Sunrise Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sunrise Elementary School

1651 MARA LOMA BLVD SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909

http://www.sunrise.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Danielle Kraus S

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Brevard 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

1651 MARA LOMA BLVD SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909

http://www.sunrise.brevard.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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.

The Sunrise family of students, parents, teachers, and staff will strive for a new beginning of excellence for every child every day.
Reviewed 2018

Provide the school's vision statement.

To enable ALL students to "shine" through responsible choices and academic potential.
Reviewed 2018

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jost, Janene	Principal	As the principal, Mrs. Jost is responsible for effectively communicating the Sunrise mission and vision to all stakeholders. She serves on the School Advisory Council to promote school improvement and decision making discussions among teachers, parents, and community members. Mrs. Jost is also responsible for leading the way in making continuous instructional improvements at Sunrise by empowering all faculty members to collaborate, engage in professional development, and make sound curriculum and instruction decisions. Mrs. Jost assists in the facilitation of MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Supports) and data team meetings to monitor student progress. Mrs. Jost provides instructional feedback to teachers and engages them in productive conversations to promote continued professional reflection and growth. Mrs. Jost clearly communicates school improvement plan action steps and goals to all stakeholders. In addition, she monitors the implementation of the school improvement plan to ensure the action steps are being implemented with fidelity.
Campione, Kathleen	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Mrs. Campione is responsible for effectively communicating the Sunrise mission and vision to all stakeholders. She engages with teachers to ensure curriculum and instructional needs are being met, and she frequently collaborates with parents and teachers together to address individual needs of students. Mrs. Campione assists in the facilitation of MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Supports) and data team meetings to promote productive child team discussions and monitors individual student progress. Mrs. Campione also provides instructional feedback to teachers to promote continuous growth and improvement. She facilitates professional development for teachers and clearly communicates school improvement action steps and goals to all stakeholders.
Gillaspie, Alicia	Teacher, K-12	As a teacher leader, Ms. Gillaspie is responsible for collaborating with school administrators, teachers, and parents to assist in school improvement decision making. Ms. Gillaspie assists in the distribution of instructional materials and also serves as an instructional peer coach to assist colleagues with implementing school improvement action steps with fidelity.
	Instructional Coach	As the literacy coach, Mrs. Elliott is responsible for providing instructional support to teachers in the realm of English Language Arts. She thoroughly understands the Language Arts Florida Standards and collaborates with teachers to develop standards-aligned lesson plans. Mrs. Elliott provides instructional coaching and feedback opportunities to Sunrise teachers and also assists in facilitating MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Supports) and data team meetings. In addition, Mrs. Elliott supports students, teachers, parents, and administrators with successful ELA program implementation (e.g. iReady).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	93	107	114	98	113	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	754
Attendance below 90 percent	14	12	11	7	11	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	3	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	13	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on FSA Math	0	0	0	5	20	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	1	1	0	4	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	4	5	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
61

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 9/19/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	48	41	46	38	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	0	9	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	16	18	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	4	7	7	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	62%	57%	61%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	60%	58%	58%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	57%	53%	51%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	63%	63%	63%	64%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	65%	62%	67%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	53%	51%	55%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	57%	53%	49%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	96 (0)	93 (0)	107 (0)	114 (0)	98 (0)	113 (0)	133 (0)	754 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	14 ()	12 ()	11 ()	7 ()	11 ()	9 ()	14 ()	78 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	1 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	15 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (0)	16 (0)	18 (0)	47 (0)
Level 1 on FSA Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	20 (0)	23 (0)	26 (0)	74 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	54%	64%	-10%	58%	-4%
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	61%	1%	58%	4%
	2018	53%	57%	-4%	56%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	56%	60%	-4%	56%	0%
	2018	52%	54%	-2%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	63%	60%	3%	54%	9%
	2018	68%	63%	5%	52%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	49%	61%	-12%	62%	-13%
	2018	52%	62%	-10%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	64%	-2%	64%	-2%
	2018	60%	59%	1%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
	2018	61%	58%	3%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
06	2019	71%	67%	4%	55%	16%
	2018	71%	68%	3%	52%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	57%	56%	1%	53%	4%
	2018	49%	57%	-8%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	29	51	48	32	50	46	19				
ELL	40	50		33	40						
BLK	35	41	29	44	57	41	31				
HSP	54	50	58	51	64	59	33				
MUL	81	71		62	62						
WHT	61	69	63	68	71	51	62				
FRL	55	61	52	57	66	49	45				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	43	45	25	44	38	24				
ELL	23			31							
BLK	35	48	53	47	65	35	13				
HSP	50	51	44	48	48	27	38				
MUL	63	57		62	48						
WHT	62	57	38	66	71	57	56				
FRL	50	51	45	55	66	47	44				
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	27	45	44	33	49	41	25				
ELL	36			64							
BLK	45	54	43	52	60	31	50				
HSP	56	42		48	65	50	29				
MUL	64	71		56	60						
WHT	65	60	59	70	70	68	56				
FRL	54	56	49	56	61	49	46				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	69
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The subgroup of Students With Disabilities (SWD) showed the lowest performance with only 29% of students achieving proficiency in ELA and 32% achieving proficiency in math in 2019. The 2018 data is similar with only 28% of students in the SWD subgroup achieving proficiency in ELA and 25% achieving proficiency in math. The SWD subgroup math trend shows increasing performance by 7%; however the ELA trend remains stagnant. Contributing factors to last year's low performance may include the following:
*Scheduling conflicts often impede tiered supports for our SWD population. Each grade level has a scheduled intervention time, and this is when students receiving Exceptional Student Education are provided support services, thus often times creating gaps in tiered support. Tiered support should be layered and "in addition" to ESE services.
*General Education and Exceptional Student Education teacher collaboration needs strengthening. ESE teachers have a wealth of knowledge for implementing individualized support strategies for students. Scheduled, structured time needs to be provided for teachers to come together to share specific strategies to meet the needs of individual students.
*Further professional development on how to best provide specialized instruction and support for our SWD population is needed. This includes learning about available resources and understanding how to utilize these tools.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Third grade proficiency in math showed the greatest decline from last year, declining by 3 percentage points from 52% in 2018 to 49% in 2019. Third grade students at Sunrise performed 10% lower than the district average in 2018 and 12% lower than the district average in 2019. This trend shows third grade students at Sunrise are increasingly falling below the district average each year. State comparison scores are similar with Sunrise 3rd graders performing 10% below in 2018 and 13% below in 2019. Factors that may have contributed to this decline include the following:
*Implementing instruction that is fully aligned to the intended depth and rigor of the Florida Standards is a challenge. Although it is not the curriculum that assures standards-based instruction is embedded, it is critical for teachers to have access to standards-aligned resources and instructional materials. For our primary teachers in grades K-3, further professional development is needed to assist them in fully accessing and implementing the standards-aligned math curriculum, since it is a new resource for them this year. Teachers in our primary grades now have access to this evidence-based, instructional math program called Ready Florida MAFS.
*Students displaying learning gaps in math need prompt intervention and support, as well as frequent progress monitoring. Specified time is scheduled for ELA intervention, but tiered support for math has been often overlooked, possibly due to the challenges of scheduling.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

This component happens to be the same as described above. Third grade proficiency in math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Sunrise third grade proficiency rate was 49% compared to the state at 62% which is a 13% negative gap. This gap was also evident in 2018. The Sunrise third grade proficiency rate was 52% and the state proficiency rate was 62%, which is a 10% negative gap. This is an increasing negative trend. The same factors noted above may have contributed to this decline:
*Implementing instruction that is fully aligned to the intended depth and rigor of the Florida Standards is a challenge. Although it is not the curriculum that assures standards-based instruction is embedded, it is critical for teachers to have access to standards-aligned resources and instructional materials. For our primary teachers in grades K-3, further professional development is needed to assist them in fully accessing and implementing the standards-aligned math curriculum, since it is a new resource for them this year. Teachers in our primary grades now have access to this evidence-based, instructional math program called Ready Florida MAFS.
*Students displaying learning gaps in math need prompt intervention and support, as well as frequent progress monitoring. Specified time is scheduled for ELA intervention, but tiered support for math has been often overlooked, possibly due to the challenges of scheduling.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Achievement in ELA for our Lowest 25% showed the most improvement. Proficiency in this area rose from 43% to 56% for a total of 13% improvement. Actions that supported this success include the following:
*During the summer of 2018, teacher teams collaborated to develop the Sunrise Elementary Vision for Excellent Instruction Pillar Checklist. This document takes the 5 pillars from Brevard Public Schools' Vision for Excellent Instruction and breaks each one down into teacher actions and student actions. Teachers used this action guide to promote excellent instruction in ELA.
*The Sunrise literacy coach collaborated with teachers to develop a specific instructional sequence plan based on the Brevard Standard Focus Document resource. Standards-aligned instructional materials from the iReady Toolbox were embedded in these plans and utilized to provide direct, targeted instruction for students demonstrating achievement gaps.
*in addition, Sunrise teachers used evidence-based, iReady data to place students into small groups for instruction in the areas in which they showed low performance in reading. This grouping strategy allowed students to receive ELA instruction in their identified area of need.

*Furthermore, each class (which includes the lowest 25% group of students), attended a scheduled computer lab time each week to use iReady as a supplemental program for providing fun and engaging individualized reading instruction.

*Sunrise teachers implement ELA interventions with fidelity. At Sunrise, the MTSS process is strong and successful with identifying individualized needs for students in ELA.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

A potential area of concern is student attendance below 90%. To address this concern, Blackboard messages regarding student absences are sent out to parents on a daily basis. Each month, individual class attendance percentages are calculated. This data is shared with teachers. The class with the highest attendance percentage is selected as the monthly winner, and they are recognized at a faculty meeting and on the morning news. The class of the month "houses" the attendance trophy in their classroom until the next winner is announce. This is a fun and positive strategy to get the students and school stakeholders excited about having perfect attendance.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increase math proficiency in the primary grade levels, with a strong emphasis in 3rd grade.
2. Increase subgroup proficiency for Student With Disabilities (SWD) and Black/African American Students in ELA and math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improved Math Proficiency in the Primary Grades
Rationale	Trend data shows a negative gap in mathematical proficiency between Sunrise's 3rd grade students and those in 4th though 6th grades. Students in 3rd grade are 13% below the state average and 12% below the district average in 3rd grade math proficiency. Students in 4th grade are only 2% below the state and district average in 4th grade and our 5th and 6th grade students are performing above the state and district averages. This gap in 3rd grade math proficiency indicates a concern with mathematics instruction in the primary grades. It is important to note, although the area focus is on improved mathematics instruction in the primary grades, excellent mathematics instruction in all grade levels will be discussed, monitored, and implemented with fidelity. Underperforming students in 3rd grade (math) during the 2018-19 school year are now in fourth grade. It is imperative to ensure gaps for these students are identified and addressed.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The proficiency percentage for our 3rd grade students will increase to 60% on the 2020 Mathematics FSA. Achieving this goal will mean an increase in proficiency of 11% from the 2019 Mathematics Assessment. In addition, 70% of students in each grade level will be meeting mathematical proficiency at the end of the year as determined by the iReady Math Diagnostic assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Janene Jost (jost.janene@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	At Sunrise, teachers will be supported in improving instruction in mathematics to full alignment, depth, and rigor of the math standards. Coaching and feedback opportunities will be implemented to improve the fidelity of core math instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to Dr. Max Thompson, research shows the single most important component of students' learning is ensuring instruction is standards-based. This is a challenge for many educators, as teaching to the intended depth and rigor of the standards is a complex process. Sunrise has evidence of past success with embedding instructional practices that promote excellent instruction. This includes, but is not limited to ensuring lessons are consistently focused on complex content that appropriately challenges students to meet the subject and /or grade level standards. Coaching and feedback is high-yield, research-based instructional improvement strategy that is linked to improvements in teacher practice and learner outcomes.
Action Step	
Description	1. The Sunrise Elementary Vision for Excellent Instruction Pillar Checklist, developed by Sunrise teachers in 2018 and derived from the BPS Vision for Excellent Instruction model, will be reviewed and shared with all instructional personnel. Teachers and administrators will use this resource as an action step guide to ensure best practices for excellent instruction are being implemented in mathematics. 2. Teachers will select an instructional representative from their grade level to participate in pre/post data collection of implementing excellent instructional practices. The Sunrise Elementary Vision for Excellent Instruction Pillar Checklist will be utilized at the data collection tool. These pillars encompass teaching practices that promote standards-aligned instruction. Data will be monitored by and shared with all faculty members. 3. Coaching and feedback opportunities will be provided to mathematics teachers in primary grade levels. The format of these opportunities may consist of grade level/team coaching plans and/or individual coaching and feedback opportunities. Feedback will be

shared during collaborative grade level meetings or individual teacher conferences.
4. Professional development opportunities will be provided to teachers to support standards-aligned instruction in mathematics. These PD opportunities will assist teachers in effectively accessing and understanding the new Ready Florida MAFS instructional resources in the primary grades.
5. Parents will be provided with resources to support mathematics instruction in the home and at school. This action will be facilitated through parent/teacher conferences, grade-level events where parents are invited to the school to learn with their child, and/or use of online resources.

Person Responsible   Janene Jost (jost.janene@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Improved Proficiency for the SWD Subgroup, the Black/African American Subgroup, and the ELL Subgroup in ELA and Math
Rationale	Historical data shows these select subgroups have not reached the proficiency targets set by ESSA. In addition, the proficiency percentages for these subgroups are far below Sunrise Elementary expectations. The proficiency percentage of the SWD (Students With Disabilities) subgroup was 39%, and the target is 41% as defined by ESSA. Additionally, two other subgroups, ELL (English Language Learners) and Africa American, both have proficiency levels of 40% with the target at 41%. The Sunrise Elementary Vision clearly states we will enable ALL students to "shine" through responsible choices and academic potential. Data shows, students in these subgroups are performing below their peers and are not meeting their academic potential.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Proficiency for the SWD subgroup, the Black/African American subgroup, and the ELL subgroup will increase to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Janene Jost (jost.janene@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Academic teams for students belonging to the SWD, Black/African American, and ELL subgroups will focus on meeting the specific, individual needs of deficient students belonging in these subgroups. This will be supported through the systematic implementation of the MTSS/RtI process as well as improving culturally responsive teaching strategies through professional development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Achievement in ELA for our Lowest 25% showed the most improvement last year. Because Sunrise teachers implement ELA interventions with fidelity, and the MTSS process is successful with identifying individualized needs for students in ELA; these students demonstrated the most growth. Since this strategy is research-based and proven effective, Sunrise academic teams will ensure the MTSS/RtI process is strong for students belonging to our SWD, Black/African American, and ELL subgroups by placing a greater focus on students in these subgroups, developing individualized intervention instruction to close achievement gaps. In addition, it is important for all educators to continuously strive to provide equitable access to instruction by ensuring ALL students are making academic gains. By providing opportunities for our Sunrise instructional community to enhance teaching strategies which are specific to students in these identified subgroups, a greater understanding will develop in regards to culturally responsive teaching.

Action Step	
Description	1. Intervention strategies and the academic progress of underperforming students belonging to these subgroups will be added to the agenda and discussed at each data team/MTSS meeting. Individualized strategies will be implemented and montiored for successful implementation with data collection. For students belonging to the SWD subgroup, this action step addresses BPIE indicator 1. 2. iReady growth and individual lesson progress for individual students belonging to these subgroups will be closely monitored. Students not passing consecutive lessons will have reteaching opportunities. 3. The leadership team will provide observation and feedback opportunities during Tier II

and Tier III instructional groups where students belonging to these subgroups may be receiving instruction to close achievement gaps.

4. Professional development opportunities will be provided to assist academic teams in providing specialized instruction for students and increasing their skill-set of culturally responsive teaching strategies. For students belonging to the SWD subgroup, this action step addresses BPIE indicators 14 and 15.

Person Responsible Janene Jost (jost.janene@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

School attendance is also a school-wide priority. We will continue to monitor attendance on a weekly basis through reports generated in AS400. Additionally, we will utilize the Blackboard Connect district resource to contact parents daily when their child is absent from school. When student attendance is an issue, individual parent contact will be made by the teacher, guidance counselor or administrator, as necessary. Truancy issues that cannot be resolved in this way will be referred to the District Truancy Office.