

Brevard Public Schools

# Enterprise Elementary School



## 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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
<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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</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, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	54%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

### School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	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 foster an inclusive environment, provide a quality education, and build positive relationships to empower lifelong learners. (August 2021)

#### **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	Position 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	Reading 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

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

617

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

4

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

5

### 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	68	83	75	96	92	81	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	577
Attendance below 90 percent	3	6	6	5	5	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	2	3	5	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	10	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2021 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	6	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**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	2	0	1	4	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

**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	9	1	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Friday 8/27/2021

## 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	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

## 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	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

## 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				69%	62%	57%	58%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	60%	58%	52%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	57%	53%	56%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				72%	63%	63%	61%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				65%	65%	62%	50%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	53%	51%	52%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				60%	57%	53%	53%	57%	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	78%	64%	14%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	61%	9%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	60%	3%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
06	2021					
	2019	67%	60%	7%	54%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	79%	61%	18%	62%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	81%	64%	17%	64%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	60%	-5%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
06	2021					
	2019	79%	67%	12%	55%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	62%	56%	6%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready Reading and Math Diagnostic Assessment data was used as a schoolwide progress monitoring tool for all grade levels during the 2020-2021 school year. The ELA and Mathematics data below reflects percent proficient for each subgroup during the 2020-2021 school year. For 5th grade Science, SSA Part 1 district assessment data was used for Fall, SSA Part 2 district assessment data was used for Winter,

and 2021 SSA data was used for Spring as demonstrated by 5th grade students during the 2020-2021 school year.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56%	72%	89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50%	76%	83%
	Students With Disabilities	43%	71%	75%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35%	67%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	70%	77%
	Students With Disabilities	43%	57%	63%
	English Language Learners	0%	100%	100%
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	43%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	49%	76%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	38%	63%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10%	29%	65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8%	30%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	25%	38%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	100%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	53%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	50%	74%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	31%	56%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7%	48%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	40%	60%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	44%	50%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	100%
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50%	65%	78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37%	61%	70%
	Students With Disabilities	29%	29%	77%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19%	43%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	37%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	36%	62%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39%	54%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	54%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	33%	33%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23%	49%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	46%	74%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	11%	44%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	8%	28%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	18%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	31%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29%	46%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	33%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	13%	27%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30%	54%	69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%	42%	61%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	20%	20%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

**Subgroup Data Review**

<b>2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2019-20</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2019-20</b>
SWD	36	53	70	64	55	40	27				
BLK	42			67							
HSP	71			79							
MUL	72	82		72	82						
WHT	66	58	67	79	59	41	67				
FRL	60	66	70	75	57	48	46				
<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b>
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				
<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
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				

**ESSA Data Review**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
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	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	



Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	75
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	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
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	60
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?

From our 2020-2021 FSA assessment data, our ELA trends show that 60-66% of students in grades 3-6 demonstrate proficiency. This indicates consistent instructional practices across grade levels; however, it also reveals additional professional development is needed to increase teacher effectiveness in reading and writing. Our Math trends indicate 72-82% of students in grades 3-6 demonstrate proficiency. While this also indicates instructional continuity across grade levels, we can see that some improvements can be made to increase achievement in our lower achieving grade levels. Our Science trends have remained stagnant at approximately 60% of students demonstrating proficiency over the past couple of years. This shows that we need to continue improving hands-on science instruction across all grade levels.

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

Based off of our 2021 progress monitoring data and 2019 state assessments, our greatest need for improvement is in the area of Science. In 2019, SSA Science Achievement had a proficiency rate of 60% which was 3% higher than the district and 7% higher than the state average. Our 2021 SSA results show that 60% of students demonstrated proficiency which is 8% higher than the district and 13% higher than the state average. However, looking at our school trends, we have shown no growth from our 2019 to our 2021 SSA Science Achievement.

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

Our 2019-2020 Grade 5 SSA Review Part 1 proficiency rate was 20% and our Part 2 proficiency rate was 49%. This was an increase of 29% from September 2019 to February 2020. Our 2020-2021 Grade 5 SSA Review Part 1 proficiency rate was, only 8% and our Part 2 proficiency rate was 28%. While this was an increase of 20% between September 2020 to February 2021, this data is significantly lower than the previous year. 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. Also common

assessments will need to be administered and science data analyzed to determine gaps in student learning and to address academic needs at the student, class, grade, and school level.

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

Based off of our 2021 progress monitoring data and 2019 state assessments, the area that showed most improvement was ELA. In 2019, ELA Achievement had a proficiency rate of 69%, which was 7% higher than the district and 12% higher than the state average. Our 2021 progress monitoring data indicated an average ELA proficiency rate of 70% for students in grades 3-6. This is based off of our Spring i-Ready Reading Diagnostics scores. Our 2021 FSA ELA proficiency was 65%; however, after deeper analysis, we had several students who were within a couple of points of scoring a Level 3.

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

In 2018 our FSA Math proficiency rate was 67%. We increased by 5% the following year showing a Math proficiency rate of 72% in 2019. Our 2021 results show an increase of 6% from 2019 with a proficiency rate of 78%. The factors we feel contributed to this were the Eureka Math program implemented by all with fidelity, monitored usage of the i-Ready program, small group and intervention supports for math, and a structured Academic Support Program that included math.

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

In order to accelerate learning we will ensure that all students are exposed to grade level content with deep engagement and high expectations for their success, address students' social and emotional needs, provide students access to a classroom and school community that cultivates their sense of belonging and makes them feel safe, and partner with all stakeholders to gain feedback on our schoolwide systems in order to offer experiences that will meet their needs and support our students.

**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.**

To support teachers with accelerating student learning, we will focus on developing structures for Professional Learning Teams that will engage teachers in purposeful collaboration to help more students achieve at higher levels. Collaborative Teams will build shared knowledge and understanding about the standards and essential learning; will help one another improve; will be open to sharing their practice; will make collective decisions on best practices; will gather, share, and discuss student learning results; will identify students who have reached learning targets and make a plan to accelerate their learning; and will take an active role in the success of all students. Additionally, we will provide trainings, resources, and supports to staff regarding effective approaches to social emotional learning. Trainings will allow our staff to acquire knowledge and be provided examples and resources related to the four approaches to SEL in the classroom. Furthermore, they will develop capacity for cultivating their own social, emotional and cultural competence, SEL strategies, and building collaborative trusting relationships.

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

Additional support services will be provided through our Academic Support Program beginning in November 2021. Our lowest performing students in reading, math, and science will be invited to participate throughout the school year. This program will be offered before and after school. To ensure sustainability of improvement, we will continue to focus on scaffolding strategies during core

instruction to keep rigorous content at the forefront of our daily instruction; to intentionally plan specific scaffolds that support students, but do not prevent them from engaging with grade-level content; and to differentiate instruction in a way that students can master the key practices and concepts in grade-level content while gaining independence over time. In addition, we will continue to focus on a continuous improvement model by offering coaching support with targeted feedback to instructional staff. Furthermore, school leaders will continue to meet with grade level teams weekly to analyze data and discuss trends, provide instructional resources and support, and develop plans for improvement where needed.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	In 2019, our SSA Science Achievement proficiency rate was 60% which was 3% higher than the district and 7% higher than the state average; however, it was an increase of only 1% from the previous school year. Our 2021 SSA results show that 60% of students demonstrated proficiency which is 8% higher than the district and 13% higher than the state average. However, looking at our school trends, we have shown no growth from our 2019 to our 2021 SSA Science Achievement. In addition our lowest performing subgroup in science achievement is SWD with only 27% demonstrating proficiency.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	SSA Science Achievement proficiency rate will increase from 60% in 2021 to 65% in 2022. Our Grade 5 SSA Review Part 2 proficiency rate will increase from 19% last school year to 50% for this school year. Furthermore, our SWD subgroup proficiency rate will increase from 27% to 30%.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	All grade levels will assess mastery toward grade level standards using the Science Benchmark Block District Assessments. This assessment data will be analyzed and discussed at the student, class, grade, and school level and plans for improvement will be created as needed. Teachers in grades 3-6 will utilize Penda Science as supplemental resource to enhance daily instruction and support mastery of standards. This ancillary program will assist with reinforcement and retention of content. All grade levels will be held accountable for providing hands-on learning instruction during the science block.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	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.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	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. Research has found that this evidence-based strategy allows for a student-centered approach and provides a science learning cycle based on evidence to support thinking. If instruction is chunked into various phases of learning and students are provided a more hands-on learning experience, student achievement will increase.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will follow district pacing and utilize district created Benchmark Blocks when planning for instruction.
2. Teachers will administer District Summative Science Assessments and Penda Science standards mastery assessments. Time 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.
3. Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational/walk through data.

**Person Responsible** Deanna Smith (smith.deanna@brevardschools.org)

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

In 2019, our FSA ELA Achievement proficiency rate was 69% which was 7% higher than the district and 12% higher than the state average. Our 2021 FSA ELA results show that 65% of students demonstrated proficiency. This is a decrease of 4% from the 2019 to the 2021 assessment period. According to our 2021 Spring i-Ready Reading Diagnostic data for students in grades 3-6, our average predicted Reading proficiency rate was 70%. While our FSA ELA achievement was slightly lower, our ELA data trends are consistent. In addition our lowest performing subgroup in ELA achievement is SWD with only 36% demonstrating proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

FSA Reading Achievement proficiency rate will increase from our 65% in 2021 to 70% in 2022. This correlates with our 2021 Spring i-Ready Reading Diagnostic proficiency data for students in grades 3-6. Furthermore, our SWD subgroup proficiency rate will increase from 36% to 40%.

**Monitoring:**

All grade levels will participate in i-Ready Reading Diagnostic Assessments three times per year. This assessment data will be analyzed and discussed at the student, class, grade, and school level and plans for improvement will be created as needed.

**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, support, or accelerate their learners. Teachers will utilize complex texts found within the resources provided in the district Benchmark Advance and Savvas curriculums, that will permit students to focus on elements of purpose, craft, and meaning. 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 curriculum based assessments to support student mastery toward B.E.S.T. standards. Because FSA is still aligned to the Florida Standards, teachers will use i-Ready Standards Mastery assessments and ELFAS formative assessments to assess student understanding. 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:**

According to John Hattie's "Visible Learning for Literacy" scaffolded instruction has an effect size of 0.82. 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 formative and summative assessments and i-Ready Standards Mastery assessments to assess student understanding 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 accelerating learning, 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 reading instruction with focus on scaffolding and accelerating learners.
2. Teachers will utilize Benchmark Advance and Savvas curriculum, district created Overview Documents, i-Ready Tools for Scaffolding, and strategies for learning acceleration to plan for instruction.

3. Teachers will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on student academic needs daily. Teachers will be provided time to discuss intervention progress monitoring data during Professional Learning Team meetings with the leadership team.
4. Teachers will be provided time to analyze ELA data and discuss ways in which they can scaffold lessons and accelerate learning to support all students access to grade level standards.
5. Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational/walk through data.
6. School-based leadership team will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support.

**Person Responsible** Robin Hurley (hurley.robin@brevardschools.org)



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

In 2019, our FSA Math Achievement proficiency rate was 72% which was 9% higher than the district and state average. Our 2021 FSA ELA results show that 78% of students demonstrated proficiency. This is a increase of 6% from the 2019 to the 2021 assessment period. According to our 2021 Spring i-Ready Math Diagnostic data for students in grades 3-6, our average predicted Math proficiency rate was 69%. While our FSA Math achievement was higher, our Math data trends are fairly consistent. We will continue to focus our efforts to sustaining student achievement in math. In addition our lowest performing subgroup in math achievement is SWD with 64% demonstrating proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

For the 2022 assessment period, we will work to increase or sustain our FSA Math Achievement proficiency rate of 78%. Our Spring i-Ready Math Diagnostic data will increase from 69% in 2021 to correlate with our FSA Math achievement proficiency of 78% for students in grades 3-6. Furthermore, our SWD subgroup proficiency rate will increase from 64% to 70%.

**Monitoring:**

All grade levels will participate in i-Ready Math Diagnostic Assessments three times per year. This assessment data will be analyzed and discussed at the student, class, grade, and school level and plans for improvement will be created as needed.

**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. Teachers will also 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. In addition, teachers will ensure that effective discourse occurs daily where students are provided opportunities to articulate their own ideas and consider their peers' mathematical perspectives as a way to construct mathematical understandings.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

According to John Hattie's effect sizes related to student achievement, classroom discussion has an effect size of 0.82. We believe that if teachers allow for daily mathematical discourse, 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. Teachers will utilize district Eureka Pacing Guide with the transition guidance provided, Enhanced Standards Focused Documents, and prerequisite standards for Math when planning instruction.
2. Teachers will be provided time to analyze math data and discuss ways in which they can scaffold lessons or accelerate learning to support all students access to grade level standards.
3. Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational/walk through data.
4. School-based leadership team will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support.



**Person Responsible** Deanna Smith (smith.deanna@brevardschools.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.

**According to the 2019-2020 data on the School Safety Dashboard, Enterprise overall is ranked in the moderate category for school incidents. We had 4 total incidents reported that school year which ranked us #792 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. We reported 0.7 incidents per 100 students which was lower than the state average of 1.0 incidents per 100 students.**

**During the 2019-2020 school year, we ranked in the moderate category for Violent Incidents, very low in Property Incidents, and High in Drug/Public Order Incidents. We had 3 Violent Incidents reported which included Threat or Intimidation and Bullying. This ranked us #37 out of 56 elementary schools in the county and #790 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. We had no Property Incidents reported that school year. This ranked us #1 out of all elementary schools in the county and state. We had 1 Drug/Public Order Incident reported during the 2019-2020 school year as Other Major Offense. This ranked us #30 out of 56 elementary schools in the county and #1,004 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide.**

**In the area of suspensions, we reported 21 total suspensions, 10 being in-school suspensions and 11 being out-of-school suspensions, during the 2019-2020 school year. We reported 3.5 suspensions per 100 students which was lower than the state average of 3.9 suspensions per 100 students. This ranked us in the moderate category as #18 out of 126 schools in the district and #831 out of 1,395 schools statewide. Data trends show that over the past 6 years, while out-of-school suspensions have declined, in-school suspensions have remained consistent.**

**Looking at data from last school year, 2020-2021, we made significant progress with discipline. We reported 1 incident of Other Major Offense. We had 5 in-school suspensions and 8 out-of-school suspensions which is a decline from the previous school year. We believe that additional systems put into place for behavior interventions through our MTSS process helped provide our teachers the supports needed for students struggling behaviorally in the classroom. In addition, Conscious Discipline training provided our staff the trauma-responsive social and emotional learning tools needed to support all learners.**

**Moving into the 2021-2022 school year, we plan to continue the implementation of Conscious Discipline which will equip our staff with integrating social-emotional learning, discipline and self-regulation in their classrooms. Additionally, we have implemented schoolwide expectations this school year, along with additional social emotional supports imbedded in daily morning meetings, and planned instruction provided by our school guidance counselor. We believe, with this, we will see a decline in discipline referrals and an increase in our newly developed positive behavior referrals. Our universal schoolwide expectations were established to provide proactive and effective positive supports to students regarding desired behaviors and to strengthen our positive school culture and spirit. Our expectations will assist in improving social, emotional, and academic outcomes for all students. These expectations will be taught and reinforced throughout the school year.**

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

After surveying our staff during the 2020-2021 school year, it was determined that there was a need for a common language for schoolwide expectations. This school year we rolled out BLAST Expectations to all shareholders. Our universal schoolwide expectations were established to provide proactive and effective positive supports to students regarding desired behaviors and to strengthen our positive school culture and spirit. Our expectations will assist in improving social, emotional, and academic outcomes for all students.

For our most recent Parent Survey, we had 354 responses from Enterprise families. Almost 80% of our families indicated that Class Dojo was the best way to communicate between school and home. 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 family fun nights, academic offerings, and volunteer opportunities. We will continue to seek guidance and direction from the district regarding family engagement opportunities provided on campus. Due to limited capacity on campus this year, we will work to provide more opportunities to gather shareholder input and feedback into school decisions. Families indicated the best way to provide input was through online surveys. Additionally, several families have expressed interest in building community within our school through our PTO. We will work to build a more active PTO through targeted recruitment efforts and small group committee work to expand capacity of parent involvement. The goal of these events is to promote a positive school culture and an environment focused on building relationships and improving academics for all.

On the YouthTruth Survey from this past school year (January 2021), Enterprise Elementary's two highest key ratings, according to our students, were in Engagement (2.86) and Relationships (2.75). According to the Survey, students felt very strongly that their teachers want them to do their best and the students feel their teachers care. This indicates that the teachers have developed a positive school environment focused on building positive relationships and learning. The area where Enterprise students indicated a need for improvement is in Culture

(2.26) followed by Belonging (2.51). In looking deeper into these results, our 5th and 6th grade students scored a lower rating than students in grades 3 and 4. According to the questions that comprise a Culture Summary Measure, data indicates that student behavior was an impacting factor in grades 4 and 5. In addition, students in grades 5 and 6 shared that they struggled with being themselves with their peers. This

indicates a need for additional behavioral supports and social emotional skills for students in grades 4, 5, and 6.

In January 2021, Enterprise's instructional staff participated in the EDI Insight Survey. Enterprise's Instructional Culture Index trends show a decrease over the last three years. Although our index has declined from 9.7 in 2018, to 9.5 in 2019, to 9.3 in 2020 we have consistently remained 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 for student behavior, school's commitment to improving teachers' instructional practice, and interactions between students and adults are respectful. The Insight Survey indicated a need to strengthen areas in the domains of Instructional Planning for Student Growth and Professional Development. Strengthening these areas will build cohesiveness across grade levels, build collaboration among colleagues, 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 will continue the implementation of Conscious Discipline Training. In addition, teachers are receiving professional development in effective approaches to SEL. Within this training our staff will acquire knowledge and be provided examples and resources related to the four approaches to SEL in the classroom. This will also develop staff capacity for cultivating their own social, emotional and cultural competence, SEL strategies and and building collaborative trusting relationships.

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

Kelli Dufresne, Principal

The principal supports and guides school improvement initiatives based on SAC feedback, parent survey data, YouthTruth student data and INSIGHT teacher data. The principal plays a vital role in developing the culture of the school. The principal creates an environment where all stakeholders feel valued, appreciated, and understood. A culture of transparency, trust, and openness help students, parents, and staff improve and maintain positive relationships. The principal ensures that the school's culture aligns with the district's vision, mission, purpose, and goals of the organization.

Deanna Smith, Assistant Principal

Our Assistant Principal provides training to instructional staff related to curriculum and instructional practices. Our Assistant Principal assists with data analysis and tracking interventions to monitor student progress and ensure student success. She also supports the principal in school improvement efforts.

Jobie Woltman, Guidance Counselor

Our guidance counselor delivers social emotional training to staff as determined in our 3-year SEL Plan. She also provides supports and resources to students and families in need. Our guidance counselor facilitates IPST meetings to assist teachers and parents in ensuring students have supports in place to demonstrate success in school.

Robin Hurley, Literacy Coach

Our Literacy Coach supports the administrative team in monitoring schoolwide data to help determine action steps. She provides coaching and resources to instructional staff that support our newly adopted curriculum and standards. She also delivers professional learning opportunities to instructional staff based on walkthrough data.

Stephanie Terapak, SAC Chair

Our SAC Chair supports the administrative team in gathering community, parent and teacher data to make informed decisions to guide school improvement.

### Enterprise Staff

Our staff members provide a safe and student-centered learning environment where students are engaged in high-quality instruction. They make informed instructional decisions based on students' social, emotional, and academic needs. Teachers work in PLT's to create a collaborative culture. Sharing best practices ensures that focusing on a positive, nurturing school culture responds to student needs. By engaging in professional development that links to student achievement, teachers support students' emotional and academic growth. Collaboration promotes a culture of collegiality among staff members. Teachers help their students develop interpersonal relationships with others and make connections with the world around them.

### Enterprise Students

A positive culture allows students to take ownership of their learning and produces productive citizens. Students are provided opportunities to reflect on their strengths and weaknesses and celebrate their successes. A positive school culture shapes students' values essential to student learning: thoughtfulness, inclusivity, building relationships, positive self-image, community involvement, challenging themselves to meet their potential, respecting their peers' similarities and differences. Enterprise students work toward following our schoolwide BLAST Expectations.

### Enterprise Families and Community Partnerships

Families and community partners work collaboratively with school personnel in support of academic achievement, strengthening school culture, and increasing family engagement to reinforce the needs of the students and school. Parental involvement in school helps children achieve academically and have a positive learning attitude. Parents promote their students' social and emotional development. Positive school culture, communication, and relationships will provide parents with the necessary tools to advocate for their students. Parents are welcome to be involved in school events and activities to promote student achievement. They help their children actively attend school and value education. They motivate and encourage students to become lifelong learners.