

Orange County Public Schools

Endeavor Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Endeavor Elementary

13501 BALCOMBE RD, Orlando, FL 32837

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

Demographics

Principal: Derek Knappins

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Endeavor Elementary

13501 BALCOMBE RD, Orlando, FL 32837

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)

Elementary School
PK-5

2018-19 Title I School

No

2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)

67%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

82%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	B	B

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and

using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

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

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

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/7/2019

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
Attendance below 90 percent	17	13	17	19	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	43	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

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

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
Attendance below 90 percent	17	13	17	19	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	43	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

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	

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	
Number of students enrolled	89 (0)	99 (0)	126 (0)	138 (0)	131 (0)	145 (0)	728 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 (17)	13 (13)	13 (17)	12 (19)	11 (22)	22 (19)	77 (107)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (4)	1 (0)	1 (6)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	26 (34)	31 (43)	49 (37)	106 (114)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
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%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%				

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

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	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				
2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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

ESSA Federal Index	
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
Black/African American Students	
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
Hispanic Students	
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
Multiracial Students	
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
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	70
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	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.

Mathematics learning gains for the lowest 25% is the data component with the lowest performance. The contributing factor is the misalignment of the standards with instructional materials and the deep understanding of concepts. This gap also is due to students' lack of mastery of basic facts as well as the use of concrete models and discourse when learning new concepts.

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

In the categories of ELA, ELA Learning Gains, ELA Lowest 25%, and Science, Endeavor scored above both the district and the state in the 2017-18 school year. In 2018-19, Endeavor scored above both with the exception of mathematics learning gains for the lowest 25%. Factors contributing to the decline include the need to provide more support for our English Language Learner (ELL) students with disabilities subgroups.

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.

Endeavor's greatest gap when compared to the state average is mathematics learning gains for the lowest 25%. The contributing factors have been previously described.

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

Endeavor's area that showed the most improvement was the learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA. The new actions that our school took in this area was the use of close reading strategies, intentionally integrated with the instructional strategies used in the Marzano Instructional Framework, and the integration of writing as students responded to text that was read. An additional action was the addition of an ESE resource teacher to provide additional time and to push in versus pulling out during the ELA block.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

A potential area of concern is the fifth grade with the highest number of students with attendance below 90%.

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

.Learning gains of bottom 25% in mathematics.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Design relevant standards lessons, use effective instructional strategies (close reading), analyze data (formative/summative), differentiate instruction, increase achievement, and support a culture of learning to develop efficacy.
Rationale	To increase teachers' capacity to utilize backwards design starting with the standard and ending with differentiated instruction to ensure the teaching of standards-based lessons that result in increased student achievement and a culture of learning. Further, teachers need increased capacity in identifying the most effective instructional strategies (including the addition of those promoting student discourse) to ensure the delivery of effective instruction as determined by the desired effect. When teachers align curriculum, instruction, and assessment, coupled with developing relationships and communicating high expectations, the result is increased student achievement and an environment that supports a culture of learning and results in student efficacy.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The intended outcome is the development instructional unit goals, daily targets, and scales to determine proficiency, identification and delivery of the most effective strategies. Additionally, data analysis and the use of formative and summative assessments that lead to differentiated instruction and the ability to prioritize tasks and sustain efforts that result in increased student achievement are also areas of focus. The Leadership Team will provide modeling and resources needed for identifying effective instructional strategies that meet the needs of ELL and ESE students, and conduct analysis of formative and summative assessment data to determine effective interventions. Principal and Leadership Team will support teachers in analyzing data that reflects: mastery of the standards, discipline, and the culture of the classroom/school. Additionally, the Leadership Team and teachers will monitor the progress in creating a culture of learning that supports the development of efficacy.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amanda Ellis (amanda.ellis@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence-based strategies will include: setting goals and scales, strategies used in the Marzano Instructional Framework, close reading strategies (student discourse), and the selection of text that supports the interests and backgrounds of our diverse student population.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The Marzano Instructional Framework is the tool used for teachers to guide instruction. Close reading strategies are a district initiative to support not only comprehension but also the social-emotional learning of students. The selection of text to support the interest and backgrounds of students ensures culturally responsive instruction.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Principal, Assistant Principal, and lead classroom teachers will provide professional learning sessions through modeling and allocation of resources focused on differentiated needs of the teacher for close reading. 2. Leadership Team will lead teachers on utilizing existing resources, specifically the organizing and collecting of leveled readers for small group
--------------------	---

instruction and embed the use of leveled book collection into the common planning tasks.

3. Principal, Assistant Principal and Leadership Team will use the student agenda (as a means of communication) and school designed GATOR forms to support developing behaviors that create a culture of learning and result in student efficacy.

4. Leadership and teachers will gather feedback from students and teachers to describe the culture of learning from their perspective.

**Person
Responsible**

Amanda Ellis (amanda.ellis@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	To support learning and efficacy, teachers/staff will organize as PLCs to plan standards based lessons, reflect on effectiveness of instruction, and design/analyze common assessments as related to increased achievement and a culture of learning.
Rationale	Teachers will improve practice by focusing on learning, collaboration, and results. Additionally, teachers will make instructional decisions that impact student learning when they have identified effective strategies and analyzed formative and summative data that accurately represent achievement.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Teachers need structure and models for collaboration and ongoing opportunities to reflect on teacher practice and student learning. Teachers need to develop a skillset for achieving clarity and coherence of team goals. Teachers will also enhance their skills at progress monitoring to track student data. The Principal and Leadership Team will attend collaborative team planning to: a) review lesson plans; b) support teams to develop goals and proficiency scales; c) identify effective strategies; and d) use formative assessments to provide differentiated instruction. The Leadership Team will also conduct classroom walkthroughs and analyze student performance data; set individual reading and mathematics goals to reflect a minimum of one year's worth of growth, and communicate to parents via parent conferences and the report card supplements that indicate proficiency of standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	The strategy of organizing adults in a PLC will be used to build proficiency and efficacy in staff.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	A PLC organizes educators around a shared commitment through a focus on learning, collaboration, and results.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership team will collaborate weekly during team time to follow a cycle for tasks that integrate curriculum, instruction and assessment. 2. Engage in job-embedded professional learning opportunities through modeling and the allocation of resources focused on differentiated needs of teachers through models for collaboration beyond grade-level teams that could include instructional rounds, common planning, common assessments, committee membership, and action research (Deliberate Practice). This includes implementation of close reading as designed by a designated team.
--------------------	---

3. Use of instructional process for gathering, analyzing and sharing data to track mastery of standards and achievement on assessments.

Person Responsible Amanda Ellis (amanda.ellis@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

N/A

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Design relevant standards lessons, use effective instructional strategies (close reading), analyze data (formative/summative), differentiate instruction, increase achievement, and support a culture of learning to develop efficacy.				\$60,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		120-Classroom Teachers	0214 - Endeavor Elementary	General Fund		\$60,000.00
			<i>Notes: Accelerated Reader, Supplemental Instruction Materials, Student Trade Books, Tutoring, and House Rallies.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To support learning and efficacy, teachers/staff will organize as PLCs to plan standards based lessons, reflect on effectiveness of instruction, and design/analyze common assessments as related to increased achievement and a culture of learning.				\$62,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3610	310-Professional and Technical Services	0214 - Endeavor Elementary	General Fund		\$2,000.00
	3610	910-To General Fund	0214 - Endeavor Elementary	General Fund		\$60,000.00
			<i>Notes: Professional materials, Substitutes, Ron Clark Academy, Assessment Conference Fall 2019</i>			
					Total:	\$142,000.00