Sunrise Elementary School

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
2019-20 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%)
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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	65%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
Isaacs, Tina	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Mrs. Isaacs 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. Isaacs 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. Isaacs 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, ESE	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 serves on the school leadership team and assists in the distribution of instructional materials. She also serves as an instructional peer coach to assist colleagues with implementing school improvement action steps with fidelity.
Elliott, Carmen	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), data team, and instructional improvement meetings. In addition, Mrs. Elliott supports students, teachers, parents, and administrators with successful ELA program implementation (e.g. iReady).

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Danielle Kraus S

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
2019-20 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%)
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].	

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	94	92	86	101	100	94	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	676
Attendance below 90 percent	8	7	5	13	11	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	2	0	0	1	5	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	3	3	0	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/16/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

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

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	
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

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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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				

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
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
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	69
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Past trends indicate our Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup is low performing. In the spring of 2019, this subgroup showed the lowest performance with only 29% of students achieving proficiency in ELA and 32% achieving proficiency in math on the FSA. The 2018 data is similar with only 28% of students in the SWD subgroup achieving proficiency in ELA and 25% achieving proficiency in math. In the 2019-20 school year, the FSA was not administered due to schools moving to distance learning (result of Covid-19). However, when analyzing iReady Diagnostic data from fall 2019 to winter of 2020, this population increased from 17% proficiency in ELA (K-6) to 41% and 11% proficiency in Math (K-6) to 22%.
Contributing factors to this low performance include:
*Scheduling conflicts having impeded tiered supports for our SWD population. Grade levels have scheduled intervention times. This is when students receiving Exceptional Student Education were provided support services, thus 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. Scheduled, structured time needs to be provided for teachers to come together to share specific strategies to meet the needs of individual students, and further professional development on how to best provide specialized instruction and support for our SWD population is needed.
*SWD need instruction at their current level most often throughout the day. SWD must have access to grade level materials and rigor during T1/Core instruction.

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 shows the greatest decline by 3 percentage points from 52% in 2018 to 49% in 2019 on the FSA. 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. In the 2019-20 school year, the FSA was not administered due to schools moving to distance learning (result of Covid-19). However, when analyzing iReady Diagnostic math data from fall 2019 to winter of 2020, third grade students increased from 8% proficiency to 33% proficiency. This same group of students (now in 4th grade) demonstrated 13% proficiency, which is 8% below the district proficiney percentage for 4th grade students in the fall of 2020 on the same assessment. In addition, on the 2020 fall iReady Diagnostic assessment in math, Sunrise students are performing below the district proficiency rate in grades 2-6, and they are only 2% above the district in first grade. This indicates a strong need to improve core instruction in math.

Contributing factors to this decline include:
*Implementing core instruction that is fully aligned to the intended depth and rigor of the Florida Standards is a challenge.
*Sunrise students need additional support in the area of fact fluency, especially in the intermediate grades.

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 has had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. On the 2019 FSA, the 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, a focus on improving core instruction is needed to ensure our math program is fully standards-aligned.
*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 is a challenge to implement. Students displaying acheivement gaps in mathematics need additional instructional support.
*Students in the intermediate grade levels struggle with many math concepts which rely on fluent knowledge of multiplication and division facts. Students need further support with math fact fluency.

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

Past FSA data revealed the most improvement has been shown in ELA achievement within our Lowest 25% group of students. Proficiency rose from 43% in 2018 to 56% in 2019 (13% increase). FSA was not administered in spring of 2020, therefore iReady Diagnostic data from fall of 2019 to winter of 2020 is one of the best data points to determine areas of growth for 19-20. Kindergarten and first grade students demonstrated the most growth in ELA (Kindergarten 46% to 72% proficiency- a 26% gain, and first grade 16% to 52% proficiency- a 36% gain). In Math, our primary students showed the most growth on this same assessment. Increases in proficiency from fall to winter: Kindergarten- 19%, 1st- 22%, 2nd- 18%, 3rd- 25%, 4th- 17%, 5th- 17%, and 6th- 9%. In ELA, our SWD subgroup showed the most growth with an increase in proficiency of 24% (17% to 41%). In Math, our greatest success was decreasing the percentage of students in "red" within the ELL subgroup (31% red in the fall and 0% red in the winter).
Actions that supported success include:
*Teachers participated in instructional walk-throughs and used data collected to mark areas of success and growth.
*The literacy coach collaborated with teachers to develop a specific instructional sequence plan based on the Standard Focus Document resource, which included Standards Mastery.
*Teachers used evidence-based, iReady data to place students into small groups for instruction and intervention in the areas in which they showed low performance.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

A potential area of concern is student attendance below 90%. The 2020 Covid-19 national pandemic has exacerbated our attendance concerns. Students attending school on campus face quarantine procedures when one possible symptom of Covid-19 presents in a student. Although a symptom(s)

may be present for a variety of reasons, students may not return to school until negative viral test results or a doctor's return note is provided. This school year, illness symptoms have sent many students home. Many of these students return within a few days with negative test results; however, they have already missed several days of instruction. In addition, students who are close contacts to a positive case must quarantine for the full amount of time. When these situations occur, quickly connecting to eLearning as an alternative and an essential piece of the continuity of instruction plan often presents challenges for many families. Another area of concern is the amount of students receiving level 1 scores on our state-wide assessment in reading and math. Students performing at level 1 proficiency are considered substantially deficient, which means their achievement gap is at least 2 to 3 years below grade level. As students' achievement gaps increase, it becomes more challenging to remediate and eventually attain proficiency.

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

There are several high priorities for schoolwide improvement throughout the 2020-2021 school year. To inform our decisions on schoolwide priority focus, we analyze student achievement data at the schoolwide, grade level, subgroup, and individual level. Comparisons are made to previous years to identify trends, and comparisons are also made to district and state student achievement data.
In the fall of 2020, our schoolwide iReady Diagnostic data has indicated less than half of our students are currently performing on grade level in ELA and Math (40% proficiency in ELA and only 18% proficiency in Math). In ELA, this proficiency percentage of 40% equates to district wide ELA proficiency, which is also 40%. However, our proficiency rate of 18% in Math is below the district proficiency percentage of 22%. Although these are low achievement percentages, our previous years' data provides much hope. In the fall of 2019, Sunrise began the school year with similar proficiency data on the iReady Diagnostic (40% in ELA and 23% in Math). By mid-year, the 2020 winter proficiency percentages already indicated significant growth (60% in ELA and 42% in Math), but in the Spring of 2020, the national pandemic resulted in on-campus learning being cancelled. Students and teachers moved to distance learning 2 weeks after the start spring break, and the final iReady Diagnostic was not able to be adequately administered to determine end of year growth. Therefore, prior to the pandemic having a negative impact on our instruction and learning, we were already able to note a 20% ELA growth and 19% growth in Math by mid-year on schoolwide student achievement. Although distance learning was the best option for continuity of instruction during national school closures, prior to returning on August 24, 2020, students had not received traditional school instruction since March 13, 2020. Even with this large gap in traditional, quality instruction, we have noted very similar proficiency rates at the start of the 2020 school year compared to the start of the 2019 school year (when teachers and students were not faced with these challenges). We believe school improvement efforts in 2019-20, coupled with strong practices during distant learning, helped prevent a greater decline in schoolwide student achievement. For the 2020-21 school year, we will continue our work to further increase student achievement at Sunrise.
Reflection on our data analysis reveals a strong need to improve in the following priority areas:
Priority Area 1: Data analysis reveals a strong need to continue centering improvement on core instruction in English Language Arts and in Math across all grade levels. To improve core instruction, we will focus on increasing the strength of standards aligned instruction. This is comprised of ensuring the full-intent and depth of the standards are being taught, as well as committing to providing access to standards aligned, grade level core instruction to all Sunrise students in ELA and Math, regardless of students' current proficiency levels. All students must be exposed to grade level rich, standards aligned instruction. Explicit instruction to close achievement gaps using below grade level resources will occur within tiered supports during scheduled intervention times.
Priority Area 2: Data analysis from the spring 2019 FSA reveals three student subgroups at Sunrise missing the Federal Index target as defined within the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Subgroups performing below the 41% benchmark must be a priority to schools. In the spring of 2019, our Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup had a federal index percentage of 39%. Our Black/

African American subgroup had a federal index percentage of 40%, and our English Language Learners (ELL) subgroup had a federal index percentage of 40%. Although we do not have 2020 FSA data to determine the effects of school improvement efforts on these subgroup populations, we do have iReady Diagnostic data from fall of 2019 to winter of 2020 to monitor our progress in each of these subgroups: The greatest growth is evidenced in ELA within our SWD subgroup (17% to 41% achievement- increase of 24%) and our African American subgroup (24% to 48% achievement- increase of 24%). Our ELL subgroup increased from 13% proficiency in ELA to 29% (an increase of 16%). These target subgroups did not show as much growth in math on the same assessment: SWD (11% to 22%- 11% growth), African American (10% to 22%- 12% growth), and ELL (0% to 13%- 13% growth). In the 2020-21 school year, we will continue to focus on increasing achievement within these three subgroups of students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data analysis reveals a strong need to continue a focus on improvement of core instruction in English Language Arts across all grade levels. ELA iReady Diagnostic 1 for grades 1 through 6 taken September 2020 indicates 40%, less than half of our students at Sunrise are currently performing on or above level in ELA. 42% of students are below level and 18% of students are well below level in ELA. Although Sunrise students are currently performing comparable to the district average in ELA on a school-wide scope, 60% of our students (the majority) are performing 1 year or more below grade level. This indicates a strong need to improve our overall core instructional program in ELA. All students, regardless of current performance level, are required to have access to quality core instruction. Currently, all students are performing comparable to the district except for 5th grade students. District 5th grade performance in ELA on the fall iReady Diagnostic is 42%, and Sunrise 5th grade students are performing at 29% proficiency, which is a 13% discrepancy. Kindergarten (not yet assessed with iReady), 1st grade 26% proficiency (22% district), 2nd grade 30% proficiency (31% district), 3rd grade 54% proficiency (district 54%), 4th grade 45% proficiency (42% district), 5th grade 29% proficiency (42% district), and 6th grade 50% proficiency (46% district). Research states, most Response to Intervention (RTI) frameworks presume the core program is meeting about 80 to 90 percent of students' learning needs. From this perspective, schools with fewer than 75 percent of students at or above grade level proficiency have a core program issue. Previous FSA trend data also shows proficiency below 75% in ELA. This is the rationale for our basis of working to improve our core instructional program in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	Sunrise will increase on grade level ELA proficiency by 10% (from 59% to 69%) on the Florida Standards Assessment for all students in grade 3-6 by the end of the 2020-2021 school year. In addition, 80% of students in each grade level will meet the typical annual growth identified on iReady diagnostic.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janene Jost (jost.janene@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sunrise will improve core instruction in ELA utilizing the evidence-based strategy of executing data-driven practices and decisions. The key action in our area of focus is "using data driven decisions to inform effective standards-aligned instruction." When this strategy is implemented well, it has the ability to greatly improve instruction, thus positively impacting student achievement. This strategy helps educators change the focus from "what was taught" to "what was learned." Data-driven practices and decisions guide educators practices towards improvement by assessing the students' understanding of the standards taught, analyzing their work to identify gaps in their understanding, and acting to reteach the content to close gaps of misunderstanding. These key learnings will help our Sunrise community of educators move to making continuous instructional decisions based on current student achievement and lesson mastery data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Improving core instruction is very challenging. There are a myriad of methods and strategies that can aim to strengthen our core/tier I ELA instructional program; however, data-driven instruction has proven to be one of the most effective. This strategy is noted as highly successful by Paul Bambrick-Santoyo in his book, Leverage Leadership 2.0: A Practical Guide to Building Exceptional Schools. It is effective because data-driven instruction informs educators about the specific needs of each student. Effective teachers and leaders know when teaching is working and when it is not. They know when their students are learning, and when they are not. When students are not learning, they act on it. Data-driven instruction places the emphasis on "Did they learn it?" Data-driven

instruction is a strategy that encompasses the strong process of assessing students' learning, analyzing the learning, and acting to reteach.

Action Steps to Implement

Action Step 1: Incorporate Professional Development into Instructional Practices
Throughout the school year, researched-based, professional development will be shared and embedded into current teaching practice to improve student engagment and task alignment to the standard.
These professional development opportunities will also allow our Sunrise team of educators to further their understanding and knowledge of why data-driven instructional practices are successful and how this strategy helps strengthen core instruction.
*Implement Professional Development ideas and strategies into current teaching practices.
-Visible Learning Strategies
-Modeling Best Practices
-Data-Driven Instructional Practices
-Analyzing Standards Mastery Assessments

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

Action Step 2: Assess, Analyze, Act
The purpose of administering assessments to students is to determine what they know and what they do not know. Data-driven instruction calls educators to really dive into students' assessments, far beyond grading, to take note of what was learned and what information needs reteaching.
*Determine individual student progress of standards-aligned instruction via analysis of iReady Standards Mastery.
*Collaborate and facilitate discussion at grade level meetings to analyze the results of common assessments and determine student growth and mastery of ELA standards.
*Identify gaps in student understanding based on Standard Mastery analysis.
*Make a plan to reteach information misunderstood by students.
*Reassess after reteaching to determine student growth and progress.

Person Responsible Carmen Elliott (elliott.carmen@brevardschools.org)

Action Step 3: Observe Instruction and Provide Feedback to Teachers
Administrators and the literacy coach will work to observe core ELA instruction and provide feedback that will improve instructional practices, student engagment, and task alignment to the standards. The steps include:
*Observe instruction frequently and consistently
*Identify the key action step (the top area for growth)
*Give effective, direct, written feedback to the teacher
*Monitor and follow up

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data analysis reveals a strong need to continue a focus on improvement of core instruction in Math across all grade levels. Math iReady Diagnostic 1 for grades 1 through 6 taken September 2020 indicates only 18% of our students at Sunrise are currently performing on or above level in Math. 59% of students are below level and 23% of students are well below level in Math. Sunrise students are currently performing below the district average in Math on a school-wide scope, 82% of our students (an overwhelming majority) are performing 1 year or more below grade level. This indicates a strong need to improve our overall core instructional program in Math. All students, regardless of current performance level, are required to have access to quality core instruction. Proficiency performance for each grade level is as follows: Kindergarten (not yet assessed with iReady), 1st grade 18% proficiency (16% district), 2nd grade 14% proficiency (16% district), 3rd grade 7% proficiency (district 15%), 4th grade 13% proficiency (21% district), 5th grade 23% proficiency (29% district), and 6th grade 30% proficiency (34% district). Research states, most Response to Intervention (RTI) frameworks presume the core program is meeting about 80 to 90 percent of students' learning needs. From this perspective, schools with fewer than 75 percent of students at or above grade level proficiency have a core program issue. Previous FSA trend data also shows proficiency below 75% in Math. This is the rationale for our basis of working to improve our core instructional program in Math.
Measurable Outcome:	Sunrise will increase Math achievement by 10% from 63% to 73% for all students measured by Math FSA by the end of the 2020-2021 school year. Also, 80% of students in each grade level will meet the typical annual growth identified on iReady diagnostic.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janene Jost (jost.janene@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sunrise will improve core instruction in Math utilizing the evidence-based strategy of executing data-driven practices and decisions. The key action in our area of focus is "using data driven decisions to inform effective standards-aligned instruction." When this strategy is implemented well, it has the ability to greatly improve instruction, thus positively impacting student achievement. This strategy helps educators change the focus from "what was taught" to "what was learned." Data-driven practices and decisions guide educators practices towards improvement by assessing the students' understanding of the standards taught, analyzing their work to identify gaps in their understanding, and acting to reteach the content to close gaps of misunderstanding. These key learnings will help our Sunrise community of educators move to making continuous instructional decisions based on current student achievement and lesson mastery data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Improving core instruction is very challenging. There are a myriad of methods and strategies that can aim to strengthen our core/tier I Math instructional program; however, data-driven instruction has proven to be one of the most effective. This strategy is noted as highly successful by Paul Bambrick-Santoyo in his book, Leverage Leadership 2.0: A Practical Guide to Building Exceptional Schools. It is effective because data-driven instruction informs educators about the specific needs of each student. Effective teachers and leaders know when teaching is working and when it is not. They know when their students are learning, and when they are not. When students are not learning, they act on it. Data-driven instruction places the emphasis on "Did they learn it?" Data-driven instruction is a strategy that encompasses the strong process of assessing students' learning, analyzing the learning, and acting to reteach.
Action Steps to Implement	

Action Step 1: Incorporate Professional Development into Instructional Practices
Throughout the school year, researched-based, professional development will be shared and embedded into current teaching practice to improve student engagment and task alignment to the standard.
These professional development opportunities will also allow our Sunrise team of educators to further their understanding and knowledge of why data-driven instructional practices are successful and how this strategy helps strengthen core instruction.
*Implement Professional Development ideas and strategies into current teaching practices.
-Visible Learning Strategies
-Modeling Best Practices
-Data-Driven Instructional Practices
-Analyzing Standards Mastery Assessments

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

Action Step 2: Assess, Analyze, Act
The purpose of administering assessments to students is to determine what they know and what they do not know. Data-driven instruction calls educators to really dive into students' assessments, far beyond grading, to take note of what was learned and what information needs reteaching.
*Determine individual student progress of standards-aligned instruction via analysis of iReady Standards Mastery.
*Collaborate and facilitate discussion at grade level meetings to analyze the results of common assessments and determine student growth and mastery of Math standards.
*Identify gaps in student understanding based on Standard Mastery analysis.
*Make a plan to reteach information misunderstood by students.
*Reassess after reteaching to determine student growth and progress.

Person Responsible   Carmen Elliott (elliott.carmen@brevardschools.org)

Action Step 3: Observe Instruction and Provide Feedback to Teachers
Administrators and the literacy coach will work to observe core Math instruction and provide feedback that will improve instructional practices, student engagment, and task alignment to the standards. The steps include:
*Observe instruction frequently and consistently
*Identify the key action step (the top area for growth)
*Give effective, direct, written feedback to the teacher
*Monitor and follow up

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data analysis reveals a strong need to continue a focus on improvement of closing the achievement gap within the content areas of ELA and Math in three of our student subgroups. These subgroups are our Students with Disabilities (SWD), our Black/African American students, and our English Language Learner (ELL) students. Historical data shows these select subgroups have not reached the proficiency targets set by ESSA. The Spring 2019 FSA scores indicate the proficiency percentage of the SWD (Students with Disabilities) subgroup was 39%, and the target is 41% as defined by ESSA. Additionally, the two other subgroups, Black/African American and English Language Learners (ELL), both have proficiency levels of 40% with the target proficiency set at 41%, as defined by the Federal Index outlined in the Every Child Succeeds Act (ESSA). The Sunrise Elementary Vision 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. Last school year, Sunrise also targeted these three subgroups. Although the pandemic prevented the FSA from being administered in the spring of 2020, we analyzed student growth using iReady diagnostic data to assess our improvement efforts last school year. Improvement was noted within each subgroup in ELA and Math. The most significant growth was noted in ELA among Students with Disabilities and Black/African American subgroups. Our SWD subgroup improved from 17% proficiency in the fall of 2019 to 41% proficiency in the winter. This shows a 24% proficiency growth, mid-year. The same growth was noted for our Black/African American subgroup (24% proficiency to 48%, which is also 24% growth from fall to winter). Due to Covid-19, we were not able to administer a 2020 spring assessment, which would have determined yearly growth.
Measurable Outcome:	Proficiency for the SWD subgroup, the Black/Afrcian American subgroup, and the ELL subgroup will increase to 41%, which is the Federal Index performance benchmark as outlined by ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janene Jost (jost.janene@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sunrise will make progress in closing the achievement gap for our under-performing subgroups by utilizing the evidence-based strategy of providing scaffolding supports to access grade level instruction as needed. All students must have increased access to grade level, standards-aligned instruction and rich content. This often poses a significant challenge to teachers because students with significant learning gaps struggle with grade level content and need varying levels of support to be successful academically. Traditional efforts to close the instructional gap include providing students content at their current level and a core instructional program that focuses too much on remedial instruction. Meanwhile, the instructional gap continues as peers continue to progress through grade level standards. While well-intentioned, these strategies alone do not help students meet the demands of their current grade level expectations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All students must have access to tier 1/core instructional programs based on current grade level standards. Along with differentiation, intervention, and remedial services, scaffolding supports can provide struggling students the assistance needed to be successful in making learning gains. Instead of simplifying core instruction and preventing under-performing students from having access to rich, grade-level content knowledge, scaffolding support strategies focus on getting students to master the grade level content independently over time. Research and best practices state all students must have access to grade level, standards-aligned instruction and rich content. TNTP (the New Teacher Project) supports

utilizing scaffolding strategies, as a key recommendation from their research findings calls to give all students greater access to grade-level instruction. When students are pulled out of their core instructional program to receive remedial support for the purpose of closing their achievement gap, they miss grade-level content that is focused on deep learning experiences.

Action Steps to Implement

Action Step 1: Adjust and Monitor Scheduling for All Students to Have Access to Core Instruction
*Adjusted the master schedule to support push-in, inclusive services for all students. This includes our Students with Disabilities population and English Language Learner population.

Person Responsible   Tina Isaacs (isaacs.tina@brevardschools.org)

Action Step 2: Incorporate Professional Development into Instructional Practices
Throughout the school year, researched-based, professional development will be shared and embedded into current teaching practice to improve student engagement, task alignment to the standard, and push-in services.
*Implement Professional Development ideas and strategies into current teaching practices.
-Utilizing Scaffolding Supports
-Inclusive Practices/Co-teaching (SWD, ELL)
-Culturally Responsive Classrooms (addresses all subgroups)

Person Responsible   Tina Isaacs (isaacs.tina@brevardschools.org)

Action Step 3: Differentiate ELA and Math Content and Scaffolds for Students Based on Individual or Small Group Remediation Needs
One best practice in the utilization of scaffolding strategies is to differentiate ELA and Math content and scaffolds for students based on individual or small group remediation needs.
*Utilize CARES Act funding and traditional Academic Support (ASP) funding to increase growth and proficiency levels in ELA and Math across all grade levels by providing differentiated and remedial instruction and supports to students below grade level. The Sunrise ASP plan will include opportunities for eLearners and brick/mortar students, flexible hours for students- to include after school and Saturdays, and quality instructional materials. Instruction will be provided by certified teachers.

Person Responsible   Tina Isaacs (isaacs.tina@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

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 automated calls 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. Attendance issues will be discussed during MTSS meetings. Truancy issues that cannot be resolved in this way will be referred to the District Truancy Office.

Youth Truth Data
Parent Survey Data
Insight Data- Feedback on Instructional Practices

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Sunrise Elementary is a Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support Bronze Modal School. The innovative PBIS strategies that promote equitable disciplinary outcomes are making sure the classroom rules and standards are linked to our expectations which are taught with fidelity and consistency by all Sunrise shareholders. School standards are displayed in all classrooms and throughout the school (e.g. hallways, cafeteria, media center, front office). Students are provided with tools to promote positive behavior such as token economy, positive behavior referrals, and school-wide recognition for positive achievements. Parents are provided with information and support to implement the standards at home to aid in generalization of standards across all settings.

**** Add Broad stakeholder groups
Add survey data (youth truth and parent)

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.