Enterprise Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Enterprise Elementary School

211 MAIN ST, Enterprise, FL 32725

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/enterprise/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2019

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically **Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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

Enterprise Elementary School

211 MAIN ST, Enterprise, FL 32725

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/enterprise/pages/default.aspx

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	82%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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 our school is to foster academic achievement and positive self-image in all our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

When we improve the relationships within the school community and stakeholders, we will create an environment of learning that increases the knowledge and implementation of instruction.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Douglas, Alicia	Principal	Educational leader of Enterprise Elementary in charge of entire school operation.
Van Slyke, Shannon	Assistant Principal	Assist principal in school operations.
Lemire, Terra	School Counselor	School counselor, PST chair, SEL.
Myers, Katie	Teacher, K-12	DLTL, testing coordinator, Technology teacher.
Barry, Sherri	Teacher, K-12	Media Specialist
Coody, Cratina	Other	Academic Coach
Gilley, Ashley	Teacher, ESE	SAC Chair
Disinger, Amanda	Teacher, ESE	ESE Support Facilitation
McGinn, Emily	Teacher, ESE	Support Facilitation
Santos, Elizabeth	Other	Academic Coach
Weston, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	Intervention teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/28/2019, Elizabeth Johnson

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

23

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

27

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	67	74	93	90	78	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	484
Attendance below 90 percent	4	20	7	10	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	6	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	0	6	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/28/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	75	93	90	91	82	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	531
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	11	6	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	13	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	3	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	10	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	75	93	90	91	82	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	531
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	11	6	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	13	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	3	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	10	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	53%	56%	57%	52%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	53%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	46%	53%	49%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	59%	63%	54%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	56%	62%	50%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	43%	51%	52%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	57%	53%	66%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	52%	58%	-6%	58%	-6%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	54%	-8%	58%	-12%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	59%	60%	-1%	62%	-3%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	40%	58%	-18%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	59%	-24%	64%	-29%
	2018	44%	60%	-16%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
	2018	52%	57%	-5%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	60%	56%	4%	53%	7%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
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	14	37	38	20	46	42	17				
ELL	41	52	55	54	60	64	50				
BLK	41	42		55	58		40				
HSP	46	62	59	46	54	56	53				
WHT	59	62	35	61	60	40	71				
FRL	46	55	45	50	54	51	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	24	40	32	25	34	19	30				
ELL	26	63	60	29	41	27	27				
BLK	40	39		39	39		18				
HSP	44	58	45	44	55	39	39				
WHT	55	53	29	54	49	43	55				
FRL	46	51	36	44	51	38	40				

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	25	38	28	23	28	42	27				
ELL	27	40	36	46	44						
BLK	39	55	60	45	45		42				
HSP	39	36	26	51	48	54	54				
MUL	45			64							
WHT	63	60	67	58	50	45	79				
FRL	46	46	49	49	46	50	59				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

SWD showed the lowest performance. ELA "lowest quartile percentage", was the lowest school data component at only 44%. Although percentage in the lowest quartile increased it was still 2% lower than the district average and 9% lower than the state. Our lowest performing grade level in ELA was 4th grade which was only 46%. This cause a loss of 10% overall.

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

Fourth grade had the largest decline with a 10% drop in ELA and a 9% drop in Math. Faculty changes, faculty leave, classroom management issues, and teachers using new curriculum. Curriculum was not used with fidelit

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.

ELA in 4th grade had a 12% gap between the state average of 58%. Math in 4th grade had a 29% gap between the state average of 65%. Overall, our fourth grade underperformed the state and district average by a large margin. The rigor of the standards taught did not meet the rigor of the FSA test.

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

Our 5th grade Science scores exceeded the district by 4% and the state by 7%. Our 5th grade Science teacher, Tammy Hirsch, took the lead and met with the district Science coordinator, Becki Lucas. They went over all the standards and dissected the data to determine which standards we needed to work on as a school. The Fifth grade team worked together to create a Science Boot Camp in which they targeted standards needed for the entire class. Third and Fourth grade also had "Wacky Wednesdays" that was a time to focus on the Science standards that the data showed were an area of difficulty.

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

Forty four students had attendance below 90% and we had 64 students score a level 1. Some of the students with poor attendance were the level 1's.

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

1. . Increasing SWD achievement in ELA
2. Increasing SWD achievement in Math
3. Increasing SWD achievement in Science
4. Increasing ELA achievement in all subgroups
5. Increasing ELA learning gains.

.
.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional Practice specifically relating to PLCs was chosen because it would effect ELA, Math and Science instruction. Enterprise's goal is to increase overall achievement in all academic areas. By using PLC's to increase, "Collective Efficacy", which has an effect size of 1.57 would give us the greatest value.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase overall achievement in ELA, Math, and Science. To increase 53% to state average of 62% of students meeting a 3 or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alicia Douglas (addougla@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	"Collective Efficacy", which has an effect size of 1.57.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Due to the effect size of 1.57, we feel this would make the greatest increase on student learning. Professional Learning Communities will be used to plan instruction to increase ELA, Math, and Science overall scores with "Collective Efficacy". Recognizing the strong correlation, between instructional leadership and the ability of teacher's to collaborate. Support teachers to engage in collaborative planning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Learning-Focus on the 4 essential questions- Curriculum, Assessment, Intervention (1.07, Hattie), Acceleration (.68, Hattie)
Persons Responsible: Shannon Van Slyke, Amanda Disinger, Literacy Coach, Tina Coody, Academic Coach
2. Virtual Learning Walks, .65, Hattie, will occur bimonthly with a focus on standards, engagement and 4 essential questions
Persons Responsible:Shannon Van Slyke
3. Raise Student Expectations (1.44) through teacher collaboration and expectations during PLC's
Persons Responsible: Academic Coaches, Tina Coody and Liz Santos, Amanda Disinger, Literacy Coach
4. Collaborative Planning will be conducted on a weekly basis.
Persons Responsible: Tina Coody, Elizabeth Santos, Amanda Disinger

Person Responsible	Shannon Van Slyke (ssvansly@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The focus ESSA Subgroup is our SWD due to the fact that we fell below the 41% expected rate for federal guidelines. To continue to work in small groups and provide "Mastery Instruction", for our SWD is a way in which our students can have targeted instructions.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the SWD to 41% of students making a 3 or better.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alicia Douglas (addougla@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Mastery Instruction-(.57 Hattie)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SWD need to meet the 41% overall ESSA score. We need to meet the individual needs of students to ensure that all students can master the standards needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1)Create a comprehensive Intervention/Remediation plan-RTI (.77 Hattie) for SWD
Persons Responsible: Jill Harris, Tutoring coordinator, Academic Coaches
2. Increase individual student feedback, Feedback (.73, Hattie)
Persons Responsible: All teachers
3. Reciprocal Teaching (.74, Hattie)strategy used in the classroom with teacher planned grouping.
Persons Responsible: All teachers
4. Professional Learning on Meta cognitive strategies (.69, Hattie) which would allow all students to take ownership of their learning
Persons Responsible: Academic Coaches, Coody and Santos
5. Identify research based resources that can be used for Intervention, Remediation, and Acceleration.
Persons Responsible: Shannon Van Slyke and Academic Coaches

Person Responsible	Shannon Van Slyke (ssvansly@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our school leadership team will use data to drive instruction, intervention, remediation, and acceleration for all students. If we use the data to determine the standards in which each child needs to master it will increase overall achievement for all students .
Measurable Outcome:	Increase overall achievement in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade to increase from 53% to meet the state average of 62%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shannon Churms (sschurms@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Analyzing data to improve teacher instruction. Raising student expectations and motivate students for achievement by providing goal setting.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Self reporting grades (1.33 Hattie) When a student performs at a level that is beyond their own expectations he/she gains confidence in his/her learning ability.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure that PLC's /Coaching cycles/Data chats are occurring on a weekly/monthly basis.
Persons Responsible: Academic and Literacy Coaches
2. Raise Student Expectation (1.44) through teacher collaboration and planning.
Persons Responsible: Tina Coody, Elizabeth Santos, Amanda Disinger
3. Self-reporting grades (1.33). Having students determine their learning.
Persons Responsible: All teachers
4. Learning Walks (.65) to focus on data driven instruction
Persons Responsible: Shannon Van Slyke
5.Create a comprehensive Intervention plan/Remediation-RTI (1.07)-Based on formative and summative assessments.
Persons Responsible: Tina Coody, Elizabeth Santos, Amanda Disinger, Jill Harris, Mrs. Van Slyke

Person Responsible	Alicia Douglas (addougla@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Utilize SEL to reduce discipline rate, Raise attendance rates for students. SEL TOA needed to address ISS or repeat offenders to support a plan to improve discipline at Enterprise.School Counselor will utilize Sanford Harmony in whole group instruction.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Enterprise Elementary is a community school. Our faculty and staff are dedicated individuals that ensure that our students are receiving the 21st century education that they deserve. In an normal year we have a very active PTA and SAC who are an important part of our decision making process. Our administration makes sure that all stakeholders are heard and consider all view points before make decisions that affect our students. Due to the pandemic it has been a struggle to gather in person but we have had virtual meetings, gatherings and celebrations to support our Enterprise family and to continue to focus on our students' academic achievement. All of our stakeholders feel valued and know their opinion matters to us.. As we continue through the 2020-21 school year, we hope to have our parent involvement activities, ie. Storybook Character Day, Science Nights, Light Up Enterprise, Dads and Donuts, etc. These may look different for the 2020-2021 school year but Enterprise will remain a community school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				$3,861.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		140-Substitute Teachers	1931 - Enterprise Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$3,861.00
		160-Other Support Personnel	1931 - Enterprise Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$2,953.69
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		590-Other Materials and Supplies	1931 - Enterprise Elementary School			$2,953.69
			Notes: Ready Reading			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems				$1,970.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

		359-Technology-Related Repairs and Maintenance	1931 - Enterprise Elementary School			$1,970.50
			Notes: ESGI and Ready Reading Toolbox Grades 3-5			
			1931 - Enterprise Elementary School			$0.00
					Total:	**$8,785.19**