

Orange County Public Schools

Audubon Park School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Audubon Park School

1500 FALCON DR, Orlando, FL 32803

<https://audubonparkk8.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Jason Fritz

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	24%
2021-22 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (73%) 2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: No Grade
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	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Audubon Park School

1500 FALCON DR, Orlando, FL 32803

<https://audubonparkk8.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	No	24%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Honohan, Trevor	Principal	To lead the school to ultimate success. To serve the needs of the students, parents, staff members and the community.
Dawkins, Machael	Assistant Principal	To lead the school to ultimate success. To serve the needs of the students, parents, staff members and the community.
Long, Penny	Instructional Coach	Works with teachers to improve the quality of their lessons and the quality of students' education. To serve as mentor and role model, helping teachers stay current with OCPS guidelines, use the latest instructional best practices, and technologies in their classrooms.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/1/2018, Jason Fritz

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

7

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

82

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,111

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	92	119	139	138	118	127	119	136	127	0	0	0	0	1115
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	8	8	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	15	9	14	13	16	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	15	15	14	13	11	0	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	6	15	9	14	13	16	0	0	0	0	73

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	2	8	8	11	11	0	0	0	41

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/21/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	100	119	107	106	96	114	119	122	129	0	0	0	0	1012
Attendance below 90 percent	1	5	8	5	3	2	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	4	2	4	6	15	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	1	1	6	9	19	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	10	9	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	11	8	0	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	2	1	4	9	9	18	0	0	0	0	43

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	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	78%	57%	55%				80%	62%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						63%	60%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						52%	55%	54%
Math Achievement	78%	41%	42%				84%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	76%						77%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						65%	54%	52%
Science Achievement	74%	57%	54%				78%	56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	89%	63%	59%				91%	74%	78%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	82%	55%	27%	58%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	81%	57%	24%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	77%	54%	23%	56%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
06	2022					
	2019	79%	52%	27%	54%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
07	2022					
	2019	77%	48%	29%	52%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
08	2022					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	80%	62%	18%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	81%	63%	18%	64%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2022					
	2019	79%	57%	22%	60%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
06	2022					
	2019	65%	43%	22%	55%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
07	2022					
	2019	89%	49%	40%	54%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
08	2022					
	2019	59%	36%	23%	46%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	81%	54%	27%	53%	28%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	65%	49%	16%	48%	17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	91%	66%	25%	71%	20%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	99%	63%	36%	61%	38%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	96%	53%	43%	57%	39%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	41	55	42	37	53	38	38	78			
ELL	67	57	42	66	73	58					
ASN	93	80		89	86						
BLK	49	55	48	46	61	45	47				
HSP	61	62	43	61	73	68	63	78	59		
MUL	77	63		88	86						
WHT	87	68	61	87	78	61	84	94	84		
FRL	59	55	45	53	64	52	48	73	61		
2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	44	44	30	41	45	29	36				
ELL	58	61	53	58	71	67					
ASN	90	100		80	78		75				
BLK	56	50	31	49	43	41	42	76			
HSP	62	53	31	60	62	58	68	68	75		
MUL	81	74		81	74		70				
WHT	84	73	59	82	70	50	78	83	83		
FRL	59	50	35	52	51	51	56	62	73		
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	36	36	38	40	49	48	31	67			
ELL	39	52	56	79	72						
ASN	81	63		90	75						
BLK	53	41	31	63	52	56	45				
HSP	67	63	61	76	83	71	64	86			
MUL	68	43		73	57						
WHT	86	66	56	88	80	67	84	96	95		
FRL	64	55	45	69	60	50	60	82	88		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	653

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	87
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	50
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	63
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	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	78
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Students in K-5 continue to progress at a slower rate based on the iReady progress monitoring data in reading than the previous school year. This was discovered after a comparison review of the iReady BOY, MOY, and EOY diagnostic data. Early comparison of the BOY and MOY data allowed teachers to make decisions about students in specific small groups in order to see the progression continue.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

While there was some improvement in the 2022 iReady reading scores, our greatest need is currently fifth grade reading. The iReady BOY of 31% did increase on the EOY to 46%. These scores indicate there is still work to be done in this grade level.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

During the 2022 school year, some students were still experiencing the effects of COVID and less families were willing to participate in summer tutoring.

In August, teachers will offer specialized small group instruction (fluid grouping) focusing on the following skills: phonemic awareness, phonics, sight words, vocabulary, comprehension - literature and comprehension - informational skills.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Progress monitoring data shows kindergarten has the most growth with a 20% BOY and 90% EOY comparison scores.

Middle School Math scores continue to excel. Seventh grade advanced Math, Algebra and Geometry data shows

that Math instruction in the intermediate grades is assisting the middle school Math teachers as they offer rigorous high school courses to middle school students.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our focused intervention support and ability grouping were the contributing factors to kindergarten growth this school year.

We added an intensive Math block which was made available to students who needed an extra period for practice and/or remedial instruction. We also have additional Math instructional support for students during school.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

During the last 4-6 weeks of the school year, intermediate teachers expose rising middle school students to content they will encounter in their advanced Math courses.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Continued use of IXL Math will be used to assist students in Math acceleration. It provides students with the added practice and ability to move at their own pace. Our in house IXL trainer/coordinator will offer PD opportunities during pre planning and data breakdown sessions with teachers throughout the school year as needed.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional support will be provided to students in the form of pull out or push in remediation or enrichment. Specific staff members have been hired and assigned to these roles. This will allow for sustainability and academic growth for years to come.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The focus was identified based on our iReady progress monitoring data and FSA level 1 and 2 scores. These are new educational standards for language arts designed to replace the standards based on Common Core. It will be critical that teachers have the instructional support, knowledge of standards, and resources needed to prioritize best instructional practices of reading and writing.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will use STAR to measure students growth during the school year. In grades 3-8, we will use the F.A.S.T. screening and progress monitoring tool to measure student growth and identify performance areas of need. With this tool, we expect to see at least a 5% increase in Reading scores from beginning to end of the academic year.

Monitoring:

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

Primary teachers will provide focused ELA instruction and use the ESGI progress monitoring tool to capture individual student data. They will take instructional decisions that impact small group instruction. (3-5 teachers will continue to use F.A.S.T. as their monitoring tool)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Penny Long (penny.long@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Orton Gillingham strategies, when implemented properly, provide primary readers with the skills needed to read and comprehend. Intermediate teachers will use Guided Reading strategies to build comprehension and vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our primary readers deserve the opportunity to accelerate their reading skills beyond the 1st grade standards. This approach will afford them the opportunity.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Guided Reading strategies will expose our intermediate students to reading comprehension strategies that increase understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

A review of our Fifth and Eighth Grade NGSSS Science revealed 84% of Fifth Grade students scored a level 3 or above leaving 16% at a level 2 or below and 65% of Eighth Graders scored a level 3 or higher. Leaving 35% of our Eighth Grade students scoring a level 2 or below. Based on the District school grading system, Science is 1/7 of our total school grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In an effort to increase student achievement in Science, we will monitor and add additional science instructional support to increase the number of students scoring a level 3 or above by 10% on the 2022-2023 NGSSS Science assessment in each grade level.

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

We will use the following programs to monitor science instruction:
Study Island-5th Grade
IXL- 5th-8th Grade
Performance Matters Assessments - Fifth and Eighth Grade
Common Assessments - Fifth and Eighth Grade

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Machael Dawkins (machael.dawkins@ocps.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Use diagnostic tools and multiple choice assessment items related to the scientific concepts to explore students' prior knowledge and understanding as they progress through units of study

Share and discuss students' responses with them and probe their ideas further to encourage them to construct explanations about their answers.

Choose 1-2 inquiry-based activities that are relevant to the current topic.

Conduct the activity and engage students in using the scientific models to explain, predict, and solve problems.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

These instructional strategies were chosen to promote conceptual change in student thinking, problem-solving, and understanding of Science concepts.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The Audubon Park School K8 invests valuable time and energy to ensure a positive school culture and environment. The School Advisory Council discusses survey results related to the matter. Recommendations are made and support by the committee is provided when action is needed to be taken. The school has also created a very unique Anti-Racism group. Staff members voluntarily meet multiple times per year to discuss uncomfortable and challenging topics. The discussion is led by a local college professor who is also a school stakeholder. In addition, the culture of the school is largely influenced by the school administration. At the APSK8 the admin. team treats everyone with tremendous respect and goes above and beyond to serve the staff so that they may have a positive impact on all. Our SAFE coordinator and middle school guidance counselor will meet with middle school students as needed to address their social and emotional needs.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

The Audubon Park School K8 has a dynamic group of stakeholders. This consists of a dedicated school staff who are dynamic and highly effective when it comes to building positivity. In addition, the School Advisory Council, the PTSA and the Falcon Fund all take part in carving out a truly positive culture and environment. It is important to note that the Falcon Fund is a group of stakeholders that meet regularly to plan events and fundraisers that lead to culture enhancement and an overall positive environment for all. SAFE coordinator and middle school guidance counselor will meet with middle school students as needed to address their social and emotional needs.