FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SUNRISE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Marion

Principal: Charles "Chuck" Trombly

SAC Chair: Jean Deshommes

Superintendent: James M. Yancey, Jr.

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/9/2012

Gerard Robinson, Commissioner
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor
K-12 Public Schools
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Note: The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
					2011-2012: Sunrise Elementary School, Grade C, Reading Mastery 51%, Math Mastery 57%, Writing Mastery 67%, Lowest 25% making gains in Reading: 80 Math: 39, Learning Gains in Reading: 73, Math: 61 2010-2011: Sunrise Elementary School, Grade C, Reading Mastery 66%, Math Mastery 70%, Writing Mastery 92% AYP: 72%, Total, African-American, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not meet AYP in Reading. No subgroups met AYP in Math. Lowest 25% making gains in Reading: 45 Math: 51, Learning Gains in Reading: 56, Math: 53 2009-2010: Reddick- Collier Elementary School, Grade B, Reading Mastery 57%,

Principal	Chuck Trombly	K-12 Physical Education Certified Bachelor of Science, MA in Adult Education, Ed. Specialist in Educational Leadership	3	11	Math Mastery 74%; Writing Mastery 94%, AYP: 85%, Total, White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in Reading. Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in Math. Lowest 25% making gains in Reading: 50 Math: 70, Learning Gains in Reading: 62, Math: 73 2008-2009: Reddick-Collier Elementary School, Grade A, Reading Mastery 62%, Math Mastery 63%, Writing Mastery 78%, AYP: 87%, Total, Black, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in Reading and Math. Lowest 25% making gains in Reading: 63 Math: 68, Learning Gains in Reading: 69, Math: 63 2007-2008: Reddick-Collier Elementary School, Grade C, Reading Mastery 61%, Math Mastery 66%, Writing Mastery 78%, AYP: 87%, Black,and Economically Disadvantaged did not meet AYP in Reading and Math. Lowest 25% making gains in Reading: 74 Math: 73, Learning Gains in Reading: 70, Math: 68
Assis Principal	Natalia Robledo	Educational Specialist's Degree in Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University Master's Degree in Reading K-12, Nova Southeastern University Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education, Florida International University School Principal Certification ESOL Endorsed	4	4	2011-2012: Sunrise Elementary School, Grade C, Reading Mastery 51%, Math Mastery 57%, Writing Mastery 67%, Lowest 25% making gains in Reading: 80 Math: 39, Learning Gains in Reading: 73, Math: 61 2010-2011: Sunrise Elementary School, Grade C, Reading Mastery 66%, Math Mastery 70%; Writing Mastery 92% AYP: 72%, Total, African-American, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not meet AYP in Reading. No subgroups met AYP in Math. Lowest 25% making gains in Reading: 45 Math: 51, Learning Gains in Reading: 56, Math: 53 2009-2010: Sunrise Elementary School, no school grade, Reading Mastery 68%, Math Mastery 76%; AYP: 82%, White, African-American, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in Reading. Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in Math. No learning gains reported due to Sunrise being a K-3 school. 2008-2009: Evergreen Elementary School, Grade B, Reading Mastery 57%, Math Mastery 60%; AYP: 82%, African-American, and Economically Disadvantaged did not meet AYP in Reading. African-American and Economically Disadvantaged did not meet AYP in Math. Lowest 25% making gains in Reading: 66 Math: 70, Learning Gains in Reading: 67, Math: 66 2007-2008: Dunnellon Elementary School, Grade C, Reading Mastery 72%, Math Mastery 70%; AYP: 92%, Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in Reading and Math. Lowest 25% making gains in Reading: 43 Math: 47, Learning Gains in Reading: 65, Math: 53

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the

Academic Coach	John Rawlins	Art (K-12) Elementary Education (K-6) Educational Leadership Master's Degree in Ed. Leadership, Walden University Bachelor's Degree in Art Education, University of Florida	23	14	2011-2012: Sunrise Elementary School, Grade C, Reading Mastery 51%, Math Mastery 57%, Writing Mastery 67%, Lowest 25% making gains in Reading: 80 Math: 39, Learning Gains in Reading: 73, Math: 61 2010-2011: Sunrise Elementary School, Grade C Reading Mastery 66%, Math Mastery 70%; Writing Mastery 92% AYP: 72%, Total, African-American, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not meet AYP in Reading. No subgroups met AYP in Math. Lowest 25% making gains in Reading: 45 Math: 51, Learning Gains in Reading: 56, Math: 53 2009-2010: Sunrise Elementary School, no school grade, Reading Mastery 68%, Math Mastery 76%; AYP: 82%, White, African-American, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in Reading. Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in Math. No learning gains reported due to Sunrise being a K-3 school. 2008-2009: Sunrise Elementary School, no school grade, Reading Mastery 66%, Math Mastery 71%; AYP: 92%, Economically Disadvantaged did not meet AYP in Reading. Hispanics and English Language Learners did not meet AYP in Math. No learning gains reported due to Sunrise being a K-3 school. 2007-2008: Sunrise Elementary School, no school grade, Reading Mastery 64%, Math Mastery 72%; AYP: 90%, Hispanic, English Language Learners, and Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in Reading. English Language Learners did not meet AYP in Math. No learning gains reported due to Sunrise being a K-3 school.
Academic Coach	Angela Stoddard	Elementary Education (1-6) Master's Degree in Ed. Leadership, Walden University Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education, St. Leo University ESOL Endorsed	12	8	2011-2012: Sunrise Elementary School, Grade C, Reading Mastery 51%, Math Mastery 57%, Writing Mastery 67%, Lowest 25% making gains in Reading: 80 Math: 39, Learning Gains in Reading: 73, Math: 61 2010-2011: Sunrise Elementary School, Grade C Reading Mastery 66%, Math Mastery 70%; Writing Mastery 92% AYP: 72%, Total, African-American, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not meet AYP in Reading. No subgroups met AYP in Math. Lowest 25% making gains in Reading: 45 Math: 51, Learning Gains in Reading: 56, Math: 53 2009-2010: Sunrise Elementary School, no school grade, Reading Mastery 68%, Math Mastery 76%; AYP: 82%, White, African-American, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in Reading. Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in Math. No learning gains reported due to Sunrise being a K-3 school. 2008-2009: Sunrise Elementary School, no school grade, Reading Mastery 66%, Math Mastery 71%; AYP: 92%, Economically Disadvantaged did not meet AYP in Reading. Hispanics and English Language Learners did not meet AYP in Math. No learning gains reported due to Sunrise being a K-3 school. 2007-2008: Sunrise Elementary School, no school grade, Reading Mastery 64%, Math Mastery 72%; AYP: 90%, Hispanic, English Language Learners, and Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in Reading. English Language Learners did not meet AYP in Math. No learning gains reported due to Sunrise being a K-3 school.
		Bachelor's Degree in			

		Elementary Education, Stetson University			
Academic Coach	Carol Krietemeyer	Master's Degree in Literacy and Mild Disabilities K-12, University of Florida	1		WHE: 2011-2012: School Grade B 61% of students in the lowest 25% made gains in Reading 66% of students in the lowest 25% made gains in Math 63% of students made a Level 3 or higher as measured on FCAT 2.0
		Ed. Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership, National-Louis University			WHE: 2010-2011: B 49% of students with disabilities made AYP in Math. 60% of economically disadvantaged students made AYP in Reading.
		ESOL Endorced Reading Endorced Early Childhood			

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	New teacher orientation in school procedures and policies	Administration	August 2012	
2	Schedule classroom visits by Academic Coaches and Administration to offer support, modeling, and mentoring	Administration/ Academic Coaches	June 1, 2013	
3	Provide specific staff development based on teacher and student needs	Administration/ Academic Coaches	June 1, 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0	N/A

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
51	0.0%(0)	51.0%(26)	27.5%(14)	21.6%(11)	39.2%(20)	100.0%(51)	7.8%(4)	0.0%(0)	64.7%(33)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities

N/A

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A

> Title I, Part A
> Sunrise Elementary is a Title 1 school based on our economically disadvantaged student population. Title 1 funds are used to give support in reading and math to our low performing students to help them realize success in core curriculum areas. Sunrise utilizes Title I funds to tutoring for struggling level 1 and 2 students in reading and math during the school year. The curriculum that is used for tutoring is Curriculum Press, which divides the lessons by specific FCAT tested skills such as main idea, author's purpose, etc.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

> N/A

Title I, Part D

> N/A

Title II

> Our district provides staff development activities to improve basic educational programs and to assist administrators and teachers in meeting highly qualified status.
>
> Title II, Part D: Our district receives supplemental funds for improving their basic education programs through the purchase of small technological equipment to supplement education programs. Technology in the classrooms will increase the instructional strategies provided to students. The use of instructional software will enhance literacy and math skills of struggling students and early childhood students.

Title III

> Services are provided through the district for educational materials and support services on an as needed basis to improve the education of immigrants and English Language Learners (ELL).

Title X- Homeless

> N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

> N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

> N/A

Nutrition Programs

> N/A

Housing Programs

> N/A

Head Start

> During the 2012-2013 school year, Sunrise is offering a state-funded Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten Program. The school uses the ELLM (Early Literacy and Learning Model), and VPK standards and curriculum provided by the Early Learning Coalition of Marion County. The program is Monday through Friday, from 7:20-2:05, with a half hour for lunch. The program lasts all year.

The VPK program helps students bridge the gap between home and school. Students are exposed to many hands-on activities, where they are manipulating objects and/or doing activities in a center, as well as actual science projects such as planting seeds and watching them grow. In addition, students are read to orally, taught the alphabet and numbers, and taught basic pre-school skills.

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school-based MRSS/RtI Leadership Team is comprised of the members of the Problem Solving Team, including:

Mr. Trombly - Principal and/or Mrs. Robledo - Assistant Principal: Administrative Support, Academic and Behavior Team Faciliator, assist and provide research-based interventions and training

Mrs. Pittman - Guidance Counselor: Academic and Behavior Team Facilitator, Note-Taker, Documentation Supplier, assist and provide research-based interventions

Classroom Teacher - Provides input and data to support need for intervention

Ms. Davis - Dean: Team Facilitator for behavior concerns, provider of discipline data from referrals, check-in/check-out coordinator for intervention, assist and provide research-based interventions

Ms. Krietemeyer - Academic Coach: assist and provide research-based interventions

Ms. Stoddard - Academic Coach: assist and provide research-based interventions

Mr. Rawlins - Academic Coach: assist and provide research-based interventions

District Level Support Personnel (Ms. DelNodal - Psychologist, Ms. Panzer - Social Worker, Ms. Piperato - Behavior Specialist, Ms. Speck - Speech/Language Pathologist): assist and provide research-based interventions

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team follows the following process:

Step 1: Problem Identification – identify and define the target problem.
Problems are identified by test results, such as District Calendar Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, and FAIR, data team meetings, speaking with teachers, grade level meetings, and data meetings.

Step 2: Problem Analysis – attempt to determine why the problem is occurring.
Problems are analyzed during collaboration meetings, weekly leadership team meetings, weekly meetings with administration, data meetings, resource staff meetings, anecdotal records, and walk-throughs.

Step 3: Intervention Design – decide what is going to be done about the problem.
The resource staff is used to help students in need of interventions. In addition, a 30 minute remediation/triple I time is built into the master schedule, to allow for interventions.

Step 4: Response to Intervention – monitor progress and determine "Is it working?"
Monitoring is done with the use of data analysis, data meetings, collaboration meetings, and weekly leadership meetings. The concentrated data resource teacher monitors the data and provides feedback to teachers and administration.

The implementation of SAT is a well defined process which begins with the identification of needed student support. The Marion County Student Assistance Team Packet walks and supports the team through the process.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team provides support in the following ways: (1) strong administrative support to ensure commitment and resources (2) strong teacher support to share in the common goal of improving instruction and/or behavior and (3) Leadership Team to build staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time. The School Advisory Council (SAC) and the leadership team provided input for the SIP. Looking at the school-wide data, decisions were made to improve the areas of deficiency in order to improve student achievement.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Examples of data management systems:
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) – grades 3 and 4; assesses reading and math
Performance Matters – the data system used to track data from FCAT, Focus Calendar Assessments, and District Benchmark Assessments
Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) – grades K-4; assesses reading skills such as phonics, fluency, and comprehension
Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN) – the data system used for monitoring the data assessed in FAIR
Monthly teacher data meetings where the teachers meet with administration to discuss the strategies that work for teaching certain skills
Graphs (teacher created) – to chart data, see the aim line, as well as the trend line, to determine if a student is progressing with the intervention provided.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The assistant principal, guidance counselor, and/or school psychologist will provide training to the teachers on the MTSS/RtI process. During grade level meetings and/or district inservice days, the staff will be trained on various components of MTSS/RtI, such as differentiated instruction and the SAT process. Although the staff was trained last school year on the RtI process, there have been many changes – including new forms and input of data through Performance Matters. The MTSS/RtI team will present the new information to staff members, as well as provide a time for teachers to practice filling out the new forms. In addition, ongoing staff training will occur during the review meetings, and the guidance counselor is available for one to one trainings and assisting teachers as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS team will provide support to teachers on using the MTSS system. During PMP meetings, the team will utilize the MTSS binder to ensure proper procedures and documentation. Administration will provide trainings throughout the year to support teachers during this process. In addition, the MTSS team will review the data and provide feedback to teachers.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) include the Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, 1-2 classroom teachers per grade level, and an ESE teacher.

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The school-based LLT meets on a monthly basis. At the meeting, ideas and strategies are shared and discussed with the team. Teachers share the information at their grade level meetings. One of the major roles of the Literacy Leadership Team is to plan and implement a parent night emphasizing reading strategies parents can use at home (Hooked on Books). At this parent night, teachers present information to parents, while their children attend a make and take that coincides with the

strategies the parents are learning. In addition, the LLT will be involved in a book study to learn new reading strategies that can be implemented in the classroom.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

The major initiative of the LLT this year will be to focus on improving content and standard-based vocabulary instruction across the curriculum. Current research shows the importance of teaching vocabulary to students, especially when it pertains to ELL and Low Socio-Economic students. This school-wide focus on content and standard-based vocabulary and writing across the curriculum allows for teachers to check student understanding before a formal assessment is given. Teachers are using quick writes/comprehension checks across all subjects to check for understanding. At the LLT meetings, teachers will provide feedback to be shared and discussed amongst the school.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

Stagger Start is a district initiative to assist students in transitioning into local elementary schools. Five (5) students per day attend school the first week, giving the staff an opportunity to administer assessments, develop one-on-one relationships with students, and eliminate anxiety. This is the primary focus of Stagger Start. FAIR and FLKRS are tools used to determine readiness needs. District trained faculty and staff administer both of these screenings.

CELLA (Comprehensive English Language Learner Assessment) is given to all new ELL Kindergarten students. This assessment is coordinated by the Guidance Department and administered by the ESOL Para-professionals. Parents are notified of the results.

In order to assist low achieving preschoolers, each Kindergarten classroom has a thirty minute immediate intensive intervention (Triple I) time. Para-professionals are provided to assist teachers at this time.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

N/A

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

N/A

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	68% of students in 3rd - 4th grade (192/282 students) will achieve mastery on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% of students in 3rd and 4th grade(72/285 students) achieved mastery.	68% of 3rd and 4th grade students will achieve mastery.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	90 minutes of uninterrupted reading block gets interrupted due to mitigating circumstances such as: fire drills, FAIR assessment, Altrusa, Demand Writing, etc.	Consistently utilize CCRP (Macmillan, Treasures/ Triumphs) during the uninterrupted 90 minute reading block, using whole group and differentiated instruction.	Administrators Academic Coach Classroom teacher	Classroom walk-throughs and lesson plan checks Schedule uninterrupted reading block	90 minutes reading block in lesson plans and on master schedule Fidelity checklist
2	Technology may not work, change/ interruption in schedule may not allow student to work on it daily.	Utilize 30 minutes daily for Triple I remediation or enrichment using SuccessMaker4	Administrators Academic Coaches SM4 Lab Manager Classroom teacher	Classroom walk-throughs and lesson plan checks Schedule daily 30 minutes for Triple I	Triple I in lesson plans and on master schedule Teachers signed up and attending the computer lab daily at their scheduled time.
3	Limited number of paraprofessionals assisting/ available to work with students, attendance of resource staff	Small group instruction utilizing paraprofessionals, resource teachers, intervention teacher, and reading coach	Administrators Academic Coaches	Administrative data meetings/grade level meetings discussions	Benchmark assessments, FAIR, FCAs, FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A Sunrise does not have any Alternative Assessed students.	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A - Sunrise does not have any students who are Alternatively Assessed.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.

Reading Goal #2a:	31% (87/282)of students in 3rd – 4th grade will achieve above proficiency on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (59/285) of students in 3rd – 4th grade achieved above proficiency on the reading portion of the 2012 FCAT.	31% of students in 3rd – 4th grade will achieve above proficiency on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited number of paraprofessionals assisting/ available to work with students	Utilizing the Treasures Above Level Readers	Administration

Reading Coach | Classroom walk-throughs and lesson plan checks | Benchmark assessments, FAIR, FCAs, FCAT |
| 2 | Not enough copies of chapter books

Technology limitations | Utilizing chapter books/ book studies with student – research | Administration

Reading Coach | Classroom walk-throughs and lesson plan checks | Benchmark assessments, FAIR, FCAs, FCAT |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.

Reading Goal #2b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A - Sunrise does not have students who are Alternative Assessed	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning	

	gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	83% of students in 4th grade and retained 3rd graders (127/153 students) will make learning gains on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (117/160)4th grade and retained 3rd grade	83% of students in 4th grade and retained 3rd graders (127/153 students) will make learning gains on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited number of paraprofessionals assisting/ available to work with students, attendance of resource staff	Small group instruction utilizing paraprofessionals, resource teachers, intervention teacher, and reading coach	Administrators Resource Teachers Reading Coach	Administrative data meetings/grade level meetings discussions	Benchmark assessments, FAIR, FCAs, FCAT
2	Technology may not work, change/ interruption in schedule may not allow student to work on it daily.	Utilize 30 minutes daily for Triple I remediation or enrichment using SuccessMaker4	Administrators Reading Coach SM4 Lab Manager Classroom Teacher	Classroom walk-throughs and lesson plan checks Schedule 30 minutes daily for Triple I	Triple I in lesson plans and on master schedule Teachers signed up and attending the computer lab daily at their scheduled time.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	N/A

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	90% (34/38) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

80% (30/38) students in the lowest 25% made learning gains	90% (34/38) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Academic Coaches may be pulled for other duties, which will result in less contact with students	Academic Coaches will work in small groups with the lowest 25%.	Academic Coaches Administration	Administrative data meetings/leadership team discussions	Benchmark assessments, FAIR, FCAs, FCAT

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # Sunrise will reach the Reading Target AMO of 74% by 2017, increasing it by 23% in the next six years. 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	51%					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	61% of students in 3rd - 4th grade (172/282 students) in each ethnicity subgroup will make satisfactory progress using the 2013 FCAT data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
African American - 38% (31/81) Hispanic - 42% (42/100) Caucasian - 61% (45/73)	61% of students in 3rd - 4th grade (172/282 students) in each ethnicity subgroup will make satisfactory progress using the 2013 FCAT data.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Academic Coach not available to work with students	Academic Coaches working with small groups of students	Academic Coaches Administration	Data chats with administration Data meetings with grade levels	Benchmark assessments, FAIR, FCAs, FCAT
2	Lack of student/ parent participation	Invitation to after-school tutoring, summer camps, and FCAT boot camp	Administration	Data meetings, weekly leadership meetings	Benchmark assessments, FAIR, FCAs, FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	We will decrease the number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress from 87% (41/47) to 77% (39/50) based on the 2013 FCAT.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
87% (41/47)are not making satisfactory progress in reading	We will decrease the number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress from 87% (41/47) to 77% (39/50) based on the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Paraprofessionals absent	Paraprofessionals consistently using the Treasures Reading Series ELL Components with ELL students	Administration Academic Coach	Data meetings Administration and reading coach walk-throughs and monitoring	Benchmark assessments, FAIR, FCAs, FCAT
2	Computer technical issues	Utilize the Success Maker ELL component	Administration SuccessMaker Manager	Administration walk-throughs and monitoring	SuccessMaker reports
3	Limited availability (time) within contract day	Provide training, strategies, and support to ESOL paraprofessionals	Administration District ESOL Curriculum Support	Monitoring of implementation Collaboration between paraprofessional and teacher	Benchmark assessments, FAIR, FCAs, FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	We will decrease the number of SWD students not making satisfactory progress from 83% (39/47) to 73% (34/47) based on the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83% (39/47) of students with disabilities are not making satisfactory progress	We will decrease the number of SWD students not making satisfactory progress from 83% (39/47) to 73% (34/47) based on the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Some students are uninterested in leisure reading	"Time for Kids" subscription	Teacher, Principal, and Assistant Principal	"Time for Kids" activities completion	Benchmark, FCA, FAIR, and FCAT
2	One of the most challenging barriers in meeting AYP is providing adequate support for students with exceptionalities	Provide Support for ESE and Regular Education students utilizing the inclusion model as well as assign paraprofessionals to assist with student	Principal and Assistant Principal	Observations Data charts Review of Lesson Plans	Benchmark, FCA, FAIR, and FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	We will decrease the number of ED students not making satisfactory progress from 59% (149/251) to 49% (124/254) using the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

3rd and 4th Grade: 59% (149/251)	We will decrease the number of ED students not making satisfactory progress from 59% (149/251) to 49% (124/254) using the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Time available for full training - personel for training	Ruby Payne training for teachers to implement strategies in the classroom to assist Economically Disadvantaged students	Title I Resource Teacher Academic Coach Administration	New strategies implemented in classroom, log effectiveness, share/ discuss with group	Benchmark assessments, FAIR, FCAs, FCAT
2	Time in schedule - how to implement another strategy with a tight schedule	School-wide focus on content and standard-based vocabulary and writing across the curriculum – using quick-writes/comprehension checks	Administration	Classroom walk-throughs and lesson plan checks	Displaying student work can show comprehension of skills and thought process of problem solving
3	Resource teachers not available	Resource teachers working with small groups of students	Academic Coach Administration	Data chats with administration Data meetings with grade levels	Benchmark assessments, FAIR, FCAs, FCAT

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Reading Leadership Committee	K-4 Reading	Academic Coach	Academic Coaches, Assistant Principal, Classroom teachers from each grade level	Once a month, after school (2:30-3:00), starting in September 2012 through May 2013	Meeting agendas and minutes turned in to Administration	Administration
Book Study Group	K-4 Reading	Academic Coach	Academic Coaches, Classroom teachers from each grade level	Once a month October 2012 – June 2013	Teachers share new ideas/strategies with their grade level during Grade Level Meetings. Minutes from monthly meetings turned in to Administration	Administration
Common Core Training	K-2 Reading	Academic Coach/ Common Core Lead Teachers	Academic Coaches, Teachers	Select Early Release dates October 2012 – June 2013	Administration walk-throughs, evident in lesson plans	Administration
Max Thompson Strategies	K-4 Reading	Academic Coach	School-wide	Select Early Release dates October 2012 – June 2013	Administration walk-throughs, evident in lesson plans	Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Work with students in small groups	Instructional Paraprofessionals (3)	Title I	$45,643.00
SuccessMaker program	Lab Manager	Title I	$15,643.00
Reading tutoring (3rd and 4th grade)	After-school tutoring for targeted, lowest quartile students	Title I	$3,070.00
Provide support and work with small groups	Academic Coach	Title I	$29,064.00
			Subtotal: $93,420.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increase technology to enhance reading instruction	Fully engage 2 classrooms with SMART technology	Title I	$6,196.00
			Subtotal: $6,196.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide professional development and support to teachers	Academic Coach	Title I	$29,064.00
			Subtotal: $29,064.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $128,680.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., 70% (35)).

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	15% (17/113) students will be proficient in the listening/speaking portion of the CELLA assessment
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
5% (6/113) students who took the CELLA assessment were profient in Listening/Speaking	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ESOL paras may be absent, so students miss the small group or 1:1 intensive instruction	ESOL paras will work with small groups of students or 1:1, focusing on oral language, comprehension, and writing	Administration	Monitor small group instruction, review data, meet with ESOL paras monthly	CELLA 2013, FCAs, FCAT, Benchmark
2	By meeting monthly, students might miss instruction with the ESOL paras due to	ESOL paras will meet with Ms. Moran, district ESOL support, monthly	Administration	Monitor small group instruction, review data, meet with ESOL paras monthly	CELLA 2013, FCAs, FCAT, Benchmark

	being out of the classroom			

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	15% (17/113) students will be proficient in the reading portion of the CELLA assessment
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
0% (0/113) students who took the CELLA assessment were profient in reading	

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>ESOL paras may be absent, so students miss the small group or 1:1 intensive instruction</td><td>ESOL paras will work with small groups of students or 1:1, focusing on oral language, comprehension, and writing</td><td>Administration</td><td>Monitor small group instruction, review data, meet with ESOL paras monthly</td><td>CELLA 2013, FCAs, FCAT, Benchmark</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>By meeting monthly, students might miss instruction with the ESOL paras due to being out of the classroom</td><td>ESOL paras will meet with Ms. Moran, district ESOL support, monthly</td><td>Administration</td><td>Monitor small group instruction, review data, meet with ESOL paras monthly</td><td>CELLA 2013, FCAs, FCAT, Benchmark</td></tr>
</table>

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	15% (17/113) students will be proficient in the writing portion of the CELLA assessment
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
0% (0/113) students who took the CELLA assessment were profient in writing	

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>ESOL paras may be absent, so students miss the small group or 1:1 intensive instruction</td><td>ESOL paras will work with small groups of students or 1:1, focusing on oral language, comprehension, and writing</td><td>Administration</td><td>Monitor small group instruction, review data, meet with ESOL paras monthly</td><td>CELLA 2013, FCAs, FCAT, Benchmark</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>By meeting monthly, students might miss instruction with the ESOL paras due to being out of the classroom</td><td>ESOL paras will meet with Ms. Moran, district ESOL support, monthly</td><td>Administration</td><td>Monitor small group instruction, review data, meet with ESOL paras monthly</td><td>CELLA 2013, FCAs, FCAT, Benchmark</td></tr>
</table>

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	67% of students in 3rd - 4th grade (188/282 students)will achieve mastery on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (162/285) of 3rd and 4th grade students achieved mastery.	67% of students in 3rd - 4th grade (188/282 students)will achieve mastery on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Fairly new textbook – all components may be unfamiliar to teachers	Daily 60 minutes of math instruction using new "Go Math!" textbook and differentiated instruction.	Administration Academic Coach Classroom teacher	Classroom walk-throughs and lesson plan checks	60 minute math block in lesson plans and on master schedule – new textbook and standards evident.
2	Updated Acaletics, some aspects may be new to teachers	Utilize Acaletics Math Program	Administration Academic Coach	Weekly Leadership Meeting Classroom walk-throughs and lesson plan checks	Acaletics Assessments
3	Computer technical issues	Utilize FasttMath computer program	Administration Academic Coach	Administration walk-throughs and monitoring	FasttMath reports

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A Sunrise does not have any students on Alternative Assessment	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	34% of students in 3rd - 4th grade (96/282) will achieve above mastery on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (68/283)	34% of students in 3rd - 4th grade (96/282) will achieve above mastery on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher planning time is limited	Differentiating instruction and providing challenging activities	Classroom Teacher Administration	Administration walk-throughs and monitoring Data chats	Evident in lesson plans Benchmark, FAIR, FCAs, FCAT
2	Updated Acaletics, some aspects may be new to teachers	Utilize Acaletics Math Program	Administration Academic Coach	Weekly Leadership Meeting Classroom walk-throughs and lesson plan checks	Acaletics Assessments
3	Computer technical issues - program not working, computers down, etc.	Utilizing SuccessMaker daily for 20 minutes	Academic Coach	Monitoring of SuccessMaker (students actually utilizing the program), walk-throughs.	SuccessMaker usage reports

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A - Sunrise does not have any students on Alternative Assessment	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	71% of students (114/160 students) will make learning gains on the math portion of the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

61% (93/153)	71% of students (114/160 students) will make learning gains on the math portion of the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited number of paraprofessionals assisting/available to work with students, attendance of resource staff	Small group instruction utilizing paraprofessionals, resource teachers, intervention teacher, and reading coach	Administrators Academic Coaches	Administrative data meetings/ grade level meetings discussions	Benchmark assessments, FAIR, FCAs, FCAT
2	Computer technical issues, computers not working properly, program not working	Utilizing the math SuccessMaker program daily for 20 minutes	Academic Coach Lab Manager	Walk-throughs, data meetings	SuccessMaker reports, FCAT, FCAs

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A - Sunrise does not have any students who are Alternative Assessed	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	49% (16/32)students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains based on the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (15/38)	49% (16/32)students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains based on the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Coaches may be unavailable or pulled away from meeting with students	Academic coaches will work in small groups with students in the lowest 25%	Academic Coaches Administration	Data chats with administration Data meetings with grade levels	Benchmark assessments, FCAT, FCAs

---

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # Sunrise will reach the Reading Target AMO of 76% by 2017, increasing it by 19% in the next six years. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	57%					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	We will decrease the number of students not making satisfactory progress in each subgroup by 10%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Caucasian - 40% (29/73) African American - 58% (47/81) Hispanic - 48% (48/100)	Caucasian - 30% (22/73) African American - 48% (39/81) Hispanic - 38% (38/100)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Resource teachers not available	Resource teachers working with small groups of students	Resource Teachers Administration	Data chats with administration Data meetings with grade levels	Benchmark assessments, FCAT, FCAs
2	Computer technical problems	Utilizing the SuccessMaker program daily for 20 minutes	Academic Coach Administration	Walk-throughs Pulling reports	SuccessMaker reports, FCAT, FCAs

---

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	We will decrease the number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress from 77% (36/47) to 67% (34/50) based on the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (36/47) are not making satisfactory progress	We will decrease the number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress from 77% (36/47) to 67% (34/50) based on the 2013 FCAT.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ESOL paraprofessionals may be pulled from their groups for various reasons - they may not be able to see the students daily	ESOL paraprofessionals working with ELL students in small groups	Administration	Walk-throughs Lesson Plan Guides check	FCAT, FCAs, Benchmark assessments, CELLA
2	District personnel may not be available when necessary	Utilizing district ESOL personnel to support and assist the ESOL paraprofessionals by providing strategies to use with students	Administration	Planning of dates on calendars Monthly meetings with ESOL personnel	FCAT, FCAs, Benchmark assessments, CELLA

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	We will decrease the number of SWD students not making satisfactory progress from 79% (37/47) to 69% (32/47) based on the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79% (37/47) SWD are not making satisfactory progress	We will decrease the number of SWD students not making satisfactory progress from 79% (37/47) to 69% (32/47) based on the 2013 FCAT.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may not work in small groups due to the para and/or teacher being absent	ESE paras and ESE teacher will work with SWD in small groups	Administration ESE teacher	Data chats with administration Data meetings with grade levels	Benchmark assessments, FCAT, FCAs

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	We will decrease the number of ED students not making satisfactory progress from 52% (131/251) to 42% (105/251) based on the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% (131/251) are not making satisfactory progress	We will decrease the number of ED students not making satisfactory progress from 52% (131/251) to 42% (105/251) based on the 2013 FCAT.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Computer technical issues, program not working	Utlilizing SuccessMaker daily for 20 minutes	Academic Coach Lab Manager	Walk-throughs Data meetings	SuccessMaker reports, FCAs, Benchmark

						assessments
2	Limited numbers of paraprofessionals	Utilizing paraprofessionals to work with Economically Disadvantaged students in a small group setting	Academic Coach	Walk-throughs Collaboration between paraprofessionals and teachers	FCAT, FCAs, Benchmark assessments
3	Limited time to work with the number of students in this subgroup	Utilizing the intervention teacher to work with students	Academic Coach	Walk-throughs Collaboration between paraprofessionals and teachers	FCAT, FCAs, Benchmark assessments

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Acaletics Program	K-4 Math	Academic Coach	Math Lead Teachers School-wide	September 2012 – June 2013 as needed	Monitor and observe Acaletics lessons Data team meetings	Administration Academic Coach Acaletics Representative
Common Core Training	K-2 Math	Common Core Trainers Administration Academic Coaches	K-2 Teachers	Select Early Release Days between August 2012- June 2013	Walk-throughs and monitoring	Administration Academic Coach
Math Series "Go Math!"	K-4 Math	Academic Coach Math Lead Teachers	School-wide	Select grade level meetings between September 2012 – June 2013 as needed	Walk-throughs and monitoring	Administration
Curriculum Maps Training	K-4 All Subjects	Administration	School-wide	August 2012	Walk-throughs and monitoring	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide support and work with small groups	Academic Coach	Title I	$22,586.00
			Subtotal: $22,586.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
		Subtotal:	$0.00
		Grand Total:	**$22,586.00**

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
N/A Sunrise is a K-4 school.	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited materials	Use district-adopted science curriculum from Harcourt Brace (1st and 2nd grade) and National Geographic (3rd and 4th)	Dean Academic Coach	Evident in lesson plans Administration walk-throughs and monitoring	Harcourt Brace Science Series Unit Tests, National Geographic Science Assessment
2	Limited time in schedule	Lead science teachers will share best practices after attending monthly science meetings	District Science Lead Teachers Administration	Meeting minutes reflecting sharing of best practices Administration walk-throughs and monitoring	Harcourt Brace Science Series Unit Tests, National Geographic Science Assessment
3	No parent support for completion of project	K-2 students will submit a class science project, 3rd and 4th grade students will submit an individual science fair project	Science Lead Teachers Administration Dean	Science Fair projects submitted by students/class	Rubric

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
N/A - Sunrise does not have any students who Alternative Assess	N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	N/A - Sunrise was a K-4 school for the 2011-2012 school year. We cannot show Level 4 and 5 on FCAT without 5th grade data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A - Sunrise does not have any student who is Alternative Assessed	N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Committee	K-4 Science	Gillian Davis	K-4 teachers, ESE teacher	Once a month September 2012-June 2013	Meeting minutes submitted Administrative observations/ classroom walkthroughs	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	77% (123/160) of 4th grade students will score a 3.0 or above on the 2013 Writing portion of the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (103/153)	77% (123/160) of 4th grade students will score a 3.0 or above on the 2013 Writing portion of the FCAT.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	Several new 4th grade teachers - new to teaching writing	Participate in quarterly county demand writings	Academic Coach Administration	Weekly data and collaboration meetings	Quarterly county demand writings; monthly in-school demand writings
2	Several new 4th grade teachers - new to teaching writing	Have additional monthly in-school demand writings	Academic Coach Administration	Weekly data and collaboration meetings	Quarterly county demand writings; monthly in-school demand writings
3	New program for most staff, may not know how to implement properly.	School-wide WriteReflections/ Melissa Forney curriculum implemented	Academic Coach Administration	Curriculum evident in lesson plans Student writing samples	Quarterly county demand writings; monthly in-school demand writings

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A - Sunrise does not have any students who are Alternative Assessed.	N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing curriculum	K-4 Writing	Academic Coach	K-4 teachers, ESE, Special Area Teachers	August 2012 Select Early Release Dates September 2012- May 2013	Walk throughs, evident in lesson plans, demand writing scores	Administration
Common Core Training	K-2 Writing	Academic Coach Common Core Lead Teachers	K-2 teachers, ESE, Special Area Teahcers	Select Early Release Dates September 2012- May 2013	Walk throughs, evident in lesson plans, demand writing scores	Administration
Melissa Forney Training	3rd - 4th writing	Academic Coach/ Melissa Forney	Select 3rd and 4th grade teachers	July 2012	Walk throughs, evident in lesson plans, demand writing scores	Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing Training – 4th Grade Teachers	Melissa Forney Writing Camp	Title I	$1,200.00
Provide writing professional development and support to teachers	Academic Coach	Title I	$22,586.00
			Subtotal: $23,786.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $23,786.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	The number of students with excessive absences and tardies will decrease by 50% (162 absences, 61 tardies)
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93.55	95
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
324	162
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
122	61

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	Phone numbers may not be accurate due to change in numbers and not advising school	Call parents and discuss attendance issues	Student Services Guidance Counselor	Monitor attendance rate and log attendance meetings/ conversations with parents	Attendance report
2	Parents unaware of Florida Law	Involve social workers with excessive attendance issues	Student Services Guidance Counselors	Monitor attendance rate and log attendance meetings/ conversations with parents	Attendance report
3	Time required to formulate a plan of action and implement	Reward students with perfect attendance each quarter	Student Services Administration	Monitor attendance rate	Attendance report

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance Committee	K-4	Dean	Student Services, Guidance Counselors, IPC, Social Workers, Teachers	Once every nine week period (October 2012-May 2013)	Meet and discuss outcomes with Administration Meeting minutes	Administration

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	The number of out of school suspensions will decrease by 5% due to PBS.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
76	30
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
40	10

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Excessive Absences Lack of Parent Participation	Check-in/Check-out system with 5% of students with specific discipline behaviors	Student Services (Dean)	Decreased referral counts	Discipline data from SMS and Custom Reports
2	Limited funding for materials and prizes	" Sunny Money" – students earn play money to purchase items at school	Student Services (Dean)	Decreased referral counts	Discipline data from SMS and Custom Reports
3	Teacher does not review expectations in class	" Words of Wisdom" school-wide expectations and announcements	Student Services (Dean)	Decreased referral counts	Discipline data from SMS and Custom Reports

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

| PBS | K-4 | Dean | K-4 teachers and paraprofessionals | Monthly from August 2012-June 2013 | Feedback from teachers and staff, review data | Dean Administration |

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	N/A - See PIP attached
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
N/A - See PIP attached	N/A - See PIP attached

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A - See PIP attached	N/A - See PIP attached	N/A - See PIP attached	N/A - See PIP attached	N/A - See PIP attached

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Parent Involvement Committee	K-4	Academic Coach	Select K-4 teachers and paraprofessionals	Once a 9 week period	Meeting minutes	Academic Coach Administration

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Literacy Night	"Hooked on Books" Informational night for parents supporting reading at home	Title I Parent Involvement	$2,300.00
			Subtotal: $2,300.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,300.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Work with students in small groups	Instructional Paraprofessionals (3)	Title I	$45,643.00
Reading	SuccessMaker program	Lab Manager	Title I	$15,643.00
Reading	Reading tutoring (3rd and 4th grade)	After-school tutoring for targeted, lowest quartile students	Title I	$3,070.00
Reading	Provide support and work with small groups	Academic Coach	Title I	$29,064.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Mathematics	Provide support and work with small groups	Academic Coach	Title I	$22,586.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Parent Involvement	Parent Literacy Night	"Hooked on Books" Informational night for parents supporting reading at home	Title I Parent Involvement	$2,300.00
STEM	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
				Subtotal: $118,306.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Increase technology to enhance reading instruction	Fully engage 2 classrooms with SMART technology	Title I	$6,196.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
STEM	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
				Subtotal: $6,196.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Provide professional development and support to teachers	Academic Coach	Title I	$29,064.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Writing	Writing Training – 4th Grade Teachers	Melissa Forney Writing Camp	Title I	$1,200.00
Writing	Provide writing professional development and support to teachers	Academic Coach	Title I	$22,586.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
STEM	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
				Subtotal: $52,850.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
STEM	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $177,352.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

ʃŋ Priority	ʃŋ Focus	ʃŋ Prevent	ʃŋ NA

Are you a reward school: ʃŋ Yes ʃŋ No

A reward school is any school that improves their letter grade or any school graded A.

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/28/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
If available, Sunrise would use the SAC funds to provide FCAT tutoring for identified/targeted students based on current data.	$0.00

Describe the activities of the School Advisory Council for the upcoming year

The School Advisory Council (SAC) is the sole body responsible for final decision making at the school relating to implementation of the provisions in section 1001.42(16) and 1008.345 (School Improvement).

SAC meets monthly to focus and discuss the progress of Sunrise Elementary School Improvement Plan (SIP). The SAC annually reviews and revises the SIP based on assessed needs, issues related to AYP status, student motivation, and FCAT testing results. Once the plan is approved, it is shared with all members of the faculty and staff, as well as parents and community members via the district/school websites. Other issues related to discipline, budgeting, school grades, safety, parental involvement, technology, and various school activities are also discussed at the SAC meetings.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Marion School District SUNRISE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	75%	57%	53%	256	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	56%	53%			109	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	45% (NO)	51% (YES)			96	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					461	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

No Data Found