Brevard Public Schools

Enterprise Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2019-20 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%)
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

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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	53%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	20%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
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.
Jackson, Christa	SAC Member	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.
Terapak, Stephanie	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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Kelli D UF Resne C

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.*

6

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.*
2

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-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	69	72	90	76	69	78	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	515
Attendance below 90 percent	3	8	3	4	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	3	4	4	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	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

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

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	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

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

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(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.

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%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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					

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
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				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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
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%	0

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%	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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	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	69
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	63
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.

In 2018-2019, SSA 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% from the previous school year. Our 2019-2020 Grade 5 SSA Review Part 1 proficiency rate was 20%. Our Grade 5 SSA Review Part 2 proficiency rate was 49%. This was an increase of 29% from September 2019 to February 2020. Although this assessment only captures student mastery toward 3rd and 4th grade standards, it demonstrates the need for standards based instruction in science to be taught with fidelity and instructional cohesiveness across grade levels.

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

In 2018-2019, FSA Math Achievement had a proficiency rate of 72%. According to our Winter i-Ready Diagnostic 2 Math data for 2019-2020, our predicted Math proficiency rate was 38%. This would be a 34% decline from the previous year. Due to COVID19 and distance learning that occurred at the end of the 2019-2020 school year, our students were unable to complete i-Ready Diagnostic 3. Therefore, we do not have true final outcome measures from the 2019-2020 school year. The 2019-2020 school year was Enterprise's first year of fully implementing the Eureka Math program. Additionally, Enterprise did not have the i-Ready math instructional component.

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.

In 2018-2019, Enterprise outperformed the state in all subgroups for both ELA and Math. However, our data indicates that our lowest performing subgroup is SWD. There was a 19% discrepancy in ELA and an 11% discrepancy in Math between SWD and Non-SWD in 2018-2019. According to our Winter i-Ready Diagnostic 2 data for 2019-2020, our predicted gap was 31% for ELA and 21% for Math. This is an increase of 12 percentage points in ELA and 10 percentage points in math from the previous year. Factors contributing to this gap may have been scheduling and use of pull-out models for servicing. This year we have aligned scheduling to allow for a push in model for ESE support services. This will provide classroom teachers and resource teachers more collaboration and planning time and will permit for a co-teach model in the general education classroom.

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

According to our 2018-2019 EWS data, we had 166 students with attendance below 90% and 19 students with one or more suspension. For the 2019-2020 school year, we had only 29 students with attendance below 90% and 11 students with one or more suspension. Last school year, our guidance counselor monitored student attendance and contacted families to educate them on the importance of being at school each day. In addition, students receiving repeated referrals were referred to guidance for mentoring and restorative practices. This helped support students social-emotional learning and reiterated expectations for appropriate behaviors.

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

After review of Enterprise's EWS data from 2018-2019 to 2019-2020 school years, one area of concern is students retained. In 2018-2019, 18 students were retained. In 2019-2020, 20 students were retained. We will continue to monitor student academic data across all content areas. Teacher's will analyze student data at weekly PLT meetings to determine strengths and weaknesses within instructional practices. Intervention data will be monitored closely to ensure that interventions are appropriate and provided with fidelity. Students showing lack of progress will be brought up to our Individual Problem Solving Team for further analysis.

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

1. Standards-aligned instruction in Math
2. Standards-aligned instruction in Science
3. Standards-aligned instruction in ELA to include text-dependent writing
4. SMART to include ELA and Math
5. Academic Support Programs for students demonstrating learning gaps

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	From the 2018 to 2019 school year, Enterprise increased FSA 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 2018-2019 i-Ready Math from Diagnostic 1 to 3. According to our Winter i-Ready Diagnostic 2 Math data for 2019-2020, our predicted Math proficiency rate was 38% for students in grades 3-6. The would be a 34% decline from the previous year. i-Ready Diagnostic 3 was not administered at the end of the 2019-2020 school year due to COVID19 and distance learning taking place. Therefore, we have no data to determine actual outcomes for the end of the 2019-2020 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Math Achievement will increase from our 2019-2020 i-Ready prediction of 38% demonstrating level 3 and above on FSA Math to 55% predicted to demonstrate a level 3 and above on FSA Math after 2020-2021 Diagnostic 2.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Assessing student understanding allows teachers to determine whether students have learned the mathematical procedures or concepts covered. Teachers will utilize Eureka Exit Slips, Mid Module Assessments, and End of Module Assessments to assess student understanding. In addition, teachers will monitor student progress in i-Ready Math to ensure students are moving forward within their instructional paths. Teachers will make instructional decisions based on this data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We believe that if teachers utilize Eureka Exit Slips, Mid Module Assessments, and End of Module Assessments to assess student understanding and monitor i-Ready Math instructional paths, teachers will have a better understanding of their students' gaps in learning. During our weekly Professional Learning Team meetings, teachers will have an opportunity to analyze their data from these assessments, discuss strategies for scaffolding instruction, and develop a plan for remediation, if needed. If this occurs, we believe student achievement will improve.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-based leaders will seek support from Elementary Math Resource Teacher, Shruti Raman, to provide resources for professional development on the Standards for Mathematical Practice and implementation of Eureka Math.
2. Teachers will utilize Eureka Pacing Guide, Enhanced Standards Focused Documents, and prerequisite standards for Math when planning instruction.
3. Teachers will be provided time to analyze math data and discuss ways in which they can scaffold lessons to support all students access to grade level standards.
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)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2018-2019, SSA 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% from the previous school year. Our 2019-2020 Grade 5 SSA Review Part 1 proficiency rate was 20%. Our Grade 5 SSA Review Part 2 proficiency rate was 49%. This was an increase of 29% from September 2019 to February 2020. Although this assessment only captures student mastery toward 3rd and 4th grade standards, it demonstrates the need for standards-based instruction in science to be taught with fidelity and instructional cohesiveness across grade levels.
Measurable Outcome:	SSA Science Achievement proficiency rate will increase from 60% in 2018-2019 to 65% in 2020-2021. Our Grade 5 SSA Review Part 2 proficiency rate will increase from 49% last school year to 60% for this school year. All grade levels will assess mastery toward grade level standards using the Benchmark Block District Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The 5E Instructional Model consists of cognitive stages of learning that comprise engage, explore, explain, elaborate, and evaluate. The model is designed to facilitate conceptual change and contribute to more consistent and coherent science instruction. The incorporation of this learning cycle in the classroom aids teachers in the development and delivery of effective inquiry-based science lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We believe that if teachers incorporate the 5E Instructional Model within their classroom, this will aid them in the development and delivery of effective inquiry-based science lessons. If instruction is chunked into various phases of learning and students are provided a more hands-on, student-centered approach, student achievement will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-based leaders will seek support from Elementary Science Resource Teacher, Michelle Ferro, or members of the Science Cadre to provide resources for professional development on 5E Instructional Model and district provided materials for instruction.
2. Teachers will follow district pacing and utilize district created Benchmark Blocks when planning for instruction.
3. Teachers will administer District Summative Science Assessments, will be provided time to analyze science data, and discuss ways in which they can scaffold lessons to support all students access to grade level standards.
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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2018-2019, FSA ELA Achievement had a proficiency rate of 69%. According to our Winter i-Ready Diagnostic 2 Reading data for 2019-2020, our predicted Reading proficiency rate was 62%. This would have been a decrease of 7% from the previous year. i-Ready Diagnostic 3 was not administered at the end of the 2019-2020 school year due to COVID19 and distance learning taking place. Therefore, we have no data to determine actual outcomes for the end of the 2019-2020 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Reading Achievement will increase from our 2019-2020 i-Ready prediction of 62% demonstrating level 3 and above on FSA ELA to 65% predicted to demonstrate a level 3 and above on FSA ELA after 2020-2021 Diagnostic 2.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Close and scaffolded reading instruction will allow teachers to identify the precise area where instruction is most helpful to students and plan to scaffold and support their learners. Teachers will utilize complex texts, found within the resources provided in the district Standards Focused Documents, that will permit students to focus their attention on elements of purpose, craft, and meaning. This will provide students a deep understanding of the text with the support of their teacher. Collaborative conversations, text-dependent questions, and embedded writing tasks will require students to re-examine the text to gain insight and evidence to support their responses. Teachers will utilize ELFAS formative assessments and i-Ready Standards Mastery assessments to determine student mastery toward the grade level standards. In addition, teachers will monitor student progress in i-Ready Reading to ensure students are moving forward within their instructional paths. Teachers will make instructional decisions based on this data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We believe that if teachers carefully plan close reading instruction using high-quality, complex text and provide ample and appropriately designed scaffolding, they will create conditions that allow for deeper exploration of text and mastery toward the full intent of their grade level standards. If teachers use ELFAS formative assessments and i-Ready Standards Mastery assessments to assess student understanding as well as monitor i-Ready Reading instructional paths, they will be better equipped to inform their instruction to support student academic needs. During our weekly Professional Learning Team meetings, teachers will have an opportunity to analyze their data from these assessments, discuss strategies for scaffolding instruction, and develop a plan for remediation, if needed. If this occurs, we believe student achievement will improve.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-based Literacy Coach will provide resources for professional development on standards-aligned and scaffolded reading instruction.
2. Teachers will utilize Standards Focused Documents and i-Ready Tools for Scaffolding to plan for instruction.
3. Teachers will be provided time to analyze ELA data and discuss ways in which they can scaffold lessons to support all students access to grade level standards.
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	Robin Hurley (hurley.robin@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Due to COVID19 and moving to distance learning in the Spring of 2019, we were not able to complete our intervention cycles that help close academic gaps in student learning. Prior to distance learning, we had 26% of students receiving Tier 2 services and 1% of students receiving Tier 3 services. Additionally, we were servicing 25% of our Grade 3 students through our Academic Support Program. We realize that with the loss of high-quality instructional time at the end of last school year, we will see an increase in student learning gaps this school year. To combat this loss, an area of focus will be on intervention (SMART) and Academic Support Programs to support student deficiencies. We believe that if intervention data is monitored closely to ensure that interventions are appropriate and provided with fidelity and students showing lack of progress are brought up to our Individual Problem Solving Team for further analysis, student gaps will close and/or students will receive appropriate supports/services needed. Additionally, we feel that if we provide additional academic assistance through our Academic Support Program before and after school hours, we will have a greater impact on student academic growth, move toward closing the gaps, and in turn raise overall student outcomes.

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 strives to support and values a positive school culture and learning environment with our staff, parents and students collectively.

In our most recent Parent Survey, Enterprise families indicated a great improvement in communication, especially through social media (Class Dojo, Facebook, Blackboard Connect email/text messages). They feel well connected to what is happening at the school due to the information and communication provided through our social media updates, our new electronic school newsletters and teacher communication. As we look for areas to improve, families have indicated that they would like more academic offerings, family fun nights, and varied meeting times. As soon as updates are made to the CDC guidelines, Enterprise Elementary will offer more academic and informational meetings to support students and families. We will work in collaboration with our PTO to plan more family fun nights that will build community within our school. The goal of these events is to promote a positive school culture and environment focused on building relationships and improving academics for all.

On the YouthTruth survey from this past school year (January 2020), Enterprise Elementary's two highest key ratings, according to our students, were in engagement (2.80) and relationships (2.64). According to the survey, students felt very strongly that their teachers want them to do their best. This indicates that the students feel their teachers care and that the teachers have developed a positive school environment focused on relationships and learning. The area where Enterprise students indicated a need for improvement is in culture (2.17) followed by academic rigor (2.38). In looking deeper into these results, our 4th and 6th grade students scored a lower rating than students in grades 3 and 5. According to the questions that comprise a Culture Summary Measure, data indicates that student behavior was an impacting factor in grades 4th and 6th. This directly correlates with our discipline data from last school year.

In January 2020, Enterprise's instructional staff participated in the EDI Insight Survey. Enterprise's Instructional Culture Index decreased from 9.7 (2018) to 9.5 (2019), which is in the top quartile of all Brevard Schools.
The collective results from this survey serve as a leading indicator of the instructional atmosphere and positive school culture that is pervasive among our faculty. Key areas of success include consistent expectations and consequences for student behavior, school leaders seek out feedback from teachers, and interactions between students and adults are respectful at our school. The Insight Survey indicated a need to strengthen areas in the domains of Academic Opportunity and Professional Development. Strengthening these areas will build cohesiveness across grade levels and improve the overall academic and learning culture of our school.

In alignment with the BPS Strategic Plan, Goal 1, Obj 3 (Provide equitable supports in a safe learning environment for every student's social, emotional, and behavioral development.) we are implementing Conscious Discipline training school-wide. In addition, teachers are receiving professional development in the areas of Trauma Awareness and Building Resilience, Stress and Kids, and CASEL Strategies.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.