Enterprise Learning Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Enterprise Learning Academy

8085 OLD MIDDLEBURG RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32222

http://www.duvalschools.org/enterprise

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

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

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Opportunities for our School Advisory Council (SAC), school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, and students were provided for them to provide input into the development of the School Improvement Plan.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Our School Improvement Plan will be a standing item each month for our School Advisory Council meetings which are open and announced to all stakeholders.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	78%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	4	56	43	55	46	39	0	0	0	243
One or more suspensions	2	4	12	6	4	12	0	0	0	40
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	4	1	6	3	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	7	2	5	1	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	30	25	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	21	26	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	74	49	40	0	0	0	0	0	172

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	44	35	23	29	24	0	0	0	160

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	4	7	2	8	1	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	38	31	29	35	28	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	4	4	4	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	4	3	5	4	1	1	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	3	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	16	49	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	18	45	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	15	48	39	0	0	0	0	0	106

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	4	20	41	30	15	41	0	0	0	151

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	2	38	31	29	35	28	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	4	4	4	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	4	3	5	4	1	1	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	3	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	16	49	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	18	45	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	15	48	39	0	0	0	0	0	106

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	4	20	41	30	15	41	0	0	0	151

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement*	42	48	53	42	50	56	36		
ELA Learning Gains				50			26		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			26		
Math Achievement*	56	58	59	55	48	50	45		
Math Learning Gains				55			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			19		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	37	52	54	42	59	59	31		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	54	54	59	54			58		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	236
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

	2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY			
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
SWD	28	Yes	4	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	43			

	2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY			
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
SWD	37	Yes	3	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	50			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	42			56			37					54
SWD	24			33			22				4	
ELL	27			59							3	54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			47			28				4	
HSP	33			59			25				5	50
MUL	67			74							3	
PAC												
WHT	49			68			58				4	
FRL	36			52			35				5	50

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	42	50	45	55	55	49	42					54
SWD	17	50	37	37	47	46	25					
ELL	13	48	53	32	64	46	15					54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	46	43	47	51	58	28					
HSP	38	47	47	57	62	42	45					62
MUL	52	55		67	45							
PAC												
WHT	50	55		63	57		57					
FRL	38	47	45	51	53	56	29					63

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	36	26	26	45	34	19	31					58
SWD	13	19	10	30	25	18	7					
ELL	10			29								58

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	22	31	38	22	14	24					
HSP	32	13		41	50		29					58
MUL	40			60								
PAC												
WHT	43	39		57	48		55					
FRL	28	23	26	39	29	25	27					64

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	34%	47%	-13%	54%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	50%	2%	58%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	46%	-5%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	67%	59%	8%	59%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	58%	3%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	52%	-14%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	33%	48%	-15%	51%	-18%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

5th grade ELA, Math, and Science demonstrated the lowest performance. This particular cohort of children was also the lowest performing cohort on the state assessment the previous school year.

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

5th grade Science showed the greatest decline from the prior year. This cohort of students also demonstrated the lowest performance across all grade levels.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

5th Grade ELA, Math, and Science demonstrated the greatest gap-a 5% decrease.

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

Both ELA and Math demonstrated a 4% increase in proficiency. We had great instruction by our teachers. Our use of the ACALETICS program contributed greatly to our math proficiency gains.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance continues to be an issue--as we had 31% of our students miss 20 or more days.

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

1. 5th Grade Science
2. 3rd Grade ELA
3. ELA LPQ

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We have a lack of engagement and adequate attendance for some of our most fragile learners. This is having a negative impact on student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will improve attendance by 25% for our LPQ students during the 23-24 school year. In addition, we will look to reduce referrals for this same subgroup by 25%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor both attendance and referral data on a monthly basis to ensure we meet our goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

April Moore (moorea6@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will increase collaboration with school social worker to monitor attendance rate for our most fragile learners; we will also increase contact time for those lowest performing learners with discipline issues by adding them to our Project THRIVE CPST and put strategies in place to assist.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that in order to promote catch up growth we must increase time they have with an adult.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In order for us to ensure a year's growth and close the achievement gap that exists, we will need to provide differentiated small group centers for all learners.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

65% of our students will achieve a year's growth on the state assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor both internal and state assessment data to ensure we are making adequate growth towards our annual goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeff Collins (collinsj1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will use F&P Level Literacy Intervention during teacher-led small groups in an effort to help our students read on grade level by the time they leave the 3rd grade.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research has shown that LLI has been able to close the achievement gap when used with fidelity.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Our school is not identified as any of these.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Our biggest area of need is to ensure ALL students are reading on grade level. We will use differentiated center activities, including teacher-led guided reading, as opportunities to move all students towards to be proficient readers.

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

Our biggest area of need is to ensure ALL students are reading on grade level. We will use differentiated center activities, including teacher-led guided reading, as opportunities to move all students towards to be proficient readers.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Our goal is for 65% of all learners in K-2 to be proficient on the state reading assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our goal is for 65% of all learners in 3-5 to be proficient on the state reading assessment.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

We will monitor through the following: classroom walkthroughs/observations, state assessment data, district assessments, benchmark assessments, etc.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Collins, Jeff, collinsj1@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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 utilize data to drive our planning and instructional delivery.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

This research-based approach provides evidence for improvement of student performance.

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 weekly common planning sessions that are admin-directed--affording teachers time to become familiar with BEST benchmarks and plan detailed lessons to meet the needs of all learners. Our Literacy Leadership Team will work with all teachers in our school to bring best teaching practices at scale across all classrooms.	Smith, Nichelle, smithn5@duvalschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We will share our SIP via school webpage as well as during our annual Title 1 Developmental meeting and monthly School Advisory Council meetings. Our school webpage is www.duvalschools.org/enterprise

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We will hold multiple parent involvement events throughout the school year at flexible times in an effort to engage all stakeholders. We will provide TDE's for our teachers to meet quarterly with parents at flexible times to discuss student progress.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

This year we will expand differentiated instruction to better meet the needs of all learners. We will close the achievement gap that exists for our most fragile learners.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

n/a

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

We have a partnership with full-service to provide additional counseling services for our students who may be suffering in the area of mental health. In addition, our school counselor provides support and meets with both individual and small groups of children.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

n/a

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We have partnered with the University of Florida and Project THRIVE grant to expand our Collaborative Problem Solving Team to include students with behavioral or discipline issues.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Our teachers will engage in professional learning activities throughout the 23-24 school year to implement best teaching practices at scale across all classrooms.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

In addition to our multiple PK-ESE classrooms, our general education PK does a wonderful job of preparing our students to enter the kindergarten classroom. Parents are afforded opportunities to learn more about the program and activities they engage in at home with their child to help them prepare.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes