

Duval County Public Schools

Enterprise Learning Academy



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Enterprise Learning Academy

8085 OLD MIDDLEBURG RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32222

<http://www.duvalschools.org/enterprise>

Demographics

Principal: Jeffrey Collins II

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-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: D (39%) 2014-15: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Enterprise Learning Academy

8085 OLD MIDDLEBURG RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32222

<http://www.duvalschools.org/enterprise>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	89%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

We encourage a positive collaborative community that differentiates instruction and challenges students to do their best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Enterprise Learning Academy provides an engaging environment that empowers students to be compassionate and responsible learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Collins, Jeff	Principal	School Safety Instructional Leader Attendance Intervention Team MTSS Team Local Education Agency Representative Scheduling Campus Supervision Oversee Implementation of Standards-Based Education Teacher Evaluations Data Analysis SAC PTA Budget Public Relations Office Staff Faith-Based Partnerships Business Partners Professional Development

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/22/2019

Prior Year - As Reported
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

Prior Year - Updated
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	42%	50%	57%	47%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	56%	58%	49%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	50%	53%	49%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	62%	63%	62%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	63%	62%	58%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	52%	51%	52%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	48%	53%	43%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (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.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	51%	-8%	58%	-15%
	2018	42%	50%	-8%	57%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
	2018	39%	49%	-10%	56%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	37%	50%	-13%	56%	-19%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
	2018	59%	59%	0%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	64%	-13%	64%	-13%
	2018	56%	60%	-4%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
	2018	48%	61%	-13%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	49%	-10%	53%	-14%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	22	43	63	24	26	26	24				

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
ELL	8			23	20						
BLK	37	41	48	50	42	38	30				
HSP	43	48	60	51	44	27	33				
MUL	45	42		55	25						
WHT	49	56	47	66	57		55				
FRL	37	47	51	47	41	28	29				
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	17	32	38	29	44	40	15				
ASN	92	70		92	80						
BLK	33	40	39	50	41	19	33				
HSP	47	55		52	48	33	44				
MUL	48	29		52	36						
WHT	50	41	32	60	49	33	50				
FRL	36	40	36	50	45	22	35				
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	32	40	42	47	36		18				
ELL	17			33							
ASN	87	60		80	60						
BLK	40	48	58	56	54	43	24				
HSP	34	25		43	50		8				
MUL	58	55		84	82						
WHT	53	53	41	69	61	69	70				
FRL	40	43	50	58	55	52	27				

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	46
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	364
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	25
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Math Lowest Performing Quartile had 30% learning gains, up just 4% from the previous school year. Contributing factors may include the following: lack of monitoring of student progress, lack of differentiation to meet the needs of LPQ students, not teaching to standard, etc.

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

Science proficiency showed the greatest decline, a 7% drop from the previous school year. Contributing factors may include the following: lack of monitoring of student progress, not teaching to standard, teachers not implementing science curriculum, etc.

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.

The area of math learning gains for the Lowest Performing Quartile had the greatest gap compared to the state average. Factors may have included the following: lack of monitoring of student progress, lack of differentiation to meet the needs of LPQ students, not teaching to standard, etc.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was the lowest performing quartile for ELA. A reading interventionist worked solely with the LPQ students in grades 3-5.

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

The number of students who are 1 or more levels behind in reading.

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

1. Instructional Culture
2. Math LPQ
3. Reading Proficiency
4. Science Proficiency
5. Reading and Math Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Science Proficiency

Rationale ELA had a 7% loss in science proficiency during the 2018-2019 school year. This year we will be using Study Island and ACALETICS to help supplement science instruction. We will utilize different field experiences for our students to learn more about the science standards.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

The goal is to increase science proficiency by 25% for the 2019-2020 school year--from 40% in 2018-2019 to 65% in 2019-2020.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy

Students will utilize Study Island as a way to help them master grade level standards in a fun and engaging manner. Study Island combines rigorous content that is customized to specific state standards in science. This use of technology will create an engaging experience for our students which will in turn increase student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Science proficiency dropped 7% on last year's FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment. Study Island is proven to increase student confidence and understanding of the science standards.

Action Step

Description

1. Purchase Study Island Site License
2. Provide PD to our science teachers on how to implement the program
3. Monitor student usage weekly
4. Conduct data chats with students
5. Ability group students according to multiple data sources

Person Responsible

Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Math Proficiency & Learning Gains
Rationale	In order to increase student achievement among our lowest performing quartile student population, we will use a math interventionist to work specifically with these students. The math interventionist will address the individual weaknesses for 50 of our lowest performing quartile students. In an effort to build math fluency we will purchase Math Reflex for students to use both at school and at home. We will utilize our Parent Liaison in order to improve the parent/school connection and improve parent involvement--which will increase student achievement. In addition, we will utilize technology as a way to increase student engagement--which will improve student achievement. We will utilize additional field experiences for our students to learn more about the Florida Standards.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase math proficiency from 56% to 60% and math learning gains from 47% to 65%. Another measureable outcome is to increase our lowest performing quartile learning gains from 30% to 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will utilize ACALETICS, a 30 minute math club, that exposes students to on grade level standards. In addition, we will use Reflex Math as a way to build our students' fluency. Our math interventionist will work with our lowest performing quartile students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	ACALETICS is a research-based program proven to improve student achievement for mathematics. Reflex math will be used to build math fluency. Part-time para-professionals will be used to push in to our classrooms to work with small groups of students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide PD on ACALETICS -- demo lessons, observe and provide actionable feedback 2. Provide PD on Achievement Level Descriptors 3. Data chats and goal setting with students and teachers 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

#3

Title Reading Proficiency & Learning Gains**Rationale**

In an effort to increase the number of students reading on grade level, we will look to incorporate Corrective Reading at Enterprise this year. In addition, our Reading Coach and Reading Interventionist will work with our lowest performing quartile students. We will use part-time para-professionals to push-in to classrooms and provide additional small group instruction with students. Our Parent Liaison will work to improve the parent/school connection which in turn will promote parent involvement and positively increase student achievement. We will utilize technology as a way to improve student engagement and increase student achievement. We will utilize field experiences in order for students to learn more about the Florida Standards.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Our goal is to increase reading proficiency from 42% to 50% and our learning gains from 47% to 65%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Hope Teper (smithh1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy

We will progress monitor using the following data sources:
DRA's
i-Ready
Achieve 3000
Corrective Reading
Reading Mastery Signature Edition

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

The resources selected are researched-based and have been proven to improve student achievement.

Action Step

Description

1. Train teachers and staff on the Achievement Level Descriptors
2. Provide PD on Guided Reading
3. Provide PD on Corrective Reading (3-5) and Reading Mastery Signature Edition (K-2)
4. Data chats and goal setting with students and teachers
5. Progress monitor and provide meaningful feedback for actionable next steps

Person Responsible

Hope Teper (smithh1@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Enterprise Learning Academy will involve parents in an organized, ongoing, and timely manner, in the planning, review, and improvement of the Title 1 Program by holding regularly scheduled monthly SAC meetings. All parents will be invited to attend the meetings. The meetings will be announced via school website, newsletter, marquee, and ParentLink automated phone system.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Enterprise Learning Academy ensures that every student has equitable access to a state certified school counselor. These components help provide a comprehensive school counseling program that provides services to address their social-emotional needs through the use of:

- individual and group counseling
- character development
- positive reinforcement activities
- outside agency referrals and
- school district support personnel

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Within the first 45 days of enrollment, all kindergarten students are given two assessments designed to screen each child's level of readiness for kindergarten. FLKRS includes a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System (ECHOS) and the first two measures of the FAIR assessment for kindergarten (Letter Naming Fluency and Initial Sound Fluency). These assessments are used to gather information on a child's development in emergency literacy. The results from these assessments are used to group students for differentiated instruction and to provide immediate intensive intervention.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST) will meet regularly to provide assistance in the development of the SIP. the team will provide data on Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; help set clear expectations for instruction; facilitate the development of a systemic approach to teaching; align processes and procedures.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency					\$770.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
			2551 - Enterprise Learning Academy			\$770.00	
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency & Learning Gains					\$3,295.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
			2551 - Enterprise Learning Academy			\$3,295.00	
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading Proficiency & Learning Gains					\$0.00
Total:							\$4,065.00