

Brevard Public Schools

Enterprise Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Enterprise Elementary School

7000 ENTERPRISE RD, Cocoa, FL 32927

<http://www.enterprise.brevard.k12.fl.us>

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.

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 will inspire students to reach their full potential in becoming productive, confident, and caring individuals who demonstrate their personal best. (August 2021)

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
Dufresne, Kelli	Principal	Monitor student achievement data; initiate collaborative meetings with the 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.
Blaile, Roxanne	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 the implementation of the School Improvement Plan.
Forand, Sharon	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.
Terapak, Stephanie	Reading Coach	Monitor school-wide ELA data; support teachers with the 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 the 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.
Villegas, Nichole	Instructional Media	Media Center Specialist supports school-wide literacy, is a member of the Literacy Leadership Team, participates in developing the School Improvement Plan, assists in preparing the school's annual budget and plan, and builds consensus with SAC members regarding school-based initiatives, instructional resources, and other school needs.

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.

Enterprise Elementary stakeholders provide input and feedback through various surveys throughout the school year. We annually survey parents, students, teachers, and our school community. The surveys are both formal and informal and are used to guide the planning and development of our School Improvement Plan. Through our work with all stakeholders, we identified strengths and weaknesses and a plan for targeting our areas of opportunities for improvement. The SIP goals identified in our plan are regularly communicated to all stakeholders, and we periodically revisit our plan to monitor progress toward our goals. Enterprise Elementary has conducted School Advisory Council meetings discussing the components/requirements of the 2023-2024 School Improvement Plan. On September 18th, the council will assist in reviewing the draft plan with student achievement data and instructional focus for the 2023-2024 school year. The dates, times, and locations for the public to review and give input will be listed in the Enterprise Express (newsletter to parents). The draft plan is also posted on the school web page.

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))

The School Improvement plan 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 instructional gaps, by engaging in an ongoing data disaggregation process with stakeholders and correlating the achievements or lack of progress to the action steps outlined on the SIP. This will be done through grade-level meetings, data chats, classroom walk-throughs, faculty meetings, Literacy Leadership Team meetings, and SAC meetings, as evidenced by agendas, meetings, and action plans. The plan will be revised to ensure continuous improvement by analyzing data from district assessments, i-Ready diagnostic and instructional paths, exit slips, Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions, and FAST assessment results to ensure student progress in grade-level standards. If we see areas of concern, we will revisit our action steps, developing new strategies to target the focus areas.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	23%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A

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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
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	9	11	8	13	13	15	8	0	0	77	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	4	1	7	0	0	14	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	5	5	4	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	6	0	20	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	9	10	14	0	0	36	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	12	11	0	0	27	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	6	3	5	3	4	5	0	0	27	

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	1	1	2	3	13	9	13	0	0	42

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	5	7	3	3	2	1	1	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	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	1	37	45	43	43	38	38	0	0	245	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	4	1	6	0	0	15	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	8	4	4	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	11	7	9	0	0	29	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	0	0	0	2	8	5	9	0	0	24

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	1	37	45	43	43	38	38	0	0	245	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	4	1	6	0	0	15	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	8	4	4	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	11	7	9	0	0	29	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	0	0	0	2	8	5	9	0	0	24

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	70	61	56	69	62	57
ELA Learning Gains	68	63	61	65	60	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63	54	52	64	57	53
Math Achievement*	72	60	60	72	63	63
Math Learning Gains	77	64	64	65	65	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	78	55	55	64	53	51
Science Achievement*	51	56	51	60	57	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

** 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	50			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	64			
HSP	73			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	67			

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)

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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	70	68	63	72	77	78	51					
SWD	41	42	37	48	66	65						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53	67		42	92							
HSP	74	62		65	92							
MUL	71	69		59	62							
PAC												
WHT	70	68	60	76	76	80	53					
FRL	69	72	76	66	73	74	41					

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
All Students	65	63	70	78	61	47	61					
SWD	36	53	70	64	55	40	27					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			67								
HSP	71			79								
MUL	72	82		72	82							
PAC												
WHT	66	58	67	79	59	41	67					
FRL	60	66	70	75	57	48	46					

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	69	65	64	72	65	64	60					
SWD	51	57	44	64	69	72	40					
ELL												

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	53	57		57	65							
MUL	67	62		70	48		60					
PAC												
WHT	71	68	69	75	68	69	61					
FRL	67	67	61	66	61	60	56					

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	65%	59%	6%	54%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	61%	15%	58%	18%
06	2023 - Spring	62%	61%	1%	47%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	56%	6%	50%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	70%	67%	3%	54%	16%
03	2023 - Spring	77%	60%	17%	59%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	61%	19%	61%	19%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	55%	20%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	74%	57%	17%	51%	23%

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.

For FAST PM3 ELA, Enterprise students scored above the district and state average in proficiency. Students in grades 3-6 scored 66%, 3 and above, compared to 70% on FSA ELA 2022. That is a 4% decrease from the previous year.

For FAST PM3 Math, Enterprise students scored above the district and state average in proficiency. Students in grades 3-6 scored 76%, 3 and above, compared to 72% on FSA Math 2022. This is a 4% increase from the previous year.

In September 2023, students took the iReady Diagnostic 1. After analyzing these results, we determined students need additional instruction in phonics and vocabulary. The deficit in phonics is prevalent among our SWD subgroup and will be addressed during intervention and ASP. The vocabulary domain in grades 3-6 is a Tier 1 instructional need that will be addressed during PLTs and targeted professional learning.

Enterprise Elementary did not have a Literacy Coach for most of the year, resulting in missed opportunities to strengthen core instruction, monitor interventions with fidelity, and align resources to support learning gaps.

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

For FAST PM3 ELA, Enterprise students scored above the district and state average in proficiency. Students in grades 3-6 scored 66% 3 and above, compared to 70% on FSA ELA 2022. That is a 4% decrease from the previous year. Florida transitioned from FSA to FAST assessments in the 22-23 school year, and looking at grade level proficiency data, 5th and 6th grades declined the most percentage points in proficiency.

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.

Enterprise students scored above the state average in all data component areas.

Enterprise was in the second year of implementation with Benchmark Advance (K-5) and SAVVAS (6th) and repeatedly shared that the text is not engaging for students.

Sometimes, schedules conflict when ESE Teachers and General Education Teachers attempt to plan

collaboratively. Consistent planning would ensure the instructional content, materials, and tasks are aligned with scaffolding support for grade-level standards.

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

Overall, Science proficiency was the most improved data component. Science proficiency in 2022-2023 was 74%, compared to 52% in 2021-2022. This is the highest Science proficiency Enterprise has had for seven years.

There were several new actions Enterprise instructional staff took this past school year to promote this increase:

All 5th-grade students had the opportunity to participate in a Science Blitz. ASP was offered during the school day, focusing on 3rd and 4th-grade Science Standards. Every 9 weeks, a different group of kids rotated through the hands-on activities. An emphasis was placed on classroom completion of Science Fair projects to ensure an understanding of the scientific method before individual projects were completed. Time was built into the schedule for more inquiry-based science activities.

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

When looking at the EWS data, Enterprise had 36 students who scored level 1 on the ELA state assessment and 27 students who scored level 1 on the Math state assessment. When breaking down the data further, it appears the SWD subgroup makes up most of the students scoring a level 1 in ELA and Math, including students on alternate assessments.

ELA Level 1 Data:

3rd- 3 (3 retentions)
 4th- 9 (3 SWD, 1 retention)
 5th-10 (4 SWD on alternate assessment, 2 SWD)
 6th-14 (5 SWD on alternate assessment, 6 SWD)

Math ELA 1 Data:

3rd-0
 4th-4 students (1 retention, 2 SWD)
 5th-12 (4 SWD on alternate assessment, 1 SWD)
 6th-11 (5 SWD on alternate assessment, 3 SWD)

Also, 5th-grade students participate in the most statewide assessments and have the most students whose attendance fell below 90%.

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

1. Improve student achievement and proficiency in ELA.
2. Maintain and/or increase in Science proficiency.
3. Maintain and/or increase Math proficiency.
4. Improve SWD proficiency in ELA.
5. Improve SWD proficiency in Math.

Area of Focus

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

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

Our Spring 2023 FAST ELA results show that 66% of students demonstrated proficiency by PM3 in grades 3-6. This is a decline in our overall proficiency rate from the previous year, which was 70% on FSA ELA. Our 3rd and 4th-grade students increased proficiency from 2022 to 2023, but our 5th and 6th-grade students declined. Overall, we did have a higher proficiency rate than the District and the State averages.

3rd Grade: 61% (Enterprise) 56% (District), and 50% (State)

4th Grade: 75% (Enterprise) 62% (District), and 57% (State)

5th Grade: 67% (Enterprise) 58% (District), and 55% (State)

6th Grade: 61% (Enterprise) 60% (District), and 47% (State)

3rd-6th Grade: 66% (Enterprise) 59% (District), and 52% (State)

While we are above the state and district averages, our results show a need to improve our ELA proficiency and strengthen our instructional practices in ELA.

3-6 Diagnostic 1 iReady Data (2023-2024)

100% of students tested out of Phonological Awareness

17% of students working on Phonics Skills

2% of students working on High-Frequency Words

52% of students working 1 or more grade levels below in Vocabulary

49% of students working 1 or more grade levels below in Overall Comprehension

46% of students working 1 or more grade levels below in Comprehension of Literature

55% of students working 1 or more grade levels below in Comprehension of Informational Text

ESE Subgroup (46 students)

100% of students tested out of Phonological Awareness

48% of students working on Phonics Skills

4% of students working on High-Frequency Words

89% of students working 1 or more grade levels below in Vocabulary

87% of students working 1 or more grade levels below in Overall Comprehension

78% of students working 1 or more grade levels below in Comprehension of Literature

89% of students working 1 or more grade levels below in Comprehension of Informational Text

Our STAR PM1 2024 K-2 proficiency results are below (50th percentile ranking and above):

Kindergarten: Early Literacy 46% (36 students)

1st Grade: Early Literacy 42% (26 students), Reading 71% (10 students)

2nd Grade: Reading-38% (28 students)

We had 34% of Level 1 and 2's or 107 students. Additionally, our SWD subgroup is struggling and requires collaboration among the general education and ESE teachers to ensure the need for differentiated instruction and support, along with ongoing progress monitoring, is critical and essential to improve student performance. The numbers below indicate the percentage and number of our subgroup SWD who did NOT show proficiency on the 2023 FAST PM3 ELA.

3rd grade: 54% (7 out of 13 students)

4th grade: 50% (7 out of 14 students)

5th grade: 71% (10 out of 14 students)
 6th grade: 100% (10 out of 10 students)

Measurable Outcome:

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

FAST PM3 Reading achievement proficiency rate will increase from 66% in Spring 2023 to 70% in 2024.

SWD: 50% of students will be proficient on the 2024 FAST ELA.

Monitoring:

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

All grade levels will participate in statewide FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments three times per year and i-Ready Diagnostic Assessments three times this year. This assessment data, along with quarterly ELA assessments, will allow us to analyze the data to alter our lesson plans and intervention cycles as needed. In our intervention cycles, we will discuss these trends in PLTs and data meetings weekly and every six weeks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is using the Science of Reading to break down barriers our students have in their learning of reading. When we break down the Science of Reading into its five parts, we can continue diving deeper into the data our students present through the different assessments. We can then use this data to create intervention cycles to close proficiency gaps. When we combine the Science of Reading with the use of systematic instruction, we can ensure that whenever students are asked to learn a new skill or concept, they already possess the appropriate prerequisite knowledge and understanding to learn it efficiently. We will continue explicitly instructing students in a gradual release process, where teachers will shift the responsibility of learning from teacher to student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In previous years, reading instruction emphasized the 3-Cueing Method, creating gaps in Phonological Awareness and Phonics. This resulted in some students struggling to read fluently, directly impacting comprehension. With professional learning in the Science of Reading, teachers will now have a more systematic and explicit approach to teaching foundational skills.

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.

Teachers will follow District pacing and utilize Benchmark and Savvas when planning for Tier 1 instruction. Teachers will follow the decision trees to determine students needing additional support through Tier 2/ Tier 3 interventions during SMART.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Terapak (terapak.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When:

Teachers will administer District-approved ELA Assessments. Time will be provided to analyze data and discuss ways to scaffold lessons to support all students' access to grade-level benchmarks. Collaborative planning among the ESE and Gen Ed teachers will provide strategic support.

Person Responsible: Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.org)

By When:

ASP will be provided to targeted students in grades 1-6. This will provide additional academic support related to skill deficits.

Person Responsible: Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

By When:

The Literacy Leadership Team will meet monthly to support the SIP goals for literacy, to engage stakeholders in improving ELA proficiency across grade levels, and to enrich the literacy culture of the school.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Terapak (terapak.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When:

The Literacy Coach and teacher leaders will facilitate professional learning to develop an understanding of the Science of Reading and its instructional implications in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Terapak (terapak.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When:

Teachers will participate in collaborative planning before each Benchmark unit utilizing the ELA Benchmark Advance Planning Protocol with the Literacy Coach.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Terapak (terapak.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When:

Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational/walk-through data.

Person Responsible: Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.org)

By When:

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

Our 2023 SSA results show an increase in proficiency from 52% in 2022 to 74% in 2023, a 22% increase. Our student's mean points earned by strand area are:

Nature of Science: 7 out of 10 points; 70%

Earth and Space Science: 12 out of 16 points; 75%

Physical Science: 12 out of 16 points; 75%

Life Science: 11 out of 14 points; 79%

Our lowest-performing strand was Nature or Science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SSA Science Achievement proficiency rate will increase or maintain in 2024.

Monitoring:

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

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. Instructional plans will be revised as needed. Teachers in grades 3-6 will utilize Penda Science as a supplemental resource to enhance daily instruction and support mastery of standards. This ancillary program will assist with the reinforcement and retention of content. All grade levels will be accountable for providing hands-on learning instruction during the science block.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.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.)

The 5E Instructional Model consists of cognitive stages of learning that comprise of Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, and Evaluate. The model facilitates conceptual change and contributes to more consistent and coherent science instruction. Incorporating this learning cycle in the classroom aids teachers in developing and delivering effective inquiry-based science lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing solid Tier 1 instruction in Science, students will have exposure to the fifth grade Science standards. Teachers will also fill in the gaps by addressing 3rd and 4th-grade power standards in Science. We believe that if teachers incorporate the 5E Instructional Model within their classroom, it will aid them in developing and delivering 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 the instruction is chunked into various phases of learning and students are provided with a more hands-on learning experience, student achievement will increase.

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.

1. Teachers will follow district pacing and utilize district-created Benchmark Blocks when planning for instruction.

Person Responsible: Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

By When:

2. Teachers will administer District Summative Science Assessments and Penda Science standards mini assessments. Time will be provided to analyze science data and discuss ways to scaffold lessons to support all students access to grade-level standards.

Person Responsible: Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

By When:

3. Teachers will complete class Science Fair projects to ensure Nature of Science standards are taught, and students understand the scientific process.

Person Responsible: Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

By When:

4. Science ASP will be developed for 5th-grade students. This will provide additional academic support related to grade 3 and 4 Science standards for students not demonstrating mastery.

Person Responsible: Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

By When:

5. Activity teachers will collaborate with grade-level teams to support science vocabulary instruction within their courses.

Person Responsible: Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

By When:

6. Students will participate in hands-on labs/activities to acquire knowledge.

Person Responsible: Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

By When:

7. Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational/walk-through data.

Person Responsible: Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

By When:

#3. 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.

Based on school data (office discipline referrals, in-school suspension, and out-of-school suspension), Enterprise saw an increase in behavior needs and school-wide incidents despite having positive referrals and common language of BLAST expectations. Enterprise had 114 referrals, with 31 written in the first and 83 in the second semester. In looking at the data, 75 of the 114 referrals were reported for 20 students, and the total number of students who received a referral was 56. The following behaviors were most prevalent: Horseplay-24, Physical Aggression-18, and Student Conflict/Class Disruption--12. Shared expectations and common vocabulary were reviewed during preplanning and the continued implementation of our BLAST expectations and problem-solving areas of concern.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We want a 10% increase in positive referrals from 177 in the 2022-2023 school year to 200 in the 2023-2024 school year. We would also like to see a decline in behavior referrals from 114 referrals in the 2022-2023 school year to less than 100 referrals in the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will review our discipline and positive referral data monthly as a leadership team and instructional staff. As we analyze school, grade level, and individual data, we will be able to see trends and identify ways to support areas of concern (professional learning, coaching, Tier 2 individual student supports, or behavior plans)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.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.)

Effective educator practices have their most significant impact when implemented within a schoolwide support system for staff and students. Schools invest in an MTSS framework, like PBIS, across the implementation cascade (i.e., state, district, school, classroom) to promote equitable academic and SEB outcomes for each student (Center on PBIS, 2021). The organization of a continuum of evidence-based practices across tiers facilitates the provision of efficient and effective classroom supports guided by data-based decisions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Schoolwide language for behavior expectations makes it straightforward for staff and students to follow. Within the MTSS framework, In classrooms, each educator implements, differentiates, and intensifies critical evidence-based and contextually relevant SEB practices to meet the needs of all learners (Simonsen & Myers, 2015). If we think of behavior like academics, we must use the components below:

- Prevent SEB challenges by setting students up for success.
- Teach critical SEB skills.
- Respond in ways that encourage SEB skills and decrease repeated SEB challenges.
- Decide whether to maintain or adjust (e.g., intensify, adapt, or fade) support based on data.

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.

1. Review BLAST expectations and preplanning for staff input to determine what's working and what isn't.
2. Teach, reinforce, and model expectations in all interactions. (Visuals)
3. Provide student interaction, engagement, and collaboration opportunities in the learning setting.
2. Closely monitor students during transition times and unstructured settings. (most referrals)
3. Provide professional learning opportunities with district training as needed to develop teacher capacity.
4. Discuss the difference between classroom-managed and office-managed referrals.
5. Use the MTSS Framework and the problem-solving process to identify strategies and interventions to support the need for tier 2 and 3 behavior concerns.

Person Responsible: Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Although Math proficiency levels and growth increased from FAST PM1 to FAST PM3, we had 24% of level 1 and 2's or 77 students. Additionally, our SWD subgroup is struggling and requires collaboration among the General Education and ESE teachers to ensure the need for differentiated instruction and support, along with ongoing progress monitoring, which is critical and essential to improve student performance. The numbers below indicate the percentage and number of our subgroup SWD who did NOT show proficiency on the 2023 FAST PM3 Math.

3rd grade: 69% (9 out of 13 students)

4th grade: 43% (6 out of 14 students)

5th grade: 50% (7 out of 14 students)

6th grade: 100% (10 out of 10 students)

Our STAR Math PM1 2024 K-2 proficiency results are below (50th percentile ranking and above):

Kindergarten: 34% (27 students)

1st Grade: 64% (49 students)

2nd Grade: 54% (40 students)

Measurable Outcome:

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

By consistently utilizing collaborative planning structures, student math proficiency will increase by May 2024, from 76% to 80%, as measured by FAST/STAR Progress Monitoring 3.

SWD: 50% of students will be proficient on the 2024 FAST Math.

Monitoring:

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

Math exit tickets will be done daily in the classroom to measure student understanding of the math standard(s) taught. Reteaching will occur when a student lacks understanding, as demonstrated through the exit ticket. In addition to exit tickets through Reveal and Edgemoor, our students will participate in Quarterly Assessments to monitor progress toward concepts taught. Student progress will be analyzed weekly on iReady for K-6th grades to ensure students progress academically on their instructional path or teacher-assigned lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.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.)

Purposeful collaborative structures to facilitate meaningful mathematical discourse will be integrated during math to engage students in learning and move towards a student-centered learning environment. Collaborative planning and monitoring of student progress and data among teachers and general education teachers will yield levels of learning for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Purposeful collaborative structures will be based on strategic pairings/ groupings throughout the math block. These structures allow students to interact, practice, and apply math strategies together using manipulatives, visuals, whiteboards, and interactive notebooks and aid in student discourse.

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.

Teachers will engage in collaborative planning incorporating engagement strategies specifically selected to align with the benchmark/unit being taught.

Person Responsible: Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.org)

By When:

Teachers will administer District Quarterly Math Assessments. Time will be provided to analyze data and discuss ways to scaffold lessons to support all students access to grade-level benchmarks. Collaborative planning among the ESE and Gen Ed Teachers will provide strategic support.

Person Responsible: Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

By When:

The District Math Coach and teacher leaders will facilitate professional learning to develop an understanding of student engagement strategies in math.

Person Responsible: Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

By When:

Teachers will use collaborative planning structures to enhance Tier 1 instruction while using data to support students struggling with mathematical concepts.

Person Responsible: Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.org)

By When:

ASP will be provided to targeted students in grades 1-6. This will provide additional academic support related to skill deficits.

Person Responsible: Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

By When:

Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational/walk-through data.

Person Responsible: Kelli Dufresne (dufresne.kelli@brevardschools.org)

By When: