Enterprise Elementary School

2021-22 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: 8/5/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
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	
* 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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	80%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

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

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 work collectively involving all 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Douglas, Alicia	Principal	Educational leader of Enterprise Elementary in charge of entire school operation.
Aivazis, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Assist principal in school operations.
Disinger, Amanda	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach
McGinn, Emily	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach
Morley, Karen	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach
Filipek, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher
Rinaldo, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher
Shinsky, Paige	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher
Lemire, Terra	School Counselor	School Counselor

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/5/2021, 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.*

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

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

576

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

0

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

3

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	92	86	71	107	85	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	18	23	16	25	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	16	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	19	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	6	14	20	19	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/5/2021

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	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

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	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

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				53%	56%	57%	49%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	56%	58%	53%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	46%	53%	35%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				56%	59%	63%	49%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	56%	62%	51%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	43%	51%	39%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				62%	57%	53%	44%	58%	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	52%	58%	-6%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	60%	-1%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	59%	-24%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	60%	56%	4%	53%	7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

For the English Language Arts and Mathematics sections the number represents the total number of students tested during the i-Ready window/Percent proficiency is percentage of students scoring "Early on Grade Level" or Mid or Above Grade Level" on the i-Ready diagnostic assessment.

For the Science section the number represents the total number of students tested. The number consists of more than one assessment/Percent proficiency is percentage of students scoring 70% or above on the assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64/20.31%	67/52.24%	62/62.52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53/20.75%	56/51.79%	50/60.00%
	Students With Disabilities	5/20.00%	7/28.57%	6/33.33%
	English Language Learners	8/0.00%	9/55.56%	7/28.57%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60/11.67%	64/39.06%	62/53.23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/12.24%	52/34.62%	50/52.00%
	Students With Disabilities	4/0.00%	5/20.00%	6/33.33%
	English Language Learners	6/0.00%	7/42.86%	7/28.57%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78/21.79%	95/36.84%	90/57.78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70/21.43%	85/35.29%	79/55.70%
	Students With Disabilities	12/0.00%	15/6.67%	13/23.08%
	English Language Learners	14/0.00%	16/18.75%	16/31.25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76/14.47%	88/19.32%	88/36.36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68/16.18%	80/18.75%	77/37.66%
	Students With Disabilities	12/0.00%	14/7.14%	13/15.38%
	English Language Learners	14/14.29%	14/14.29%	15/13.33%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66/46.97$	77/57.14%	91/58.24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52/44.23%	62/53.23%	74/54.05%
	Students With Disabilities	20/10.00%	21/33.33%	27/25.93%
	English Language Learners	10/20.00%	12/50.00%	15/33.33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66/7.58%	79/32.91%	78/51.28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53/9.43%	64/35.94%	63/44.44%
	Students With Disabilities	20/0.00%	22/9.09%	22/27.27%
	English Language Learners	10/10.00%	11/18.18%	13/46.15%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	80/16.25%	96/39.58%	112/41.07%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68/16.18%	82/37.80%	96/40.63%
	Students With Disabilities	22/4.55%	28/7.14%	29/13.79%
	English Language Learners	16/6.25%	17/23.53%	20/25.00%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78/12.82%	84/34.52%	85/45.88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67/11.94%	73/30.14%	73/43.84%
	Students With Disabilities	23/4.35%	25/16.00%	23/26.09%
	English Language Learners	17/0.00%	16/6.25%	16/18.75%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67/34.44%	73/36.71%	78/44.71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/28.57%	53/33.33%	57/38.71%
	Students With Disabilities	16/6.25%	18/9.09%	18/9.09%
	English Language Learners	13/30.77%	16/33.33%	16/47.06%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67/13.43%	81/33.33%	80/52.50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/10.20%	59/27.12%	58/48.28%
	Students With Disabilities	18/0.00%	22/4.55%	19/21.05%
	English Language Learners	13/7.69%	16/37.50%	16/62.50%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	295/57%	263/53%	184/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	214/50%	194/55%	135/59%
	Students With Disabilities	67/14%	56/31%	46/33%
	English Language Learners	63/36%	50/40%	43/64%

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	12	44		17	38		36				
ELL	32	50		29	33		45				
BLK	35			24							
HSP	39	44		43	38		53				
WHT	52	53		59	66		56				
FRL	40	50	58	46	51	46	50				
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				

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
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				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
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	30
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	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	57
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

In reviewing the iReady ELA Scale Scores and ELA FSA scores their was a close correlation in Grades 4 and 5. In 4th Grade students scored 41.07% proficiency on the Spring iReady ELA diagnostic, with 39% of students scoring on Grade Level on the FSA ELA Assessment. In 5th Grade students scored 44.71% proficiency on the Spring iReady ELA diagnostic, with 43% of students scoring on Grade Level on the FSA ELA Assessment. We also found a close correlation between our iReady Math Scale Scores and Math FSA scores in Grades 3 and 4. In 3rd Grade students scored 51.28% proficiency on the Spring iReady Math diagnostic, with 48% of students scoring on Grade Level on the FSA Math Assessment. In 4th Grade students scored 45.88% proficiency on the Spring iReady Math diagnostic, with 46% of students scoring on Grade Level on the FSA Math Assessment.

In reviewing our SMT data from January 2021 and Math FSA scores we found a close correlation in Grades 3-5. In 3rd Grade students scored 50% proficiency on the SMT, with 48% of students scoring on Grade Level on the FSA Math Assessment. In 4th Grade students scored 45% proficiency on the SMT, with 46% of students scoring on Grade Level on the FSA Math Assessment. In 5th Grade students scored 48% proficiency on the SMT, with 45% of students scoring on Grade Level on the FSA Math Assessment.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is in ELA Achievement. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 46%, ELA Learning Gains were 51% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 50%, which was below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one or more of our three targeted ESSA Subgroups: SWD (ELA Achievement 17%), ELL, and AA (ELA Achievement 35%) that performed below 41%.

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

When looking at the data the contributing factors were a need to calibrate Writing Assessments, as well as SWD students having access to on grade level curriculum. Students need for cumulative test/ assessments to build stamina for testing situations. Due to the restraints of COVID-19 our students did not participant in a traditional ELA Walk to Intervention.

This school year we will take the following new actions: Implement Benchmark Curriculum, AVID, Teacher Clarity, Collective Teacher Efficacy, Core Connections, Student Lead Conferencing, Feedback.

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

Our areas with the greatest growth was our Math Lowest Quartile, Science ESSA Subgroups (SWD & AA), as well as our ELA Lowest Quartile.

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

During the 2020-2021 School Year we had 90 minutes for our Math Block of time. During this time teachers used 20 minutes for enrichment and intervention.

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

Enrichment activities in the areas of ELA and Math during the school day, as well as after school. These activities will include: Student Council, Junior Science Olympiad, Battle of the Books, Math Mania, Young Author's Writing.

We plan to gather more frequent OPM data that students will use during student lead conferencing. Incorporating Writing for SWD's throughout the day, as well as a more structured Math Intervention/ Acceleration plan by Grade Level.

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.

During the 2021-2022 School Year teachers will receive training in the new Benchmark Curriculum, AVID, Teacher Clarity, Collective Teacher Efficacy, Core Connections, Student Lead Conferencing, Feedback.

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

We will provide Learning Walks with Feedback, PLC's to determine appropriate level of rigor/task assessment alignment. Teacher's will also be provided with planning days to plan for intervention and remediation.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 46%, ELA Learning Gains were 51% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 50%, which was below the district and state average. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one or more of our three targeted ESSA Subgroups; SWD, ELL, and AA, that performed below 41%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA overall proficiency from 46% to 54%. Increase ELA LQ learning gains from 50% to 54%, including ESSA subgroups: SWD, ELL, and AA.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through evidence of frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific ELA look-fors (collaborative structures/planning tooks), and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible- School Leadership Team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alicia Douglas (addougla@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Collective Teacher Efficacy. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administration, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collective Teacher Efficacy has an effect size of 1.57 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 1.57, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes collective teacher efficacy as those who: - Have a collective belief in their ability to positively affect students. - Work together to set high challenging expectations. - Have collaborative conversations based on evidence. - Have a combined belief that it is the teachers who cause learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Incorporate WICOR:
- Writing incorporating Core Connections
- Inquiry is integrating questioning
- Collaboration- Collaboration Structures
- Organization- Organizing the binders, as well as Student Lead Conferencing
- Reading- Intervention and Acceleration plan within all aspects of school campus

Person Responsible	Laura Filipek (lbfilipe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Training on Benchmark Materials during Pre-Planning and on-going throughout the school year.

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

Collaborative Planning will be conducted on a weekly basis.

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

Learning Walks with District Support.

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

Planning Days once a Quarter for Half a Day.

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

Data Chats & Data Tracking for all students.

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

Intervention & Acceleration Plan Tracking As Needed using i-Ready, District Assessments & On Going Progress Monitoring.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
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 index. 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 higher, or students making a Learning Gain.
Monitoring:	This will be OPM more frequent data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alicia Douglas (addougla@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is feedback. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administration, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Feedback has an effect size of 0.73 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.73, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher feedback is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes feedback and excellent teachers as those who: - Provide information about the task. - Answers on of three questions: Where am I going? How am I going? Where to next? - Provide the right form of feedback at or just above the level the student is working at. - Combine feedback with effective instruction to enhance learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify all of our SWD's and LQ Students.

Person Responsible	Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

AVID Binder

Person Responsible	Laura Filipek (lbfilipe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Tracking of Data by the Student Sub Groups & Data Chats by Program Specialist to include Review of Lesson Gain Charts.

Person Responsible	Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Data Chats

Person Responsible	Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional Development Training of Paraprofessionals on Direct Instruction to include EIR, Connecting Math Concepts and Corrective Reading.

Person Responsible	Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Observe Model Classrooms, Walkthroughs & Feedbacks with Program Specialist.

Person Responsible Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Planning Days with Program Specialist

Person Responsible Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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 and Panorama in whole group/ small instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase students Emotional Regulation from 25% to 46% Strength or Higher & Social Emotional Awareness from 42% to 50% Strength or Higher.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored through the use of our Panorama Survey's at the beginning of the year, middle of the year and at the end of the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terra Lemire (tjlemire@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is the use of Panorama Playbook resources & Sanford Harmony.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our rationale for using the Panorama Playbook resources include: - Student data with their needs & concerns voiced - Data collected is a guide for SEL lessons - Classroom use of Mood Meter and daily/weekly check-ins w/ students - Data used to establish small groups Our rationale for using Sanford Harmony include: - It is the fastest growing and widely well-known social and emotional learning program in the country. - Readily accessible to teachers and staff. - Short lessons to be implemented in daily 10-15 min sessions - Lessons for Pre-K to 5th Grades

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze Panorama Survey Data

Person Responsible	Terra Lemire (tjlemire@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional Development on Sanford Harmony (Refresher), as well as on Panorama Academy and how to access Panorama Playbook.

Person Responsible	Terra Lemire (tjlemire@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Align the Panorama or Sanford Harmony Lessons to address student survey results.

Person Responsible	Terra Lemire (tjlemire@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Reoccurring Behavior Team Meetings with Behavior Specialist, Classroom Teacher and Administration as needed.

Person Responsible	Terra Lemire (tjlemire@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

After comparing our school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools across the state, we have identified the following areas to focus on: Disruption on Campus, Bullying and Threat or Intimidation.

As a result our school plans to reduce these incidents by utilizing the following:
- School Wide Discipline Assemblies
- Implementing the 8 Pillars of Kindness
- Rockstar Positive Behavior System
- Behavior Team Meetings with our Behavior Specialist
- Professional Development of Classroom Management Strategies
- Weekly SEL Lessons
- League of Mentors

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.

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. Our PTA and SAC 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 2021-2022 school year, we hope to have our parent involvement activities, ie. Storybook Character Day, Science Nights, Light Up Enterprise, Dads and Donuts, etc.

At Enterprise Elementary we utilize the Pillars of Kindness, where students earn 'Rockstars' for displaying one of the 8 Pillars of Kindness for their classroom. The 8 Pillars of Kindness are: Fairness; Gratitude; Compassion; Responsibility; Helpfulness; Integrity; Respect; and Caring.

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

Our Administration promotes a positive school culture by being visible on campus, communicating with students, staff, parents and stakeholders.

Our School Counselor will work to provide SEL and Panorama lessons to small groups of students, as well as supports to Instructional Staff to use within the classroom.

Our Parent Liaison provides a positive school culture by promoting School Events and opportunities for parents to be engaged through our Social Media pages on Twitter and Facebook.

During PLC's our Academic Coaches will work with Instructional Staff to review student Data and provide supports for Enrichment and Intervention.

Finally, our school uses the 8 Pillars of Kindness. The 8 Pillars of Kindness are: Fairness; Gratitude; Compassion; Responsibility; Helpfulness; Integrity; Respect; and Caring. These are introduced at the beginning of the year and students are reminded of them throughout the year on the weekly news. As students are displaying, the 8 Pillars of Kindness they can earn Rockstars for their classroom by any staff member on our campus.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$7,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		140-Substitute Teachers	1931 - Enterprise Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$7,500.00
			Notes: This funds will be used to provide three quarterly half planning days for Instructional Staff.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$0.00
					Total:	$7,500.00