

Duval County Public Schools

# Enterprise Learning Academy



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# Enterprise Learning Academy

8085 OLD MIDDLEBURG RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32222

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Jeffrey Collins II**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (51%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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 Duval 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

## Enterprise Learning Academy

8085 OLD MIDDLEBURG RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32222

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

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	92%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

### School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

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

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

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

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Collins, Jeff	Principal	
Blake, Faylene	Instructional Coach	
Moore, April	School Counselor	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 7/26/2021, Jeffrey Collins II

**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.*

**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.*

#### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

#### Total number of students enrolled at the school

719

#### Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

#### Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

#### Demographic Data

**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 7/26/2021

**2020-21 - 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	118	134	112	135	124	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	744
Attendance below 90 percent	36	42	25	41	12	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182
One or more suspensions	5	3	6	3	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	42	89	73	58	39	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	347
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	61	107	72	91	23	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398

**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	45	95	67	64	27	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	340

**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	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

**2020-21 - 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	118	134	112	135	124	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	744
Attendance below 90 percent	36	42	25	41	12	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182
One or more suspensions	5	3	6	3	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	42	89	73	58	39	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	347
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	61	107	72	91	23	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398

**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	45	95	67	64	27	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	340

**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	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				42%	50%	57%	44%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	56%	58%	43%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	50%	53%	40%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				56%	62%	63%	56%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				47%	63%	62%	47%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	52%	51%	26%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				40%	48%	53%	47%	55%	55%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**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	2021					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	50%	-13%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	51%	64%	-13%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	39%	49%	-10%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Grade level common assessment data; quarterly district assessments (PMA)

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

## Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	13	19	10	30	25	18	7				
ELL	10			29							
BLK	32	22	31	38	22	14	24				
HSP	32	13		41	50		29				
MUL	40			60							
WHT	43	39		57	48		55				
FRL	28	23	26	39	29	25	27				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	43	63	24	26	26	24				
ELL	8			23	20						
BLK	37	41	48	50	42	38	30				
HSP	43	48	60	51	44	27	33				
MUL	45	42		55	25						
WHT	49	56	47	66	57		55				
FRL	37	47	51	47	41	28	29				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	32	38	29	44	40	15				
ASN	92	70		92	80						
BLK	33	40	39	50	41	19	33				
HSP	47	55		52	48	33	44				
MUL	48	29		52	36						
WHT	50	41	32	60	49	33	50				
FRL	36	40	36	50	45	22	35				

## ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	275

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	37
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	48
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	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Significant learning loss across multiple groups but especially our lowest performing students. This was the case for all grades 3-5.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Reading, Math, and Science (proficiency and learning gains)

#### What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The pandemic played a significant role including 30% of our student population missed 20 or more school days.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

n/a

#### What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

n/a



**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

We need to increase student engagement at all levels; we need to increase contact time that lowest performing quartile students have with their teachers and working in small groups.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Teachers will be trained on way to increase student engagement--these include research based best teaching practices. In addition, we will look to increase software programming and access to technology for our students as a way to increase engagement. Finally, we will work to engage families and promote the role they play as advocates for their child's education.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

We will add an instructional coach and part time tutors. These will assist with coaching cycles and increased contact time for our most fragile learners.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:****#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	We will reduce referrals for lowest performing students by 25% during the 2021-2022 school year.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	We will monitor discipline data on a monthly and quarterly basis. We will also provide feedback to teachers through classroom walkthroughs.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will increase the amount of contact time that lowest performing students and those with discipline issues have with key adults/teachers in the building.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Research shows that in order to promote catch up growth and engage all learners you must increase time they have with an adult that is proven to get results.
<b>Action Steps to Implement</b>	
<i>No action steps were entered for this area of focus</i>	

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Our current economically disadvantaged children are underperforming relative to their peers.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Our goal is to increase learning gains across Reading and Math for economically disadvantaged children by 25% for the 2021-2022 school year as identified on the Florida Standards Assessment.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	These students will be monitored both for academics and behavior on a monthly basis. We will use discipline data for behavior and classroom assessment/common grade level assessments to monitor academic performance.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Research has proven that one way to improve learning outcomes for lowest performing students is by increasing contact time with their teacher in an individual or small group setting.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	In order to improve learning outcomes for lowest performing learners, we must increase the level of student engagement for all students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on 2020-21 data, ELA was identified as a critical need. Students at our school need support with learning the foundational skills of how to read and also understanding the content they are reading. As an Area of Focus, student success in ELA progress will also increase student achievement in other subject areas.

o The percentage of students in grades 3-5, below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment are as follows: 3rd grade is 58%, 4th grade is 63%, and 5th grade is 72%.

o The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2020-2021 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment is as follows: 1st - 80% and 2nd - 73%

**Measurable Outcome:**

K-5 data:

\*Increase percentage of K-2 students scoring "At Grade Level" or above by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.

\*Increase percentage of 3 -5 grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.

**Monitoring:**

Our school leadership team, district content specialist support, and Supplemental Instructional APs will review ELA data from district assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Data Driven Lesson Planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning.

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered. Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs.

Progress Monitoring: Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity. Checking effectiveness from student data.

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: Collecting data from classrooms in real time and providing immediate and clear feedback for teachers and school leadership teams to work together to ensure effectiveness.

Data-driven Lesson Planning: Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential components such as the objective, the implementation, and a reflection. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/howto-plan-effective-lessons>

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results and is the gateway to meeting the needs of all learners. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/turn-small-reading-groups-into-big-wins>

### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Progress Monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is, either for individual students or for the entire class. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/how-student-progress-monitoring-improves-instruction>

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to 1) recognize accomplishments, 2) track actions, 3) measure implementation impact, 4) evaluate the plan, 5) determine next steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead. <https://institutionalresearch.org>

### Action Steps to Implement

Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all four strategies listed above. Professional Development during Early Release Days and Common Planning will be essential for Leadership to support teachers. Based on observational data and teacher feedback, PD topics will be set before each Early Release and Common Planning.

**Person Responsible** Jeff Collins ([collinsj1@duvalschools.org](mailto:collinsj1@duvalschools.org))

During Common Planning and individual teacher data chats, specific data pertaining to ELA reading and student success will be discussed and analyzed to ensure we are monitoring progress.

**Person Responsible** Jeff Collins ([collinsj1@duvalschools.org](mailto:collinsj1@duvalschools.org))

Give immediate feedback on any observations/walkthroughs conducted by state support, school leadership, district content specialists, and district leadership.

**Person Responsible** Jeff Collins ([collinsj1@duvalschools.org](mailto:collinsj1@duvalschools.org))

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**By improving student engagement across all grade levels we believe we will engage more learners and ultimately reduce the number of discipline referral incidents for students. We will utilize Reading/Math interventionists and tutors to work with students that are currently working below grade level and/or disengaged. Our Parent Liaison will be instrumental in our work to engage families in the educational process. She will market strategies and resources that we have for families to use with their children at home. Our Reading Coach will conduct coaching cycles and spearhead professional development centered around engagement strategies for students and best teaching practices. In addition, we will utilize software such as Reflex to help build automaticity with math facts for all learners. Finally, we will use increased technology such as more laptops and chargers/interactive carts to promote engagement and provide more access for all of our students.**

#### **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.**

Our approach to build and sustain a positive culture at Enterprise Learning Academy is multi-faceted. We solicit and use feedback from all stakeholders to build a plan to address our areas of opportunity. We devise a school improvement plan that embodies the input from stakeholders. This information is shared and revisited throughout the year. In addition, we have assemblies with students twice during the school year to review our expectations for learning and culture in the building. Also, we implement social emotional programming to assist with mental health of students and staff.

#### **Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

Our stakeholders include the following: students, teachers, staff, families, business leaders, and community leaders. Each stakeholder plays a vital role in the promotion and maintaining a positive culture and environment at Enterprise Learning Academy. Parents play a role in staying active in their child's education and partnering with us. Teachers play a role in terms of promoting key values and collegiality throughout the school and in all relationships. Local businesses and community leaders play a role in supporting the mission and vision of the school to ensure the success of all students.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00