Enterprise Learning Academy

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Enterprise Learning Academy

8085 OLD MIDDLEBURG RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32222

http://www.duvalschools.org/enterprise

Demographics

Principal: Jeffrey Collins II

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](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 Learning Academy

8085 OLD MIDDLEBURG RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32222

http://www.duvalschools.org/enterprise

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Collins, Jeff	Principal	
Moore, April	School Counselor	
Smith, Nichelle	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Jeffrey Collins II

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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
38

Total number of students enrolled at the school
700

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	121	119	108	101	112	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	676
Attendance below 90 percent	2	38	31	29	35	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	4	3	5	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	3	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	16	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	18	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	15	48	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	4	20	41	30	15	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	5	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/31/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	50%	56%				42%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						47%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						52%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	55%	48%	50%				56%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%						47%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						30%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	59%	59%				40%	48%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	37%	50%	-13%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	64%	-13%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	39%	49%	-10%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	17	50	37	37	47	46	25				
ELL	13	48	53	32	64	46	15				
BLK	36	46	43	47	51	58	28				
HSP	38	47	47	57	62	42	45				
MUL	52	55		67	45						
WHT	50	55		63	57		57				
FRL	38	47	45	51	53	56	29				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	13	19	10	30	25	18	7				
ELL	10			29							
BLK	32	22	31	38	22	14	24				
HSP	32	13		41	50		29				
MUL	40			60							

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
WHT	43	39		57	48		55				
FRL	28	23	26	39	29	25	27				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	43	63	24	26	26	24				
ELL	8			23	20						
BLK	37	41	48	50	42	38	30				
HSP	43	48	60	51	44	27	33				
MUL	45	42		55	25						
WHT	49	56	47	66	57		55				
FRL	37	47	51	47	41	28	29				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

With the exception of 4th grade Math and Reading scores, we saw significant progress being made in the areas of both proficiency and learning gains across the board.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

4th grade ELA and Math demonstrated the greatest need for improvement.

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

Significant lack of both student and teacher attendance contributed to this lack of performance. In addition, the lack of consistency contributed greatly to this area of concern. We have added additional team members to the areas of both Math and Reading for the 2022-2023 school year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Learning gains in the area of Reading and Math showed significant improvement from 2021. The area with the largest growth was that of our LPQ Math students.

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

We had great instruction led by our teachers. Our use of the ACALETICS program along with our curriculum and math interventionist contributed greatly to this improvement.

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

We need to ensure the learning of ALL students. We need to ensure that ALL children can read on grade level and achieve a year's growth in all areas. We will look to fully implement LLI in teacher led small groups. In addition, our focus will be on providing differentiated instruction based on the needs of our individual learners.

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

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

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

We will add another interventionist to help meet the needs of our most fragile learners.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Engagement of Our Most Fragile Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	We currently a lack of engagement for some of our most fragile learners that is having a negative impact on their overall learning.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We will reduce referrals for our LPQ students during the 2022-2023 school year. Observations and classroom walkthroughs will capture student behaviors that demonstrate an increase in student engagement. As a result of increased engagement of our most fragile learners, student outcomes will improve.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will monitor student progress throughout the year to ensure students are on track for success. In addition to looking at student achievement data, we will look at attendance and referrals data sources.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	April Moore (moorea6@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	We will increase the amount of contact time that lowest performing students and those with discipline issues have with key adults/teachers in the building.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Research shows that in order to promote catch up growth and engage all learners you must increase time they have with an adult that is proven to get results.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

We will implement the Ron Clark House System as a way to promote student engagement and cultivate a stronger connection across all grade levels for all learners, but especially our most fragile students. These House meetings will take place on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible	Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

We will use Title 1 funds to hire a volunteer/parent liaison to strengthen the communication between school and home for our most fragile learners. We will also ensure that our meeting times allow flexible scheduling for our families to attend. Research shows that increased family involvement promotes student outcomes.

Person Responsible	Nichelle Smith (smithn5@duvalschools.org)

We will implement the THRIVE program as part of our Collaborative Problem Solving Team to better monitor the academic and behavioral needs of our most fragile learners.

Person Responsible	April Moore (moorea6@duvalschools.org)

Our interventionists for Math and Reading will work to build and foster positive relationships with our most fragile learners and their families. We will provide additional updates on their progress throughout each quarter. We will use Title 1 fund to purchase the interventionists to work with these fragile learners and increase student engagement which will improve student outcomes.

Person Responsible   Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

We will use Title 1 funds to hire additional classroom teachers to help lower student to teacher ratio so that our most fragile learners have smaller class sizes. This will allow for additional contact time by our teaching faculty for our most fragile learners--thus promoting student achievement.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

We will ensure Title 1 funds are used to support our most fragile students by providing access to additional technology such as laptops, interactive monitors, document cameras, projectors, laptop chargers, and headphones. In addition, we will ensure we secure student access to Reflex Math as a way to address learning deficits and build upon student engagement in the classroom.

Person Responsible   Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our current ELL student population is not performing at the same rate relative to their peers.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our goal is to increase learning gains across Reading and Mathematics for our ELL students by 50% for the 2022-2023 school year.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	These students will be monitored both for academics and behavior on a monthly basis. We will use discipline data for behavior and classroom assessment/common grade level assessments to monitor academic performance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Research has proven that one way to improve learning outcomes for lowest performing students is by increasing contact time with their teacher in an individual or small group setting.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	In order to improve learning outcomes for lowest performing learners, we must increase the level of student engagement for all students.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	While we had significant growth in the area of Reading last year, we still have a long way to go in order to get ALL students to read on grade level.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase percentage of 3 -5 grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 5 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 5 percentage points.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Our school leadership team, district content specialist support, and Supplemental Instructional APs will review ELA data from district assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered. Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Progress Monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is, either for individual students or for the entire class. https://www.ascd.org/ el/articles/how-student-progressmonitoringimproves-instruction Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to 1) recognize accomplishments, 2) track actions, 3) measure implementation impact, 4) evaluate the plan, 5) determine next steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead. https://institutionalresearch.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Primary area of focus is our students with disabilities group is performing much lower than their grade level peers.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Primary area of focus is our students with disabilities group is performing much lower than their grade level peers.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our goal is to raise the level of achievement for all students, especially those students with disabilities. The goal will be to bring the achievement levels of our SWD's within 2 points of their grade level peers.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our goal is to raise the level of achievement for all students, especially those students with disabilities. The goal will be to bring the achievement levels of our SWD's within 2 points of their grade level peers.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

We will monitor multiple data sets throughout the year including the following: PM FAST data, common assessments for each content on end of unit, and other progress monitoring pieces throughout the 22-23 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Collins, Jeff, collinsj1@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

We will be using best teaching practices across all content areas. We will differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all learners. We will use data to drive our planning and instructional delivery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

We believe our research based approach does provide evidence for student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Provide admin-directed common planning sessions whereby teachers are afforded time to become familiar with BEST and plan detailed lessons to meet the needs of all learners. The Literacy Leadership team and Literacy Coaches will work with all teachers to bring best practices at scale across all classrooms.	Collins, Jeff, collinsj1@duvalschools.org
Implement both Corrective Reading and LLI for small group reading instruction to best meet the needs of our students with disabilities and those who are not reading on grade level. Use formative and informal assessments to plan for both instruction as well as professional development for our students and teachers.	Smith, Nichelle, smithn5@duvalschools.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

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

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

Our stakeholders include the following: students, teachers, staff, families, business leaders, and community leaders. Each stakeholder plays a vital role in the promotion and maintaining a positive culture and environment at Enterprise Learning Academy. Parents play a role in staying active in their child's education

and partnering with us. Teachers play a role in terms of promoting key values and collegiality throughout the school and in all relationships. Local businesses and community leaders play a role in supporting the mission and vision of the school to ensure the success of all students.
Duval - 2551 - Enterprise Learning Academy - 2021-22 SIP
Last