

Orange County Public Schools

# Endeavor Elementary



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Endeavor Elementary

13501 BALCOMBE RD, Orlando, FL 32837

<https://endeavores.ocps.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Derek Knappins**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (54%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* 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 Orange County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Knappins, Derek	Principal	<p>The role of the leadership team is to create an enriching and diverse pathway that leads our students to success with the support of families and the community.</p> <p>The Roles and Responsibilities of the Principal -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guide and lead the Leadership Team</li> <li>• Provide clear vision and expectations with a focus on creating a culture of learning</li> <li>• Lead and develop grade-level chairs and classroom teachers in the use of standards to design lessons, effective instructional strategies, and formative assessments that lead to a path of differentiated instruction that results in increased student achievement</li> <li>• Walk classrooms and provide actionable feedback for teachers</li> <li>• Lead professional learning</li> <li>• Monitor student learning</li> <li>• Ensure intervention, practice, and enrichment based on student evidence of learning</li> <li>• Collaborate with select grade-level teams and Gifted Resource Teacher to design and deliver additional STEM science instruction</li> </ul>
Diaz, Cruz	Assistant Principal	<p>Cruz Diaz, Assistant Principal-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work collaboratively with Principal on the above</li> <li>• Lead committees, SAC, discipline, and safety goals</li> <li>• Lead professional learning</li> <li>• Facilitate facilities agreements Inventory management (property and textbook)</li> <li>• Coordinate field trips</li> <li>• Ensure Partners in Education and Additions Volunteer efforts are instituted</li> <li>• Maintenance drills and reporting</li> <li>• Interview and select classified staff</li> <li>• Supervise custodians</li> <li>• Create master, lunch and duty schedules; and school and community news articles for the Hunters Creek Magazine</li> </ul>
Young, Linda	Other	<p>Linda Young, Reading Coach/Instructional Coach -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead and monitor the use of i-Ready</li> <li>• Lead and monitor the use of Imagine Learning</li> <li>• Lead and monitor the use of Fountas and Pinnell</li> <li>• Model instructional strategies for teachers</li> <li>• Lead professional learning</li> <li>• Provide Tier III ELA MTSS support</li> </ul>
Toledo, Jessica	Other	<p>Jessica Toledo, Staffing Specialist-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead and support the MTSS process</li> </ul>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support and monitor the needs of ESE students</li> <li>• Provide professional learning</li> <li>• Lead MTSS Academic support</li> <li>• Ensure ESOL/ESE placement</li> <li>• Facilitate transportation</li> </ul>
Carmenate, Wanda	Instructional Coach	<p>Wanda Carmenate, Instructional Coach/Curriculum Resource Teacher -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the design of standards-based instruction</li> <li>• Support the use of instructional strategies</li> <li>• Support the use of common assessments</li> <li>• Model instructional strategies for teachers</li> <li>• Lead professional learning</li> <li>• Oversee the organization and distribution of resources</li> <li>• Maintain retention and portfolios</li> </ul>
Blair, Andrea	Guidance Counselor	<p>Andrea Blair, Guidance Counselor -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor district data on homeless students, SEDNET service</li> <li>• Facilitate 504 documentation</li> <li>• Conduct gifted screenings, provide whole class and small group guidance</li> <li>• Chair and lead Endeavor Guidance Committee</li> <li>• Lead professional learning in Social-Emotional Learning, mental health, and school safety.</li> <li>• Lead MTSS Behavior support</li> <li>• Monitor abuse/bullying</li> <li>• Facilitate district and state-mandated guidance/mental health initiatives</li> <li>• Monitor Panorama Social Emotional Learning Student survey results.</li> <li>• Responsible for threat assessments (bullying)</li> <li>• Support discipline through the use of conflict resolution and skills embedded in character education</li> </ul>
Zupa, Mei	Instructional Coach	<p>Mei Zupa, Instructional Coach-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the use of instructional strategies</li> <li>• Support the use of common assessments</li> <li>• Model instructional strategies for teachers</li> <li>• Lead professional learning</li> <li>• Support beginning teachers</li> <li>• Support the design of standards-based instruction</li> <li>• Lead and support the MTSS process</li> </ul>

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**  
 Wednesday 7/15/2020, Derek Knappins

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

47

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (54%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	



<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	28	86	94	108	138	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	580
Attendance below 90 percent	6	21	12	10	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

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

**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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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**

Tuesday 7/14/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	89	99	126	138	131	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	6	13	13	12	11	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	31	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

**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	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	89	99	126	138	131	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	6	13	13	12	11	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	31	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

**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	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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	69%	57%	57%	65%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	58%	58%	57%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	52%	53%	50%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	67%	63%	63%	62%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	61%	62%	67%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	48%	51%	69%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	56%	53%	48%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	55%	15%	58%	12%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	57%	7%	58%	6%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
03	2019	67%	62%	5%	62%	5%
	2018	60%	61%	-1%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	63%	1%	64%	0%
	2018	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	55%	57%	-2%	60%	-5%
	2018	60%	59%	1%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	54%	54%	0%	53%	1%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

<b>Subgroup Data</b>											
<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b>
SWD	45	51	43	47	42	36	56				
ELL	57	65	67	64	60	45	48				
ASN	90	64		95	85						
BLK	90	53		62	60						
HSP	62	65	62	64	60	48	52				
WHT	78	67		70	70	45	88				
FRL	64	61	60	63	62	45	57				
<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	38	45	36	45	57	43	27				
ELL	47	60	64	57	66	63	29				
ASN	75	58		88	75						
BLK	53	50		59	50						
HSP	62	60	62	62	62	56	54				
WHT	81	73		80	64		69				
FRL	63	62	63	65	64	62	56				

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	13	35	33	35	71	67	8				
ELL	49	58	58	51	68	70	22				
ASN	91	81		88	88						
BLK	59	60		47	60						
HSP	60	56	49	58	67	69	38				
WHT	76	55		69	61	60	60				
FRL	58	54	50	54	62	64	37				

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	504
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

**Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	84
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	66
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	70
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

**Analysis**

**Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance were students identified as bottom 25% in mathematics. This component area reflects a clear regression from the previous year and falls below district and state averages. Contributing factors include instructional alignment of state standards and district-adopted mathematics materials as well as the identification and deliberate use of effective strategies and tasks that scaffold and help bridge new learning with previously learned skills. While existing instructional practices helped support growth of math learning gains at Endeavor, it was not sufficient in meeting the needs of students identified in the bottom quartile.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was also the lowest 25% in mathematics with a drop from 58% to 47%. This was 1% lower than the district and 7% lower than the state. In ELA, all three components increased by 3%. In mathematics, proficiency and learning gains increased by 1%, with lowest 25% decreasing by 11%. This decline is due to the increased rigor and the ability to close the gap with our students who struggle the most. While we implemented math acceleration tutoring, which targeted our students who were struggling and provided added support to our students with disabilities, there was a group in between who were not provided additional mathematics opportunities.

**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.**

The data component that showed the greatest decline was also the lowest 25% in mathematics with a difference of 4%. The previous year Endeavor scored 11% above the state, however with the increase in the state average of 4% for the lowest 25% and the decrease in the scores of Endeavor, clearly indicate there was a sharp fall. There was additional support provided for targeted students that enabled Endeavor to meet the targets for ESSA in all subgroups, however, the overall growth of the lowest 25% did not show improvement. Contributing factors continue to be the rigor of the standards and the ability to provide instruction that closes gaps quickly.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 2% growth in each of the three categories for ELA. New actions taken this year was the continued and expanded use of novels/stories in the form of trade books that were purchased for students. This created a common text for initial instruction and a resource for teachers that allowed students to effectively engage in the close reading process. It also provided opportunities for deeper learning experiences particularly the integration standards.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

In reflecting on Endeavor's EWS data, a potential area of concern is 5th-grade students with 2 or more early warning indicators.

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

1. Mathematics core instruction- standards-based instruction with differentiated support.
2. Small group instruction- continued small group instruction based on common formative assessments in both ELA and mathematics.
3. Independent practice- Use of engaging independent practice tasks that focus on standards to review/preview in addition to the current standard of focus.
4. Social-Emotional Learning- The expansion of the integration of strategies for children that support their needs for conflict resolution, resiliency, and cultural responsiveness.
5. Digital- This year is our first year for one-to-one digital devices for our students. While the experience with making the adjustment to distance learning was satisfactory, it has not been enough to transition to digital learning without additional professional learning to engage and provide feedback to students.
6. Targeted professional learning- Provide targeted professional learning with an intense focus on improving classroom practice, small-group instruction, and differentiation of instruction.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**



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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** According to our school performance data, 47% of our identified lowest 25% students met their learning gains target. Comparatively, this school grade component area showed the greatest decline and overall performance from the previous year. By specifically focusing on improving instructional practices relating to math, we will increase student performance of our lowest 25% students in the area of mathematics by improving teacher utilization of backward designing and the effective use of instructional strategies specifically geared towards providing equitable learning opportunities for our most diverse learners.

**Measureable Outcome:** For the 2020-2021 school year, our school performance data will indicate at least a 5% increase from 47% of our lowest 25% students making adequate learning gains in mathematics to 52%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Derek Knappins (derek.knappins@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** With the support of leadership, teachers will plan with the end in mind and plan lessons using a backward-design model that will specifically focus on effective learning objectives, assessment, student-centered learning activities, and re-teaching.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** By using a data-driven backward-design approach to plan instruction, teachers can better plan differentiated lessons wherein, student-centered activities are strategically selected to help teachers meet the needs of students working at varying levels of the standard. Additionally, teachers will use the backward lesson mapping model to make intentional modifications geared towards providing students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 equitable learning opportunities during whole-group and small-group instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. The leadership team will provide classroom teachers with professional learning sessions specifically tailored to helping teachers grow in the area of lesson planning using the backward-design model. (Administration/Lead Teachers)
2. During common planning, teachers will use the most current student data to plan for the specific needs of students identified in the lowest 25%. (Teachers/Administration/Paraprofessionals)
3. Administration will conduct classroom observations and provide timely, actionable feedback with an intense focus on differentiating instruction for our most fragile students. (Administration)
4. The leadership team will lead teachers on the effective use of digital resources to help engage students identified as bottom quartile. (Administration/Lead Teachers)

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** To support the needs of our diverse learners and establish a culture of learning and collective staff efficacy, teachers/staff will organize as a Professional Learning Community to plan standards-based lessons, reflect on the effectiveness of instruction, and design and analyze common formative assessments as they relate to increased student achievement and a commitment to a culture of learning.

**Measureable Outcome:** To gauge the effectiveness of this Area of Focus, the leadership team will collect/analyze classroom observation and student performance data and adjust professional learning to target our most pertinent areas of growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Derek Knappins (derek.knappins@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Evaluating the effectiveness of specific pedagogical strategies and behaviors. Teachers/staff will gather evidence of the effects of specific strategies and behaviors and use data collected to track standards mastery, differentiate instruction, and meet the specific needs of low-performing students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** By reflecting on instructional practice and evaluating the most effective pedagogical strategies and teacher behaviors, teachers will make intentional instructional modifications that will help increase overall student performance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. The Principal/Leadership Team will attend collaborative team planning to review lesson plans, support teams to develop goals and student-centered learning objectives, identify effective pedagogical strategies, and effective use of common assessments data to differentiate instruction for all learners.
2. The Principal/Leadership Team will conduct classroom walkthroughs and analyze student performance data. The Principal and Leadership Team will attend collaborative team time and review lesson plans to reflect on the effectiveness of planning, instruction, and assessment.
3. Students and teachers will set academic goals in reading and math reflecting 1 year's growth. Additionally, teachers will communicate these goals to parents via conferences and quarterly updates.
4. The Leadership Team will help facilitate the creation and execution of Deliberate Practice plans with a focus on teacher reflection and improving instructional practice.

**Person Responsible** Derek Knappins (derek.knappins@ocps.net)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** To help support the needs of our diverse student population, we will build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. By incorporating important elements of social-emotional learning, students will grow in the areas of communication and problem-solving.

**Measureable Outcome:** For the 2020-2021 school year, our lowest-performing ESSA subgroup, Students with Disabilities will grow by 4% from 46% to 50% as a result of our increased focus on collaborative structures and communication skills related to Social-emotional Learning.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Derek Knappins (derek.knappins@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** As a school, we will use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. We will embed social-emotional elements into our weekly PLC's and monitor effectiveness by closely monitoring both academic, and behavioral data. Further, we plan to strategically use our in-house G.A.T.O.R House system to cultivate and develop relationships that directly impact student's well-being and social-emotional health

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** By incorporating social-emotional learning strategies and activities in our Professional Learning Communities, we will establish and maintain a positive school culture that will result in increased student efficacy and growth in the area of communication and collaboration

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Structured planning with an intense focus on student collaboration and cooperative structures.
2. Structured grade-level common planning with a focus on the integration of culturally-responsive materials.
3. Use of in-house GATOR house system to promote positive relationships and social engagement.
4. Consistent classroom visits followed by structured actionable feedback.

**Person Responsible** Derek Knappins (derek.knappins@ocps.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**N/A**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Stakeholders include teachers, staff, parents, extended families, PTA, SAC, district/learning community staff, business partners, and volunteers. The following structures describe how we build a positive school culture and environment:

1. Newsletter- Our monthly newsletter is structured around the topics of our School Improvement Plan. Each edition of the Endeavor newsletter includes information about school activities, classroom practices, and volunteering opportunities.
2. School Advisory Council- Our School Advisory Council meetings are held each month and are open to all community stakeholders. Our SAC meetings are well-attended by teachers, parents, business partners, and community stakeholders.
3. Parents-as-Partners- At the conclusion of each monthly SAC meeting, parents are invited to sit down with school administration and discuss pertinent topics regarding the status of our school.
4. Partners-in-Education- Endeavor's Partners in Education host activities on campus throughout the school year. Our business partners focus on cause-related marketing and provide hands-on real-world experience to our students.
5. Parent-Teacher Association- Endeavor's PTA is an active organization that provides a plethora of volunteering opportunities for families and community stakeholders. PTA members plan, organize, and execute many school activities designed to strengthen the relationship between teachers, students, and the community.
6. Hunter's Creek Magazine Publication- Each month Endeavor submits an article that is published and distributed to homeowners in the Hunter's Creek area. This publication features current school events and highlights our teachers and business partners.
7. Social Media- Endeavor Elementary's social media platforms help school personnel engage with community stakeholders and provide a safe digital space wherein students, teachers, parents, and community members can ask questions and remain updated on the latest happenings at Endeavor.

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

<b>Part V: Budget</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Social Emotional Learning</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$0.00</b>