Audubon Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Audubon Elementary School

1201 N BANANA RIVER DR, Merritt Island, FL 32952

http://www.audubon.brevard.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Candace Jones M   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Brevard 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

Audubon Elementary School

1201 N BANANA RIVER DR, Merritt Island, FL 32952

http://www.audubon.brevard.k12.fl.us/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	79%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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 create a community of empowered life-long learners in an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create a partnership of students, parents, staff, and community. Our student-centered environment ensures that each learner will have the opportunity to soar to higher levels.

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
Jones, Candace	Principal	As the principal, Mrs. Jones creates and shares a common vision for the use of data to inform school-wide decision-making, aligns professional development with the identified needs of students and professionals, and helps to create a climate and culture of success, high expectations, positive character, and excellence.
Slentz, Jaime	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Mrs. Slentz works collaboratively with staff members to develop, lead, and evaluate rigorous, standards-aligned instruction that is focused on student achievement.
Crawford, Karolyn	Teacher, ESE	As the leader of the ESE team, Mrs. Crawford participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional strategies into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers to co-teach while providing students with disabilities rigorous, standards-based instruction. Mrs. Crawford monitors the development and implementation of all IEPs to ensure compliance.
Loggins, Gina	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the Title 1 team, Mrs. Loggins is responsible for following all district and federal guidelines regarding Title 1 funding. She completes and submits routine required paperwork for compliance. Mrs. Loggins will work with grades 3-6, in Math, to to support effective pedagogical practices to improve instruction. Mrs. Loggins is a member of the MTSS team, using research-based programs to provide small group interventions for students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups. She develops partnerships with parents as she organizes family engagement events that bridge the gap between home and school to support student learning.
Saltsman, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the Title 1 team, Mrs. Saltsman is responsible for following all district and federal guidelines regarding Title 1 funding. She completes and submits routine required paperwork for compliance. Mrs. Saltsman serves as the Science Contact to support effective instruction as she collaboratively plans with 4th and 5th grade classroom teachers as well as co-teaching lessons within the classroom. Within this role, Mrs. Saltsman administers and analyzes assessment data to identify gaps in student understanding and creates and implements instruction to review these science concepts. Mrs. Saltsman is a member of the MTSS team, using research-based programs to provide small group interventions for students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups. She develops partnerships with parents as she organizes family engagement events that bridge the gap between home and school to support student learning.
Hastings, Kalie	School Counselor	As the guidance counselor, Miss Hastings is responsible for the Social/ Emotional program at Audubon, providing counseling to students individually and in the whole class setting. She works with all faculty to coordinate the IPST process, students with disabilities, and those with 504s. Miss Hastings serves as the point of contact for our ELL student population and monitors attendance for students of concern.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Slaughter, Lauren	Instructional Coach	As the instructional coach, Mrs. Slaughter coaches and supports school staff to design and improve instructional practices to ensure students' academic needs are met. As the MTSS facilitator, Mrs. Slaughter monitors common assessment data, including district purchased iReady, to support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.
Nickerson, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the Title 1 team, Mrs. Nickerson is responsible for following all district and federal guidelines regarding Title 1 funding. She completes and submits routine required paperwork for compliance. Mrs. Nickerson will work with grades K-2, in Math, to support effective pedagogical practices to improve instruction. Mrs. Nickerson is a member of the MTSS team, using research-based programs to provide small group interventions for students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups. She develops partnerships with parents as she organizes family engagement events that bridge the gap between home and school to support student learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Candace Jones M

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.*

2

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

43

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%

2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (60%)

2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	72	59	61	63	56	51	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	440
Attendance below 90 percent	6	9	9	13	10	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	4	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	1	2	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	5	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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

Friday 9/11/2020

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	66	76	64	66	59	73	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	499
Attendance below 90 percent	5	26	20	19	10	25	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	8	1	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	8	4	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	2	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	1	2	2	13	5	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	5	5	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	66	76	64	66	59	73	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	499
Attendance below 90 percent	5	26	20	19	10	25	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	8	1	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	8	4	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	2	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	1	2	2	13	5	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	5	5	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	62%	62%	57%	64%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	60%	58%	57%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	57%	53%	45%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	63%	63%	64%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	65%	62%	55%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	53%	51%	49%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	57%	53%	61%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(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	64%	64%	0%	58%	6%
	2018	61%	63%	-2%	57%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	61%	12%	58%	15%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	56%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	56%	60%	-4%	56%	0%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	58%	60%	-2%	54%	4%
	2018	64%	63%	1%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	61%	-8%	62%	-9%
	2018	63%	62%	1%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	64%	-6%	64%	-6%
	2018	59%	59%	0%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	51%	60%	-9%	60%	-9%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
06	2019	63%	67%	-4%	55%	8%
	2018	58%	68%	-10%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	56%	-3%	53%	0%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	28	36	33	26	45	33	15				
ELL	36			27							
BLK	25	47	46	18	21	15					
HSP	48	47		40	53		20				
MUL	48	50		48	58		42				
WHT	71	61	36	64	67	39	63				
FRL	55	52	32	42	54	33	45				
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	30	40	38	29	32	17	35				
BLK	19	38	36	19	44	42					
HSP	56	68		56	59						
MUL	44	45	36	47	45	31					
WHT	66	55	29	66	48	19	56				
FRL	53	49	31	53	43	27	41				
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	33	41	33	36	48	40	20				
BLK	11	26	33	18	40	40					
HSP	67	73		70	58						
MUL	67	48		58	59		50				
WHT	69	60	47	68	56	43	66				
FRL	56	54	41	51	51	48	51				

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)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
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	45
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.

Based on analysis of the 2018-2019 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), the lowest 25% student population in both ELA and Math showed the lowest performance at 35% proficiency (Math) and 36% (ELA) respectively. i-Ready Math Diagnostic 1 data from September 2019 indicates that 80% of students in grades K-6 were identified as needing Tier 2 or Tier 3 instruction. By Diagnostic 2 in December of 2019, this improved to 56% of students who were identified as requiring additional tiered instruction. While we were able to increase the percentage of students showing proficiency of grade level standards when i-Ready was administered in December 2019 by 24%, only 45% of students were considered on grade level. While ELA was slightly better, Diagnostic 1 data from September 2019 indicates that 64% of K-6 students students showed a need for additional Tier 2 or 3 instruction. By Diagnostic 2 in December 2019, this improved to 45% of students who were identified as requiring additional tiered instruction. While this is an improvement, only 55% of students were showing proficiency with grade level content.

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

On the 2018-2019 FSA, Audubon experienced a 5% school-wide decline in the percentage of students scoring at proficiency in Math as evidenced by a score of a Level 3 or above on the Florida Standards Assessment. In the absence of standardized testing results for 2019-2020, i-Ready Diagnostic data was analyzed. This data supports the conclusion that math proficiency is of priority concern. Grade level data from the September 2020-2021 administration compared with 2019-2020 data of the same students shows a decline of proficiency levels in every grade level. Grade K- 61% to 19% ; Grade 1- 43% to 19% ; Grade 2- 46% to 10% ; Grade 3- 34% to 21% ; Grade 4- 62% to 34% ; Grade 5- 35% to 14% ; We believe this can be attributed to lack of instruction due to distance learning.

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.

When comparing Audubon's 2018-2019 school data to that of the state, the greatest gap is evidenced in the lowest 25% student population in ELA, showing that only 36% of the lowest 25% at Audubon scored at proficiency as evidenced by a score of a Level 3 or above. While this is an improvement of 2% from the previous school year, this is well below the district average of 57% and the state average of 53%. We believe that the improvement can be attributed to a revised MTSS process for the 2018-2019 school year that appropriately focused on identifying students in need of interventions and providing Tier 2 and Tier 3 small group intensive instruction. However, additional supports appear to be needed as the MTSS process continues to utilize interventions that match student need.

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

According to 2018-2019 FSA data, Audubon showed an 11% increase in the percentage of students who exhibited learning gains in math, up from 49% in 2017-2018 to 61% in 2018-2019. During this school year, there was a targeted focus on the MTSS process where ongoing data was frequently analyzed and additional tier 2 and tier 3 math instruction was provided to students during the regular RtI block daily. The Eureka math curriculum was introduced and utilized during the 2019-2020 and, in the absence of statewide assessment data and three months of remote learning, its instructional value has not been adequately measured.

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

Particularly alarming is the number of students who scored a Level 1 on the 2018-2019 Math FSA who are currently in sixth grade (12), with ELA just slightly better at 8.
Another area of concern is shown in the attendance rate for 2019-2020 school year, with 63 students falling below 90%. Most of these students were in grades 3-6.

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

1. Math Proficiency
2. ELA Proficiency
3. Lowest 25% ELA and Math
4. ESSA subgroups
5. Science Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Audubon showed a 5% decrease in students scoring at a Level 3 or above in Math for the 2018-2019 school year, with 60% of students showing proficiency in 2017-2018 and only 55% in 2018-2019. This was 8% below both the district and state averages for this tested school grade component. Furthermore, iReady Diagnostic data from September 2020 shows that only 19% of the student population is scoring within the proficiency range for their grade level.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2020-2021 Math FSA, 63% of our students in grades 3-6 will achieve proficiency as evidenced by a score of Level 3 or above. This will match both state and district proficiency levels from the 2018-2019 administration of Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jaime Slentz (slentz.jaime@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During the 2019-2020 school year, Audubon implemented the use of Eureka as the core mathematics curriculum in grades K-5 and continued the use of Big Ideas in sixth grade. This will continue for the current school year, as there was no standardized test to measure the program's overall impact on student learning for the 2019-2020 school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Eureka Math program, also known as Engage NY, has been used by many schools within the district with positive results. It is the most widely used curriculum in America, with 57% of teachers using this program within their classrooms. After adopting Eureka Math at Scholarship Prep Charter School in Santa Ana, California, the school showed the highest year-to-year percentage growth in students meeting or exceeding expectations on their state standardized assessment with a 36 point increase. Andrew Crowe, Chief Academic Officer at Scholarship Prep, states that "Eureka Math gives teachers methodologies for grouping material, organizing lessons, and creating small group sessions. The Mid-Module Assessments also help teachers identify student needs and adjust instruction before the End-of-Module Assessments." This is just one of many schools with proven success using the Eureka Math curriculum within their classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use Title 1 funds to hire staff specifically dedicated to support tier 1 math instruction. These two staff members (T) will assess current instructional practices and provide resources to support improved instruction.
2. Schedule monthly targeted Math meetings where ongoing data from Standards Mastery, iReady, and Eureka module assessments are analyzed. This data is used to inform instruction, create small groups for reteaching, and appropriately challenge students who have shown mastery of grade level skills.
3. Utilize iReady instructional path to assess student understanding and close achievement gaps, and closely monitor our ESSA sub-groups.
4. Use ASP funds to hire faculty to provide small group math instruction both in person and virtually.
5. Purchase Eureka Affirm, In Sync, and Equip as well as hands-on Eureka materials (T) to support classroom instruction in addition to supporting families at home.

Person Responsible	Jaime Slentz (slentz.jaime@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Audubon faculty will focus on increasing proficiency of its lowest 25% student population in the area of ELA. On the 2018-2019 FSA, 36% of the lowest 25% student population at Audubon scored proficient as indicated by a score of a Level 3 or higher on the ELA portion. This is significantly lower than the district average of 57% and the state average of 53%.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2020-2021 FSA, Audubon Elementary will increase the overall proficiency for the lowest 25% in ELA from 36% to match the 2018-2019 state average of 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Candace Jones (jones.candace@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using Title 1 funds, we will purchase and implement the Building Vocabulary program to be used in all grade 2 through 6 classrooms during Tier 1 instruction, as this has been identified as an area of need based on 2020-2021 school-wide Diagnostic 1 data. Classroom teachers will also place a priority focus this year on having students track progress on iReady instructional path lessons and set individual goals for Diagnostic growth. Scholastic News will be utilized in grades 2-6, as it provides rigorous text that will guide students in developing vocabulary in addition to supporting extended responses with multiple texts. The Title 1 teachers will observe direct instruction and provide teachers with feedback through the coaching cycle. Weekly coaching meetings with the administrative team and Title 1 will be scheduled to ensure that suggested practices are implemented with fidelity as we complete our classroom walk-throughs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Building Vocabulary program, created by literacy experts and thought leaders based on strong and well-accepted research sets, students up for academic success across the content areas with a systematic approach to teaching vocabulary. This series focuses on vocabulary acquisition using Greek and Latin prefixes, suffixes, and bases which account for 90% of English words with two or more syllables. Hattie's effect size indicates that setting challenging goals with and for students has an effect size of .52, which shows that it can have a significant impact on student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Purchase the Building Vocabulary (T) program and LAFS materials as additional Tier 1 supports. as iReady data indicates that vocabulary and comprehension are areas of concern.
2. Title 1 teachers (T) will provide Tier 3 intensive instruction in small group setting daily.
3. Using iReady instructional path, students will monitor weekly progress towards the learning path. They will be analyzing diagnostic data to set goals for self improvement.
4. Utilize the Title 1 team (T) to plan, observe, and provide coaching feedback to improve instructional practice. Hold weekly coach's meeting with administration to discuss focus areas that will guide instructional look fors during classroom observations.
5. Utilize the literacy coach (.5 T) to support teams in common standards based planning, and continued data analysis chats to include close monitoring of ESSA subgroups.
6. Scholastic News (T) purchased for grades 2-6 to provide differentiated instruction to support reading comprehension and articles for extended responses.

Person Responsible	Lauren Slaughter (slaughter.lauren@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Audubon's Science coach will assist the teachers in Grades 3-5 in the use of Penda, an online supplemental resource that supports Science instruction. She will also plan with grades 4 and 5, assist them with data analysis of the standards assessed through Unify, and provide appropriate feedback to the teachers in an effort to remediate students, as needed.
Measurable Outcome:	Although Audubon increased its overall science proficiency by 3% from 49% in 2017-2018 to 52% in 2018-2019 on the Science Standardized Assessment this is below the district and the state averages, it is our hope to increase our 5th grade science proficiency to 60% on the 20-21 Science Standardized Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Saltsman (saltsman.jessica@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During the 2019-2020 school year, fourth and fifth grade students participated in the Science lab on the activity wheel with a primary focus on the Annually Assessed standards in grades 4 and 5. On the Grade 5 Review Part 1,30% of the students passed, and only 13% of the students showed an increase on the Grade 5 Review Part 2. Unify test scores often fell below average. Both results showed an increasing need in the quality of instruction as well as a need for additional practice given outside of the lab time. The purchase of Penda will allow for all of the standards in grades 3-5 to be assigned to the fifth graders, ensure that the standards are being taught with fidelity, and hold teachers accountable for providing quality instruction in Science.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Penda is an online supplemental resource that is used to engage students in research based pedagogy as well as help teachers and students to raise test scores. Efficacy reports state that 30 minutes of participation in the program yields the best results. Studies have revealed that "there are statistically significant relationships between a student's use of Penda and their FCAT test performance," according to the program's website.

Action Steps to Implement	

1. Penda (T) will be purchased as a supplemental resource for grades 3-5. Training will be provided for its use.

Person Responsible	Jaime Slentz (slentz.jaime@brevardschools.org)

2. The Science coach (T) will meet on a weekly basis with teachers in grades 4 and 5 for the planning of instruction. She will also assign the Unify assessments in correlation with the pacing guide and help teachers with their data disaggregation in an effort to help them plan their remediation efforts.

Person Responsible	Jessica Saltsman (saltsman.jessica@brevardschools.org)

3. Weekly usage reports will be reviewed and groups will be formulated through Penda for remediation purposes.

Person Responsible	Jessica Saltsman (saltsman.jessica@brevardschools.org)

4. The Science coach will push in to the fifth grade Science blocks to help with quality instruction and recognize select students on meeting their weekly goals and passing scores on the Penda program as well as their Unify scores.

Person Responsible	Jessica Saltsman (saltsman.jessica@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The staff and administration at Audubon will monitor ESSA subgroups throughout the year via the MTSS process, as there were three subgroups who fell below the 40% threshold during the 2018-2019 school year. These include our English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities, and African American student population. Frequent and ongoing data analysis of the students in any of these subgroups will take place during weekly data meetings for both Math and Reading. Any of these students who are of concern as it relates to this data review will be provided small group and tiered instruction to help close the achievement gap.

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.

Student Discipline will continue to be an area of focus as Audubon builds on the PBIS program that was first implemented during the 2019-2020 school year. Using established S.O.A.R. expectations, students and faculty alike will be held accountable for following clearly defined rules for behavior.
To further support the PBIS initiative, the CHAMPS program will be introduced and used by all teachers in grades 3 through 6 for the 2020-2021 school year. This program is designed to help school staff improve safety and civility within all areas of the school as it builds a foundation to engage students and enhance learning.
Teachers in grades PreK through second grade will be trained in Conscious Discipline for the 2020-2021 school year. This research-based program focuses on emotion regulation and behavior management strategies to help improve school culture.
Additionally, the Audubon faculty will receive Trauma Informed training to help all staff members understand the nature of trauma and promote environments of healing.
The Caring School Community curriculum will be utilized in all classrooms to support the social emotional learning of Audubon students.
Results from the 2019-2020 Youth Truth survey compared Audubon Elementary students' ratings to 553 other elementary schools in the county. Audubon's highest rated themes were in Engagement and Relationships, and the lowest rated themes were Academic Rigor and Instructional Methods. Highest rated question was "Does your teacher want you to do your best?" With the lowest rated being "Do you learn interesting things in class?"
Parent Survey for the 2019-2020 showed that 99% of parents feel that the school is safe and they feel welcome. 89% feel that the office is polite and helpful. Parents prefer to get an email for communication. 73% prefer family fun nights and 68% would like to see academic support materials sent home. 81% of

families feel like they provide input to Audubon, and most families would like to see behaviors addressed, as well as more math support.

EDI Insight survey shows the lowest domains are diversity, equity and inclusion, and retention strategies. The highest domains are in leadership and instructional planning for student growth. Even with these domains as the lowest, Audubon was higher than the district average in all areas. We will continue to focus on these areas through conversations, observations, as well as providing leadership opportunities.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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