Sunrise Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sunrise Elementary

101 LONE PALM RD, Orlando, FL 32828

https://sunrisees.ocps.net/

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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Brinzo, Alejandra	Principal	Principal: Manages all school operations and functions of the school; assists teachers with data-based decision making skills to ensure school-based data is being utilized and implemented correctly and continuously throughout the year; develops and administers policies and procedures that provide a safe and effective learning environment; visible in the community and recognized as an instructional leader; follows and implements all district guidelines and instructional initiatives; maintains timely and accurate information and all assessments on all staff members; purchases curriculum, current technology, and other necessary resources to enable the teachers to perform their job effectively. Select General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate): Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/ instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection; integrates core instructional activities/ materials into instruction with struggling students, and collaborates with general education teachers through activities.
Wise, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal: Supports the Principal in the following areas: assists teachers with data-based decision making skills to ensure school-based data is being utilized and implemented correctly and continuously throughout the year; develops and administers policies and procedures that provide a safe and effective learning environment; visible in the community and recognized as an instructional leader; follows and implements all district guidelines and instructional initiatives; maintains timely and accurate information and all assessments on all staff members. Select General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate): Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/ intervention; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection; integrates core instructional activities/materials into instruction with struggling students, and collaborates with general education teachers through activities.
Waltz, Ginger	Curriculum Resource Teacher	CRT and Instructional Coach develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered struggling learners; assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Each resource teacher is to support technology programs in their area.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rogers, Dana	Instructional Coach	CRT and Instructional Coach develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze the existing literature on curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered struggling learners; assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Turnbull, Margaret	Dean	The dean works with the instructional team to implement positive behaviors support and restorative practices to minimize negative behaviors that can be a distraction to other or harmful. She follows the OCPS student code of conduct when addressing discipline. The dean also co-chairs the Partners in Education initiative.
Kiem, Melanie	Instructional Media	The media specialist supports District and school-wide initiatives implemented by the leadership and instructional staff. As the technology leader, she coordinates all digital media and provides guidance on the digital devices for staff, parents, and students. Additionally, she facilitates several reading programs that promote literacy.
Bovbjerg, Zuleika	Staffing Specialist	Staffing Specialist collects, interprets, and analyzes data; facilitates the development of intervention plans, provides support for intervention and assists with the different types of documentation. They work with the ESE team of teachers to review the curriculum, assessment, and instruction. They help develop IEP plans, EP plans, and 504 plans.
	School Counselor	The school counselor promotes mental health and wellness initiatives at the school. She leads our Threat Assessment team, as well as leads groups based on students' needs, i.e., anxiety, divorce, social pressures, and social skills. The school counselor works with other student service staff to provide students with counseling needs and resources.

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.

The SIP was developed using school-wide data including input from stakeholders. Input included Panorama surveys completed by community members, staff, and students. The results were reviewed in a SAC meeting with community stakeholders.

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 school improvement plan will be monitored through MTSS, Child Study, and data meetings. We will revise interventions based on student data and use the MTSS process to provide for students' intervention needs and determine if the student needs any additional academic assistance.

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-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	50%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	37%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	3	6	8	17	8	13	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level 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	0	1	1	3	8	8	0	0	0	21

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	8	11	11	9	8	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	15

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	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	0	8	11	11	9	8	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	15

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	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	72	57	53	77	56	56	75		
ELA Learning Gains				73			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			50		
Math Achievement*	76	60	59	77	46	50	74		
Math Learning Gains				62			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33			24		
Science Achievement*	76	63	54	77	61	59	64		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	79	59	59	68			56		

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	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
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	65

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	516
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
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	24	Yes	4	1
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	57			
HSP	64			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	63			

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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	60			
HSP	63			

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				
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	65			

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	72			76			76					79
SWD	26			23			20				4	
ELL	44			44							3	79
AMI												
ASN	92			100							2	
BLK	50			63							2	
HSP	59			65			68				5	67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	82			83			81				4	
FRL	59			63			58				5	73

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	77	73	49	77	62	33	77					68
SWD	29	33	36	36	33							
ELL	52	67		50	50	40	67					68
AMI												
ASN	80			93								

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	60			60								
HSP	65	76	71	65	57	33	70					67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	84	70	21	82	67	27	88					
FRL	67	84	79	62	54	44	67					

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	75	61	50	74	47	24	64					56
SWD	17			22								
ELL	70	82		63	45		60					56
AMI												
ASN	92			100								
BLK	46			54								
HSP	70	65		64	38		65					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	81	60		79	57		65					
FRL	65	64	50	52	32	18	41					50

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	71%	54%	17%	54%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	60%	13%	58%	15%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	52%	20%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	86%	59%	27%	59%	27%
04	2023 - Spring	83%	62%	21%	61%	22%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	55%	11%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	74%	59%	15%	51%	23%

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.

After reviewing the data, the trend across grade levels is that students with disabilities are not demonstrating adequate proficiency in ELA or Math. FAST data reflects that students with disabilities perform lower than their grade-level peers in ELA and Math. A contributing factor includes changes in instructional staff members. The data review also revealed an area of opportunity in increasing small-group instruction school-wide.

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 proficiency of below 35% in ELA and Math. Students with disabilities experienced a learning loss of skills dating back to March 2020 due to the pandemic and delayed access to virtual learning opportunities. To address the need to increase proficiency in ELA and Math for students with disabilities, we will provide rigorous intervention and data monitoring for identified students. We will utilize intervention and a multi-tiered system of support to focus on the learning progress of students with disabilities and monitor small-group instruction.

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.

Sunrise students performed 17% over the state proficiency average in ELA and 20% over the state proficiency average in Math. Some contributing factors to the higher proficiency in Math include the introduction of Reflex Math and Reflex Frax to improve Math fluency, as well as the implementation of the Mathlympics program.

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

During the 2022-23 school year, data indicates that Math scores showed the most improvement. During the 2022-23 school year, the average growth in Math Proficiency for grades 3rd through 5th was 67%. Recent state scores show that 79% of students are proficient in Math. The actions that were contributing factors included Increased math fluency through Reflex Math and Relex Frax. The school also allowed the students to participate in a quarterly Mathlympics program which targeted grade-level standards and provided anecdotal data for classroom teachers.

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

One potential concern is the more significant number of students scoring a Level 1 on the statewide ELA assessment than on the statewide Math assessment. Another possible concern is the more substantial number of students with two or more early warning indicators in grades 3 through 5.

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

1. Improve student performance for Students with Disabilities in Math.
2. Increase student proficiency in ELA.
3. Increase positive student perception of the School's Climate

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

#1. 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.

Improve student performance for Students with Disabilities in Math. The rationale is to improve student learning for our students with disabilities. FAST data shows that 25% of SWD were proficient in Math.

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

Our intended outcome is to increase from 25% to 50% proficiency for our students with disabilities as evidenced by the 2023-24 PM3 FAST Math assessment.

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

Administration walk-throughs during intervention and enrichment to monitor instruction. Students will be provided acceleration when appropriate. Data meetings will occur weekly to discuss progress and brainstorm strategies. All faculty members will be trained and utilized to help provide interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alejandra Brinzo (alejandra.brinzo@ocps.net)

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.)

Teachers will provide students with evidence-based interventions through Success Maker, Reflex Math, and Reflex Frax.

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

Success Maker will provide students with differentiated supports to bridge learning gaps and provide teachers with data to make informed instructional decisions. Reflex Math will help students build math fluency. These interventions and our regularly scheduled data/MTSS meetings will help us close the achievement gap between students with disabilities and their grade-level peers.

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.

One action will be working individually and providing targeted intervention with students not demonstrating Math proficiency. Teachers, instructional leaders, and administration will meet weekly to discuss the student performance data and make instructional decisions.

Person Responsible: Alejandra Brinzo (alejandra.brinzo@ocps.net)

By When: This action begins in September of 2023 and continues through the end of May of 2024.

The instructional leadership team will attend common planning meetings, regularly visit classrooms, provide actionable feedback, and model lessons as needed.

Person Responsible: Alejandra Brinzo (alejandra.brinzo@ocps.net)

By When: This action begins in September of 2023 and continues through the end of May of 2024.

#2. 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.

Improve student performance in ELA. Based on the 2022-23 FAST ELA data, 74% of the students demonstrated proficiency in ELA.

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

Based on the FAST ELA data for the 2022-2023 school year 74% of students school-wide demonstrated proficiency. For the 2023-2024 school year, Sunrise will increase proficiency in ELA from 74% to 80%.

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

Administration walk-throughs during intervention and enrichment to monitor instruction. Students will be provided acceleration when appropriate. Data meetings will occur weekly to discuss progress and brainstorm strategies. All faculty members will be trained and utilized to help provide interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Alejandra Brinzo (alejandra.brinzo@ocps.net)

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.)

Exact Path, SIPPS, and Orton Gillingham are the evidence-based interventions that will be used during ELA core instruction and intervention.

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

Teachers will embed Exact Path, SIPPS, and Orton Gillingham into their ELA instruction and intervention for teaching and will monitor student data and achievement. These interventions and our regularly scheduled data/MTSS meetings will help us improve student proficiency in ELA.

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.

Teachers, instructional leaders, and administration will meet regularly to discuss the student performance data and make instructional decisions.

Person Responsible: Alejandra Brinzo (alejandra.brinzo@ocps.net)

By When: This action begins in September of 2023 and continues through the end of May of 2024.

The instructional leadership team will attend common planning meetings, regularly visit classrooms, provide actionable feedback, and model lessons as needed.

Person Responsible: Alejandra Brinzo (alejandra.brinzo@ocps.net)

By When: This action begins in September of 2023 and continues through the end of May of 2024.

Students not demonstrating reading proficiency using strategies from SIPPS and Orton Gillingham will be provided with additional support.

Person Responsible: Alejandra Brinzo (alejandra.brinzo@ocps.net)

By When: This action begins in September of 2023 and continues through the end of May of 2024.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

After reviewing student data according to the Panorama survey administered in the Spring of 2023, the lowest-scoring topic is School Climate. In analyzing the question results, students expressed that the behavior of others hurt their learning.

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

After reviewing student Panorama survey data, the lowest-scoring topic is School Climate. In analyzing the question results, the limited growth in favorable student responses is due to student behavior impacting student learning. Discipline data from the 2022-2023 school year indicate that 54 students received discipline referrals. For the 2023-2024 school year, Sunrise Elementary will decrease student referrals by at least 15%.

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

Our school has hired a dean and school counselor who will help students minimize negative behaviors. We plan to implement behavior strategies, conflict resolution, and building resiliency strategies and practices. Multiple professional developments will be offered to teachers to embed strategies in the classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alejandra Brinzo (alejandra.brinzo@ocps.net)

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.)

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based intervention that will be used to identify and support desired student behaviors.

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

PBIS will be implemented school-wide. Teachers will use behavior intervention strategies to encourage positive classroom behavior and monitor student progress. Student performance will be reviewed during regularly scheduled Child Study Meetings.

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.

Identify student resiliency needs to prepare for academic instruction. Implement a schoolwide resiliency program and PBIS strategies.

Person Responsible: Alejandra Brinzo (alejandra.brinzo@ocps.net)

By When: This action begins in September of 2023 and continues through the end of May of 2024.

<div style="background-color:navy;color:white;text-align:center;">

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).

</div>

Our school will continue to increase teachers trained in Orton Gillingham, a multi-sensory intervention training. We have a full-time ESE teacher who provides services to students identified with a disability.