Sunrise Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sunrise Elementary School

1651 MARA LOMA BLVD SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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 2023

Provide the school's vision statement.

To enable ALL students to "shine" through responsible choices and academic potential.
Reviewed 2023

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kraus, Danielle	Principal	As principal, Mrs. Kraus works with the leadership team to set clear goals for the school based on collaborative analysis of data. She organizes the team to shape a vision of quality instruction and academic success for all students through a clear focus on data-driven strategic goals, instructional priorities, and collaborative planning and professional learning. She supports shared decision-making regarding curriculum, resource allocation, instruction, staffing, and community engagement.
Marlasca, Alison	Assistant Principal	As assistant principal, Mrs. Marlasca leads the implementation of new curriculum/initiatives, collaborative planning efforts, and professional development. She is focused on a vision of shared instructional leadership and academic success for all. She defines and promotes high expectations among the school-based learning community in support of quality instruction and improved student achievement. She identifies the instructional talents and interests of teachers, organizing them to apply those talents as teacher leaders to lead collaborative planning, professional development, and peer coaching efforts.
Elliott, Carmen	Reading 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 English Language Arts B.E.S.T 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. She also serves as the chair of our school's Literacy Leadership Team.
Miller, Annie	Staffing Specialist	Provides support to ESE students and teachers. Serves as a liaison on ESE compliance. Gathers data on students new to our school, organizes and leads meetings to discuss students' placement, possible changes to IEP, academic, and behavioral concerns. Collaborates on the design of an action plan for specific students in the MTSS process.
Bishop, Kelly	School Counselor	As school counselor, Ms. Bishop supports the leadership team by providing critical data regarding attendance and SEL needs as well as available community supports. Ms. Bishop guides the threat/ mental health assessment process and conducts suicide risk inquiries as needed. The information collected from these assessments is utilized to enhance school supports or investigate the need for additional supports. She supports students through SEL counseling groups and also works with families to find available community supports such as housing, food banks, and outside counseling to name a few. The work she does as a member of the leadership team has a positive impact on the ability of students to arrive to school engaged and ready to learn.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

In May of 2023, the administration and a team of 20 teachers conducted Sunrise's Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). During this process, the team examined the Insight Survey, where teachers answered questions about the school and their job satisfaction. Then, the team looked at the survey data from the Parent Survey given at the end of the previous school year. Additionally, the team looked at the Youth Truth Survey report, which is an anonymous survey taken by the students, it was examined by the team, and areas for improvement were chosen.
Finally, the team looked at assessment trend data from the 22-23 school year to include both iReady and the FAST assessment. As a team, we discussed the trends that were noticed school-wide and the cohort trends that have emerged.
The CNA team then chose the school's areas of focus for the SIP for the 2023-2024 school year.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The administration will conduct routine classroom walk-throughs for the purpose of observing instruction, collecting evidence and data on instructional practices, and providing explicit feedback to teachers. A common Look-For tool will be utilized during walk-throughs. The Instructional Practice Look-For tool will encompass areas of focus which are current barriers to student growth and achievement:
-Grade level, standards-aligned instruction during core
-Use of research-based/vetted curriculum resources that are aligned to the
standard
- A focus on small group instruction in both reading and math
-Use of academic language and vocabulary (by teacher and student)
-Strategies for authentic student engagement (such as student discourse and
collaboration)
-High-level/complex/challenging tasks, problems, and questions
-Teachers in the facilitator role, allowing students to do the work and thinking of the lesson

Additionally, year-long professional development on ESE, offered once per month, will be a focus for all staff. This will help to support the inclusion model and improve academic achievement for the SWD ESSA subgroup.

Weekly PLC meetings where student data is examined to closely monitor the performance of ESSA sub-groups (paying close attention to SWD and BLK students), in order to ensure students are receiving and making progress with appropriate targeted ELA and Math interventions and/or Tier 1 enrichment opportunities to support improved academic performance. This will help to close achievement gaps among the lowest 25% and the ESSA subgroups that are currently below 41%.

Data will be analyzed from the group to the individual student level, to examine the effectiveness of scaffolds for Tier 3 students in the ESSA sub-groups. If scaffolds are found not to be effective, decisions will be made with respect to new strategies or resources that are better suited to serve the needs of individual students.

Lexia will be purchased and utilized school-wide to fill achievement gaps and provide the science of reading-based literacy solutions that support every student.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	92%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems	

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	9	30	13	21	20	13	19	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	5	2	4	8	0	0	23
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	18	25	26	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	20	43	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	18	16	15	16	3	16	0	0	88

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	5	2	10	10	7	20	0	0	57

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	4

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	9	22	31	23	23	36	25	0	0	169
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	0	3	3	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	26	21	16	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	32	21	19	0	0	75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	14	9	14	11	13	9	0	0	71

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	5	0	3	4	0	0	16

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	10	2	5	0	0	1	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	9	22	31	23	23	36	25	0	0	169
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	0	3	3	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	26	21	16	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	32	21	19	0	0	75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	14	9	14	11	13	9	0	0	71

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	5	0	3	4	0	0	16

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	10	2	5	0	0	1	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	56	58	53	56	61	56	59		
ELA Learning Gains				62			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			53		
Math Achievement*	56	58	59	55	49	50	53		
Math Learning Gains				65			73		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			60		
Science Achievement*	49	58	54	53	60	59	49		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	56	54	59	67			64		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	285
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	4	
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	62			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	50			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	3	
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	2	
HSP	53			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	52			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	56			56			49					56
SWD	32			33			27				4	
ELL	54			62							3	56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			33			28				4	
HSP	57			50			50				4	
MUL	68			59							3	
PAC												
WHT	57			62			54				4	
FRL	47			46			45				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	56	62	49	55	65	56	53					67
SWD	33	45	30	33	46	48	20					
ELL	58	53		47	53							67
AMI												
ASN												

							2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS					
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	38	50	42	29	47	57	20					
HSP	52	51	36	48	59	42	50					82
MUL	61	71		78	79		50					
PAC												
WHT	61	65	52	59	67	61	60					
FRL	49	58	45	46	61	50	45					62

							2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS					
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	59	64	53	53	73	60	49					64
SWD	31	51	48	33	52	50	15					
ELL	45			59								64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	50	27	38	57	42	31					
HSP	50	57		43	65		20					
MUL	66	82		53	73							
PAC												
WHT	62	64	64	58	79	73	55					
FRL	56	61	53	46	65	50	47					64

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
05	2023 - Spring	49%	59%	-10%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	61%	-11%	58%	-8%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	60%	61%	-1%	47%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	56%	9%	50%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	58%	67%	-9%	54%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	60%	4%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	61%	-10%	61%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	65%	55%	10%	55%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	52%	57%	-5%	51%	1%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

FAST - ELA
In 2021, students in grades 3-6 scored 57% proficiency, in 2022 proficiency dropped to 55% and currently we have remained steady with 55% proficiency in 2023.
FAST - Math
In 2021, students in grades 3-6 scored 52% proficiency, in 2022 proficiency dropped to 54% and currently we have remained steady with 60% proficiency in 2023.
EWS: Discipline, grade level academic data, attendance
Our two lowest performing grade levels overall were fourth and fifth grades. Neither of these grade levels had major correlations to our discipline data. For the school year, Sunrise only had 203 total referrals with the majority of them falling in our primary grades. Of our 823 students, only 15% had attendance below 90%, not a significant number to impact our proficiencies.
Subgroup data: Our two subgroups of concern are our Black students and our Students with Disabilities. Our Black students only show 39% proficiency in ELA and 38% proficiency in Math. Our Students with Disabilities group had a staggering 21% proficiency in ELA and 25% proficiency in Math.
Some factors that contributed to our deficiencies include: inconsistent instruction in our supported level classrooms and our resource service model was not structured in a way that supported a strong co-teaching model between the general education and ESE instructors.

Sunrise data has been in steady decline over several years, and the subgroup data has remained consistently in the negative.

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

Students with Disabilities showed a significant decline. In 2022, Students with Disabilities has 33% proficiency in ELA and 33% proficiency in Math - that calculates to a 21% drop in ELA and an 8% drop in Math. After much discussion with our staff, it is apparent that both general education teachers and their exceptional student education resource colleagues echo there is not a cooperative working relationship between the two groups. Both groups of educators have yet to find a system that works best to support their student achievement. Additionally, Sunrise did have some retention issues in the self contained units. One additional area for consideration, is the effective use of behavior intervention and following the structures of MTSS-B. The knowledge base for across our instructional team is limited in this capacity, which leads the team to believe behaviors were often times ignored instead of addressed, leading to missed academic opportunities for students.

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.

Our largest gap compared to the state average, was our ESE subgroup. The state average for ELA is 52% compared to our 21% proficiency with our ESE subgroup. The state average for Math is 58% compared to our 25% proficiency with our ESE subgroups.

Factors that contributed to this gap:
After much discussion with our staff, it is apparent that both general education teachers and their exceptional student education resource colleagues echo there is not a cooperative working relationship between the two groups. Both groups of educators have yet to find a system that works best to support their student achievement. Additionally, Sunrise did have some retention issues in the self contained units. One additional area for consideration, is the effective use of behavior intervention and following the structures of MTSS-B. The knowledge base for across our instructional team is limited in this capacity, which leads the team to believe behaviors were often times ignored instead of addressed, leading to missed academic opportunities for students.

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

With a proficiency of 60%, our Math scores have shown the most improvement. Prior to this school year, Sunrise has not adopted a curriculum that had substantial rigor nor did it provide all components to support effective instruction. This led to teachers piece-mealing lessons in hopes that it would be successful. This past school year, our district adopted Reveal for K-5 and EdGems. With the support of a math coach and ongoing feedback cycles our school was able to make great gains, the best we have seen in years in this area.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

1. Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency - 88
2. Number of students who scored a level 1 on the ELA Fast Assessment - 76

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. ESSA Subgroup student proficiency in both ELA & Math
3. Math proficiency

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In 2021, students in grades 3-6 scored 57% proficiency ELA, in 2022 proficiency dropped to 55% and currently we have remained steady with 55% proficiency in 2023. As of the first progress monitoring, Sunrise has 30% meeting proficiency.

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

With our baseline being 30% overall proficiency in ELA, our goal by the end of the year is to have 65% proficiency which is approximately 311 students in grades 3-6.

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

This area of focus will be monitored throughout the year using:
1.FAST Assessment data (3x annually), iReady Diagnostic growth (3 x annually), as well as districtwide comparison data with the standardized ELA assessments.
2. Administration will utilize walk-thru data to provide feedback on instructional practices.
3. Monthly data meeting specific to ELA to monitor data trends for the grade level

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Kraus (kraus.danielle@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Fidelity to the district prescribed evidence based curriculum (K12 Reading Plan)
2. Utilizing John Hattie's Visible Learning strategies: teacher clarity, small group, explicit phonics instruction (K-2)
3. Implementation of Kagan structures to support student engagement in learning, which scored low in our Youth Truth survey

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Our district prescribed curriculum is based on the Science of Reading research.
2. John Hattie states that teacher clarity has a .75 effect size, small group instruction .47 effect size, explicit phonics instruction (K-2) .59 effect size
3. Student engagement has a .56 effect size in student achievement. Implementation of Kagan structures would be supportive of improved engagement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Administration will conduct regular classroom walk-throughs to observe instructional trends, collect evidence and data on instructional practices and provide explicit feedback to teachers. A common look-for tool will be utilized during walk-throughs and provided to all teachers.

The primary indicators we will look to observe are:

-Grade level specific, standards aligned instruction during core

-Fidelity to the prescribed curriculum and pacing

-Strategies for student engagement (i.e. Kagan)

-Rigorous tasks and questioning

-Teacher in the facilitator role, students doing the work and thinking of the lesson

-Small group

Person Responsible: Danielle Kraus (kraus.danielle@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing, regular weekly walkthroughs and follow up with teaching

Monthly ELA PLCs to support planning and effective implementation.

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

By When: Monthly

Data chats with teachers after each progress monitoring assessment period. Discussions to include students making adequate progress, students not making adequate progress and intervention strategies in place.

Person Responsible: Alison Marlasca (marlasca.alison@brevardschools.org)

By When: 3 times annually

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our Students with Disabilities group had a staggering 21% proficiency in ELA and 25% proficiency in Math.
Some factors that contributed to our deficiencies include:
-inconsistent instruction in our supported level classrooms
-resource service model was not structured in a way that supported a strong co-teaching model
-MTSS-B not being utilized
-Lack of fidelity to the prescribed curriculum

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

Sunrise will improve our SWD proficiency to 30% in both ELA and Math.

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

This area of focus will be monitored throughout the year using:
1.FAST Assessment data (3x annually), iReady Diagnostic growth (3 x annually), as well as districtwide comparison data with the standardized ELA and Math assessments.
2. Administration will utilize walk-thru data to provide feedback on instructional practices.
3. Monthly data meeting specific to ELA and Math to monitor data trends for the grade level
4. Monthly ESE Team meetings will inspect student service logs
5. Collaborative planning will take place amongst our ESE Resource teacher and general education teachers

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alison Marlasca (marlasca.alison@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

-Implementation of Magnetic Reading
-Fidelity to prescribed curriculum
-Implementation of LEXIA to provide targeted support
-Implementation of MTSS-B

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lexia's digital curriculum solutions are founded upon Structured Literacy, the application of the science of reading into practical classroom instruction. The structured, explicit, and systematic approach to literacy and language instruction builds upon prior learning in a sequential manner—from simple to complex—ultimately improving each teacher's ability to deliver critical literacy concepts, strengthening a student's relationship with learning, and transitioning ownership of learning to that student.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our Students with Disabilities group had 39% proficiency in ELA and 38% proficiency in Math.
Some factors that contributed to our deficiencies include:
-inconsistent instruction in our supported level classrooms
-resource service model was not structured in a way that supported a strong co-teaching model
-MTSS-B not being utilized
-Lack of fidelity to the prescribed curriculum

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

Sunrise will improve our Black/African American proficiency to 41% in both ELA and Math.

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

This area of focus will be monitored throughout the year using:
1.FAST Assessment data (3x annually), iReady Diagnostic growth (3 x annually), as well as districtwide comparison data with the standardized ELA and Math assessments.
2. Administration will utilize walk-thru data to provide feedback on instructional practices.
3. Monthly data meeting specific to ELA and Math to monitor data trends for the grade level
4. Monthly ESE Team meetings will inspect student service logs
5. Collaborative planning will take place amongst our ESE Resource teacher and general education teachers

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Kraus (kraus.danielle@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

-Implementation of Magnetic Reading
-Fidelity to prescribed curriculum
-Implementation of LEXIA to provide targeted support
-Implementation of MTSS-B

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lexia's digital curriculum solutions are founded upon Structured Literacy, the application of the science of reading into practical classroom instruction. The structured, explicit, and systematic approach to literacy and language instruction builds upon prior learning in a sequential manner—from simple to complex—ultimately improving each teacher's ability to deliver critical literacy concepts, strengthening a student's relationship with learning, and transitioning ownership of learning to that student.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Sunrise Elementary School is a Positive Behavior Intervention Support model school. With that we are purposeful in acknowledging students regularly for academics and following our schoolwide expectations. Furthermore, we have reviewed the outcome data provided by our Youth Truth Survey. The survey indicates that students rank low in belonging as well as engagement.

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

According to the Youth Truth Survey, we ranked in the 49th percentile overall in belonging. In engagement we ranked in the 76th percentile, with 4th and 6th grade in the 65th percentile.

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

We will monitor this data through student feedback in our quarterly surveys and through morning meeting formative feedback conversations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cayla Scherer (scherer.cayla@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Morning meeting will be implemented daily.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Morning Meeting is a beneficial strategy to address psychological needs that allows students to build relationships with each other. To meet belonging needs, teachers can encourage cooperation and collaboration, be patient, and have a positive attitude (DeMarco & Tilson, 1998).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Sunrise Elementary's leadership team reviews allocations, schedules and other resources to ensure all students receive high quality instruction.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

NA - K-2

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

In 22-23, 49% of students in grades 5 scored level 3 or higher and demonstrated proficiency. 51% scored level 1 or 2 - below proficient.

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

NA - K-2 did not trigger RAISE actions.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By end of year 23-24, 60% or more of Grade 5 students will score proficient (level 3 or higher) on PM3 of FAST.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

This area of focus will be monitored throughout the year using:
1.FAST Assessment data (3x annually), iReady Diagnostic growth (3x annually), and districtwide comparison data with the standardized ELA assessments.
2. The administration will utilize walk-thru data to provide feedback on instructional practices.
3. Monthly data meeting specific to ELA to monitor data trends for the grade level

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Kraus, Danielle, kraus.danielle@brevardschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

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

Fifth grade teachers will implement the Benchmark Advance curriculum aligned with the B.E.S.T. Standards. Teachers will also utilize Lexia, iReady, and 95% Group materials during the intervention process. These materials are systematic and explicit as well as meet Florida's definition of evidence-based materials. Teachers will also be given standards-aligned collaborative planning time, coaching support, ongoing professional learning based on schools needs/trends, and research-based quality curriculum resources. The BPS pacing and guidance documents for core instruction will be referenced with fidelity to support K-12 implementation. The K-12 Decision Trees and IPST Forms 1-8 are tools that will be used ongoing in MTSS process to determine both which instructional materials and levels of support needed.

Rationale:

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

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

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

All evidence-based practices/programs listed above address the identified need that is improving primary literacy achievement. The identified practices/programs show proven record of effective for the target population as they are:
• B.E.S.T. Standards Aligned
• Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan
• Meet Florida's definition of evidence-based
• Systematic and/or explicit
• Geared towards struggling readers with an emphasis on Foundational skills such as Phonological Awareness and Phonics

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Administration will conduct regular classroom walk-throughs to observe instructional trends, collect evidence and data on instructional practices and provide explicit feedback to teachers. A common look-for tool will be utilized during walk-throughs and provided to all teachers. The primary indicators we will look to observe are: -Grade level specific, standards aligned instruction during core -Fidelity to the prescribed curriculum and pacing -Strategies for student engagement (i.e. Kagan) -Rigorous tasks and questioning -Teacher in the facilitator role, students doing the work and thinking of the lesson -Small group	Kraus, Danielle, kraus.danielle@brevardschools.org
Monthly ELA PLCs to support planning and effective implementation.	Elliott, Carmen, elliott.carmen@brevardschools.org
Data chats with teachers after each progress monitoring assessment period. Discussions to include students making adequate progress, students not making adequate progress and intervention strategies in place.	Marlasca, Alison, marlasca.alison@brevardschools.org