

Brevard Public Schools

Enterprise Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Enterprise Elementary School

7000 ENTERPRISE RD, Cocoa, FL 32927

<http://www.enterprise.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Kelli D UF Resne C

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Enterprise Elementary School

7000 ENTERPRISE RD, Cocoa, FL 32927

<http://www.enterprise.brevard.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	55%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Enterprise Elementary School is to facilitate an inclusive environment, provide a quality education, and build positive relationships to empower hard-working, life-long learners. (Revised 2018)

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Enterprise community is committed to inspiring caring students who reach their full potential to become innovative, confident, and successful citizens. (Revised 2018)

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dufresne, Kelli	Principal	Monitor student achievement data; initiate collaborative meetings with school-based leadership team and faculty; plan professional learning opportunities for staff; observe instructional practices and provide feedback to teachers; oversee school operations to ensure alignment with school improvement processes.
Smith, Deanna	Assistant Principal	Monitor student achievement data; initiate collaborative meetings with faculty and grade level teams; plan professional learning opportunities for staff; observe instructional practices and provide feedback to teachers; ensure alignment of curriculum and instruction with state-adopted standards; manage implementation of the School Improvement Plan.
Hurley, Robin	Instructional Coach	Monitor school-wide ELA data; support teachers with implementation of ELA standards and the analysis of student data; provide feedback to instructional staff that will positively impact instructional routines in the classroom; deliver professional learning opportunities based on the needs of our instructional staff and school; support administration in the implementation of the School Improvement Plan.
Williams, Anquanice	SAC Member	Lead School Advisory Council as Chairperson; build staff, family, and community partnerships through SAC; participate in the development of the School Improvement Plan; assist in the preparation of the school's annual budget and plan; build consensus with SAC members regarding school-based initiatives, instructional resources, and other school needs.
Woltman, Jobie	School Counselor	Assist students with physical, social, and psychological needs; provide professional development to staff related to social and emotional needs at our school; facilitate Individual Problem Solving Team meetings; monitor Early Warning Systems.

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	79	94	82	75	82	62	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	568
Attendance below 90 percent	14	38	21	21	30	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	3	2	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	5	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on FSA Math	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 2 on FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	0	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 2 on FSA Math	0	0	0	0	2	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	3	9	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	4	4	5	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

46

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/13/2019

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	30	31	27	25	43	29	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	217
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	3	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	14	15	23	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	2	2	8	8	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	69%	62%	57%	58%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	60%	58%	57%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	57%	53%	53%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	63%	63%	67%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	65%	62%	66%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	53%	51%	62%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	57%	53%	59%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	79 (0)	94 (0)	82 (0)	75 (0)	82 (0)	62 (0)	94 (0)	568 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	14 ()	38 ()	21 ()	21 ()	30 ()	19 ()	23 ()	166 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	9 (0)	19 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)	8 (0)	14 (0)	30 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	17 (0)
Level 1 on FSA Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	8 (0)	17 (0)
Level 2 on FSA ELA	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (0)	20 (0)	30 (0)
Level 2 on FSA Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	10 (0)	15 (0)	27 (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	78%	64%	14%	58%	20%
	2018	64%	63%	1%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	61%	9%	58%	12%
	2018	65%	57%	8%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	63%	60%	3%	56%	7%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019	67%	60%	7%	54%	13%
	2018	58%	63%	-5%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	61%	18%	62%	17%
	2018	60%	62%	-2%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	64%	17%	64%	17%
	2018	70%	59%	11%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
05	2019	55%	60%	-5%	60%	-5%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
06	2019	79%	67%	12%	55%	24%
	2018	63%	68%	-5%	52%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		28%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	56%	6%	53%	9%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
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	51	57	44	64	69	72	40				
HSP	53	57		57	65						
MUL	67	62		70	48		60				
WHT	71	68	69	75	68	69	61				
FRL	67	67	61	66	61	60	56				
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	31	32	44	37	46	47	64				
BLK	54	55		46	55						
HSP	50	50		45	44						
MUL	50	50		68	43						
WHT	59	52	61	63	52	56	56				
FRL	57	52	50	61	50	46	53				
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	39	41	31	48	67	33					
HSP	46	50		54	67						
MUL	47	38		67	67						
WHT	61	59	60	69	67	65	60				
FRL	55	51	46	65	62	52	57				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	61
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 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	69
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	63
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

In 2018-2019, Science Achievement had a proficiency rate of 60%, which was higher than the district and the state average; however, it was an increase of only 7%. Math Lowest 25th Percentile scored at 65%, which is tied with district and 3 percentage points above state. In 2017-2018, Math Lowest 25th Percentile scored at 50% which was 9 percentage points below the district and state.

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

All school grade components for 2018-2019 increased. However, Science Achievement had the lowest increase of all components with only an increase of 7% from 2017-2018. When disaggregating by grade level, we concluded that our fifth grade students in ELA and Science scored comparable.

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.

Enterprise Elementary was higher than the state average in all categories. ELA Achievement of 69% proficient for Enterprise Elementary performed 12 percentage points higher than the state's

proficiency level of 57%. Also, Math Lowest 25% was 64% for Enterprise as compared to the state's average of 51%. The data component which scored closest to the state's average is Math learning gains with 65% and for the school and 62% for the state.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was learning gains in mathematics. In 2017-2018, Enterprise had 50% of students demonstrate a learning gain in mathematics. In 2018-2019, Enterprise increased that score by 15 percentage points, with 65% of students demonstrating learning gains in mathematics. In 2018-2019, teachers were given the autonomy (not all grade levels chose) to utilize Eureka and Zearn to deliver the Florida Standards. In addition, a 90-minute math block was encouraged.

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

After review of Enterprise's EWS data from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 one area of concern is attendance below 90% which impacts instruction in the classroom. We will continue to monitor attendance and dive deeper into students arriving tardy or checking out early to analyze the instructional impact occurring.

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

1. Focus on the 3 Shifts of ELA and standards aligned instruction
2. Implementation of Eureka Math among all grade levels with fidelity
3. SMART to include ELA and Math
4. Text-dependent writing across content areas

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA
Rationale	From the 2018 to 2019 school year, Enterprise increased ELA proficiency scores from 58% to 69%. This was 7 percentage points above the district and 12 percentage points above the state. Additionally, Grades 1 and 2 improved QLA proficiency scores with an 18% increase in Grade 1 and a 29% increase in Grade 2 from QLA 1 to QLA 4.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA Achievement will increase from 69% to 72% demonstrating level 3 and above on FSA ELA. In addition, at least 60% of students will meet or exceed QLA proficiency scores in Grades 1 and 2.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Focus on 3 Shifts of ELA and standards-aligned instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe that if teachers provide regular practice with complex text and its academic language; provide reading, writing, and speaking grounded in evidence from texts; build knowledge through content rich nonfiction; and ensure lessons, assignments, and assessments are aligned to the Florida Standards and meet the full intent, student achievement will improve.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will utilize aligned resources to plan lessons which include, grade level standards, Test Item Specifications, Standards Focused Documents, Quality Questioning, Common Core Companion, ATU's, Text Sets, ELFAS, DBQs, and i-Ready Toolbox. 2. Teachers will participate in half-day structured collaborative planning sessions focused on developing standards-aligned instruction with the Literacy Coach leading these sessions. 3. Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational/walk through data. 4. Teachers will be provided with professional development and embedded coaching cycles on standards-based planning and instructional delivery from the Literacy Coach. 5. School-based leadership team will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support.
Person Responsible	Deanna Smith (smith.deanna@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Math
Rationale	From the 2018 to 2019 school year, Enterprise increased Math proficiency scores from 61% to 72%. This was 9 percentage points above the district and state. Additionally, all primary grades (K-2) demonstrated improvement on overall scale scores on i-Ready Math Diagnostic. Kindergarten showed an increase from 19% to 73%, 1st Grade showed an increase from 8% to 57%, 2nd Grade showed an increase from 17% to 49% meeting or exceeding grade level benchmark from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 3.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math Achievement will increase from 72% to 75% demonstrating level 3 and above on FSA ELA. In addition, at least 60% of K-2 students will meet or exceed grade level benchmark on i-Ready Math Diagnostic 3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of Eureka Math among all grade levels with fidelity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe that if teachers apply the Standards for Mathematical Practice within their daily lessons and utilize a curriculum that fully aligns with the Florida Standards, student achievement will improve.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School-based leaders will seek support from the Elementary Math Resource Teacher, Diane Gard, to provide professional development on the Standards for Mathematical Practice and implementation of Eureka Math. 2. Teachers will be provided training on high yield instructional mathematical practices. 3. Teachers will be provided collaborative planning time to discuss and analyze student understanding in order to scaffold lessons using the Eureka Math program. 4. Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational/walk through data. 5. School-based leadership team will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support.
Person Responsible	Deanna Smith (smith.deanna@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	SMART
Rationale	From the 2018 to 2019 school year, Enterprise increased in all learning gain cells including lowest 25%. Learning gains in Reading improved from 52% to 65%. Learning gains in Math increased from 50% to 65%. The percent of lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading increased from 56% to 64%. The percent of lowest 25% making learning gains in Math improved from 52% to 64%. Additionally, all primary grades (K-2) demonstrated improvement on overall scale scores on i-Ready Reading Diagnostic. Kindergarten showed an increase from 24% to 82%, 1st Grade showed an increase from 17% to 75%, 2nd Grade showed an increase from 39% to 71% meeting or exceeding grade level benchmark from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 3.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Learning gains in both Reading and Math will improve from 65% to 70%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Deanna Smith (smith.deanna@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe that if teachers deliver targeted interventions in both Reading and Math, monitor students' academic progress, and evaluate their instructional practices SMART time will be effective. Therefore, resulting in this, we believe that learning gains will improve.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will meet regularly every 4-6 weeks for a scheduled data meeting with our Literacy Coach to review student progress monitoring data. discuss students' academic needs, and form and/or adjust intervention groups using i-Ready data, district assessment data, and classroom teacher data. 2. Tracking of student data will occur through the use of Teacher Data Binders, Student Data Folders/Notebooks, Data Board and discussion at PLTs. 3. School based leaders will create a monitoring schedule to provide feedback regarding effective implementation of SMART time.
Person Responsible	Robin Hurley (hurley.robin@brevardschools.org)

#4	
Title	Science
Rationale	From 2018 to 2019 Enterprise increased Science proficiency by 7%. However, when looking at trend data, Enterprise's SSA scores have fluctuated over test administration periods. Although Science proficiency increased, this content area demonstrated the lowest gain out of all school grade components.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Science Achievement will increase from 62% to 70% demonstrating level 3 and above on SSA .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	5 E Instructional Model
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe that if teachers take students through the cognitive thinking process of engage, explore, explain, elaborate, and evaluate during science instructional time, science achievement scores will increase.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School based leaders will seek support from the Elementary Science Resource Teacher, Michelle Ferro, to provide professional development on the 5E Instructional Model for teachers in grades 3-6. 2. Teachers will implement STEM activities in the classroom and during Media class. 3. School based leaders will utilize the science content experts on campus to teach Science Saturday lessons that will provide hands-on, strand specific activities to support deeper understanding of the standards.
Person Responsible	Deanna Smith (smith.deanna@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

In addition to our main areas of focus, teachers will also embed writing across all content areas. Writing allows students to demonstrate, support, and deepen their knowledge and understanding of their learning. This area of focus will be integrated within all school wide professional learning offered this school year.