ELA with the academic coach. This support will include observations, feedback, modeling, lesson planning, assessment review, and as appropriate mini professional learning sessions.	Trinidad, Peggy, pstrinid@volusia.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.

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 Zones of Regulation program to assist with self-regulation strategies as well as the Skillstreaming program for social emotional learning direct lessons. The school counselor provides social skills lessons, mentoring, and peer mediation sessions.

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.

For the 22-23 school year, the school will implement the PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports) Program hand in hand with Leader in Me to continue to build a positive school culture and environment.

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

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 Leader in Me and PBIS. 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.