Audubon Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Audubon Elementary School

1201 N BANANA RIVER DR, Merritt Island, FL 32952

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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. (Last reviewed during preplanning 08-22)

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
Slaughter, Lauren	Reading 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.
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.
Dunegan, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the Title 1 team, Mrs. Dunegan is responsible for following all district and federal guidelines regarding Title 1 funding. She completes and submits routine required paperwork for compliance. Mrs. Dunegan 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.
Wessinger, Megan	School Counselor	As the guidance counselor, Miss Wessinger 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 Wessinger serves as the point of contact for our ELL student population and monitors attendance for students of concern.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

In an effort to keep alignment with the Brevard Public Schools Strategic Plan, various stakeholders were involved in the development, review, and communication of the School Improvement Plan. Specific focus was given to alignment of the District Strategic Plan goals in Elementary Leading and Learning with a focus on providing equitable supports for every student. The process begins with administration and teachers working collaboratively to analyze student and staff survey data and statewide assessment data. All input for improvement is taken into consideration and a first draft is created and shared with the Audubon Leadership Team. The SIP draft is then communicated with the entire faculty for input and feedback. Once input is gathered and the plan is modified, it is taken to the School Advisory Council for final approval. The final plan is then presented to the faculty, seeks Board approval, and uploaded onto the school's website. Goals from the School Improvement Plan are shared in the monthly schoolwide newsletter and weekly staff newsletter. The SIP is a working document and is revisited by all stakeholders during monthly SAC meetings, faculty meetings and Audubon Leadership Team Meetings.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP is continuously reviewed and modified throughout the year to meet the needs of the school. The SIP is a working document and is revisited by all stakeholders during monthly SAC meetings, faculty meetings and Audubon Leadership Team Meetings. As progress towards schoolwide goals is monitored, changes in practices are implemented as necessary to meet the needs of all learners and ensure SIP goals are met.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	96%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	9	17	9	13	8	6	14	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	7	5	4	6	0	0	26
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	10	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	15	10	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	0	5	6	4	7	0	0	25

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	15	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	4

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	16	18	6	13	20	8	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	7	10	1	2	3	12	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	15	13	11	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	18	12	22	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	14	7	9	9	11	13	0	0	83

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	5	3	14	15	18	0	0	59

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	15	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	3

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	16	18	6	13	20	8	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	7	10	1	2	3	12	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	15	13	11	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	18	12	22	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	14	7	9	9	11	13	0	0	83

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	5	3	14	15	18	0	0	59

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	15	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	3

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	56	58	53	59	61	56	56		
ELA Learning Gains				62			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			37		
Math Achievement*	57	58	59	64	49	50	56		
Math Learning Gains				67			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			31		
Science Achievement*	58	58	54	51	60	59	68		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	46	54	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	277
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	426
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	1	
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	9	Yes	1	1
HSP	62			
MUL	68			
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	62			
FRL	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	59			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	56			57			58					46
SWD	35			37			33				3	
ELL	27			36							3	46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18			0							2	
HSP	62			62							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	58			77							2	
PAC												
WHT	59			58			60				4	
FRL	48			46			53				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	59	62	59	64	67	64	51					
SWD	28	45	50	32	50	56	33					
ELL	23			50	80							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20	42		36	73							
HSP	54	70		59	55		58					
MUL	73	88		74	88							
PAC												
WHT	65	60	60	67	65	57	52					
FRL	45	58	62	47	60	59	37					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	56	50	37	56	56	31	68					
SWD	22	25	25	27	48	29	20					
ELL	30			20								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	25		48	58							
HSP	72			64								
MUL	42	40		44	70							
PAC												
WHT	61	55	50	59	58	27	73					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
FRL	41	39	27	43	50	31	64					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	59%	-1%	54%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	61%	-10%	58%	-7%
06	2023 - Spring	63%	61%	2%	47%	16%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	56%	2%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	63%	67%	-4%	54%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	66%	60%	6%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	61%	-7%	61%	-7%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	55%	-2%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	55%	57%	-2%	51%	4%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

ELA: Fourth grade showed the lowest performance in the 22-23 school year on the FAST assessment. Fourth grade was at 51% level three and above, falling short of the district average of 61% and the state average of 58%. Both fourth and fifth grade were at 51% proficiency on the final iReady diagnostic. Since FAST was new in the 22-23 school year, much of our focus was on reaching proficiency and ensuring our tier 1 instruction was focused on the rigor of the standards. While focusing on tier 1, it was evident that two of our ESSA subgroups were falling short of the expectations. Our Students with Disabilities (SWD) did not have any grade level scoring 50% or higher on the final iReady diagnostic, and of our African American population, only our first graders were above the 50th percentile on the final iReady diagnostic. In addition to the decrease in our ESSA subgroups, the current fifth grade cohort will remain a focus for the 23-24 school year. This cohort put us into RAISE status while in third grade and they continue to show low performance in ELA FAST and iReady testing.
Math: Fourth and Fifth grade fell below the district and state average in math with fourth grade scoring at 54% proficiency and fifth grade at 53% proficiency. There were some inconsistencies in the final iReady diagnostic which showed fourth grade at 65% proficiency and 63% proficiency for fifth grade.
Science showed a 4 point increase moving from 51% to 55% proficiency. This is above the state average, but below the district average of 57%.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is math proficiency. On the 21-22 FSA state test, Audubon was at 64% proficiency and on the 22-23 FAST state test, Audubon was at 59% proficiency. This was a new test last school year, and was also completed on the computer. We also implemented a new math curriculum during the 22-23 school year that teachers were learning to implement. While focusing on the curriculum, the implementation of small groups to support differentiated instruction was also not implemented with fidelity.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was our fourth grade math. Audubon had 54% proficiency compared to the state at 61%. This was also a decline from the previous school year in which our fourth grade proficiency was 62% and above the state average of 61%. There was a difference in the iReady outcome on the final diagnostic for the fourth grade which showed a 65% proficiency level. The cohort group that took the 22-23 FAST test was also the group that struggled in the area of ELA and placed Audubon into RAISE status. This may have contributed to the lower proficiency with reading and comprehending some of the word problems.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was decreasing our Level 1s from 21-22 to 22-23 school year. Audubon dropped the number of level 1 students significantly in both math and reading. We had 36 fewer students in ELA and 49 fewer students in math scoring a Level 1.
Since we knew that the new state test would not include the lowest 25% student population, nor have a learning gain for the 22-23 school year, Audubon focused on developing a strong Tier 1 and focused on bubble students who needed additional support to reach proficiency. While we did see good results using this strategy, we quickly determined that our two ESSA subgroups of students with disabilities and African Americans dropped significantly from the year prior.

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

In reflecting on the EWS data, Audubon will continue to focus on its lowest 25% to help support continuing to decrease our level 1 students in both reading and math. Schoolwide attendance also needs to be an area of focus. The number of students who were out for quarantine made it very difficult to maintain good attendance rates. The district is sending out automatic attendance warning letters, and daily call outs for students who are absent, but as a school, we are also monitoring attendance and working through the truancy process if it is needed.

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

In the upcoming school year, Audubon will focus on increasing math proficiency in fourth and sixth grades. Both grades decreased in the overall proficiency from the previous year. These same two grade levels also decreased in the ELA proficiency, with fourth grade falling below the district and state proficiency.
Science will continue to be a focus to be able to meet or exceed the district average of 57%.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

2022-2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Math results indicate that 59% of Audubon students scored proficiency (as indicated by a Level 3 or higher). This is a decrease of 2% from the 2021-2022 school year. While both third and fifth grades showed an increase from the previous year, fourth grade remained unchanged and sixth grade showed a 7% decrease from the 2021-2022 school year.

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

On the 2023-2024 Math FAST, 66% of Audubon students in grades 3-6 will achieve proficiency as evidenced by a score of Level 3 or above. Third grade proficiency will improve from 66% in 2023 to 70%, fourth grade will improve from 54% in to 63%, fifth grade will improve from 53% to 62%, and sixth grade will improve
from 63% to 67%.

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

FAST progress monitoring with be used to monitor math proficiency throughout the 3 PM windows. Additionally, iReady Math Diagnostic data will also be used to monitor math proficiency and inform instruction. Teachers will continue to use formative assessments to monitor understanding daily and drive instruction in each classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jaime Slentz (slentz.jaime@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Standards-aligned instruction
Student engagement
Differentiated small group instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student engagement through standards-aligned instruction can be seen as the glue that holds together all aspects of student learning and growth. Not only does student engagement make teaching itself more fun and rewarding, but it has been shown to have critical impacts on students. When students display high levels of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement, they are more likely to excel academically, form a stronger sense of connection with their school, and have a more positive sense of social-emotional well-being. Furthermore, by providing relevant and engaging tasks within a small group differentiated setting, instruction will target those students and their specific skill deficit areas.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Teachers will engage in professional development to learn about strategies of engagement and how these are woven into the scope and sequence of the district's adopted Reveal and EdGems curriculum. Ongoing book studies read by Audubon's Leadership team will highlight best practices that will be incorporated into classrooms to reach all learners.

Person Responsible: Gina Loggins (loggins.gina@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 2023-May 2024

Teachers will engage in collaborative planning sessions and support sessions with school-based Title 1 instructional coach(T) and district math coach.

Person Responsible: Gina Loggins (loggins.gina@brevardschools.org)

By When: September - May 2024.

Teachers will provide exit slips at the conclusion of each lesson to determine level of proficiency of the focus standard(s) and follow up with a reteaching lesson for identified students.

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

By When: August 2023-May 2024

Small group instruction with hands on math manipulatives when needed (T) will take place daily within the dedicated 90 minute math block. Teachers will utilize chapter and unit tests, exit tickets, iReady Diagnostic, and FAST assessment data to identify trends to reteach in small group.

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

By When: August 2023-May 2023

ASP funds will be used to support math instruction during the school day. This certified teacher will pull small groups within the classroom to reteach and reassess with all students who show the need based on current skills/topics of study.

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

By When: October 2023-April 2024

Audubon will hold Parent and Family Engagement Math Night created to facilitate parent involvement and support for their child in math at home. (T)

Person Responsible: Gina Loggins (loggins.gina@brevardschools.org)

By When: November 2023

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

If we provide rigorous, standards-aligned instruction that engages all learners, along with targeted remediation to our students with disabilities, then student academic growth and proficiency will increase. This is aligned with Brevard Public Schools Strategic Plan goal 1 which focuses on academic excellence. The objectives outlined within this goal state that school leadership will ensure every student has daily engagement with complex, grade appropriate curriculum; ensure every student is taught by certified, skilled teachers who hold high expectations for all learners; and ensure equitable services and interventions through a multi-tiered framework for every student's social, emotional, and behavioral development. The students with disabilities subgroup according to ESSA was 42% for school year 2022, which is just above the threshold of 41%. When analyzing this ESSA subgroup data further, only 28% of our students with disabilities (SWD) demonstrated proficiency (based on a Level 3 or higher) with grade level standards in reading on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment. While this was an increase of 6% from the 2021 school year, this shows a continued need as a dedicated area of focus. Math proficiency for school year 2022 was slightly higher for the SWD subgroup at 32%, up from 27% in 2021. Likewise, only 33% of Audubon's SWD students demonstrated proficiency on the Statewide Science Assessment.

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

Based off the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) to be administered in May 2024, the subgroup of Students with Disabilities at Audubon will show an overall increase of 5% (from 42% in 2022 to 47% in 2024).

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

Data will be analyzed and shared during monthly data chat meetings that target ELA and Math achievement and learning gains. Subgroup data will also be analyzed to ensure that students with disabilities are making adequate progress. Interventions and small group support will be implemented with fidelity 5 days a week to target students' specific skill deficits. Administrative classroom walkthroughs will ensure that implementation of standards-based instruction and student engagement is occurring with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Candace Jones (jones.candace@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

a. Subject area teachers will participate and engage in ongoing professional development focused on student engagement.
b. Computer-adaptive programs will be utilized to identify specific skill deficits and inform small group instruction to be implemented daily in all academic blocks.
c. A daily, dedicated walk to intervention model will be used schoolwide to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to those students identified by Brevard Public Schools Decision Tree as working below or significantly below grade level. Tier 1 core instruction will be monitored with daily administrative walkthroughs to ensure adherence to adopted curriculum and alignment of grade level Benchmarks/ Standards.
d. Monthly data chat meetings will analyze school, grade level, and individual student trends and inform the MTSS process. Students with Disabilities who are not showing adequate growth towards goals and

grade level proficiency will necessitate an IEP meeting to address concerns and make changes to allow for student success.

e. After School Program (ASP) funds will be used to hire a certified teacher to pull small groups and provide push-in support to students who have been identified as working below grade level and fall into the SWD subgroup.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

a. As teachers are provided with the strategies and skills necessary to provide engaging and rigorous content, student growth and proficiency will increase.

b. Programs such as iReady, Imagine Learning, PENDA, and MobyMax are adaptive to the individual needs of each student and help teachers to differentiate instruction based on these individual student deficit areas.

c. Response to Intervention (RtI) is a preventive approach that aims to identify struggling students before they fall too far behind their peers. One basic premise of the RTI approach is that classroom instruction should be high quality; therefore, ineffective instruction can be ruled out as the reason for inadequate academic performance. High-quality instruction involves the effective use of curriculum and instructional procedures that have been validated through rigorous research. In the MTSS process, struggling students' skills are monitored to determine whether they show adequate growth following the implementation of high-quality instruction. Students who do not respond adequately to research-validated instruction in the general education classroom are provided with increasingly intensive and validated interventions. Students' progress in skill areas of concern is monitored frequently and the data collected inform subsequent decisions about whether a student is either appropriately responsive or still needing more intensive instruction.

d. Ongoing data analysis helps teachers understand their students' learning abilities and challenges, and facilitates an ingrained cultural process that uses detailed inputs (information) to ensure optimal outputs (results for students).

e. ASP provides extended learning opportunities for remediation in a small group setting targeted to pre-identified areas in need of additional support and/or instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

a. School Leadership Team will plan professional development for teachers that focus on student engagement while meeting the rigorous standards/Benchmarks of grade level content. This will include selecting staff to attend district level High Level Practice (HLP) training to support the needs of all students.

b. Book studies of "Building Thinking Classrooms in Mathematics" and "The Wild Card" will take place schoolwide and with the Leadership Team as we work to implement high-yield strategies within each classroom.

c. A team of teachers will attend Kagan training and bring information and materials (T) back to Audubon to share in early release professional development days.

Person Responsible: Candace Jones (jones.candace@brevardschools.org)

By When: All professional development for the 2023-2024 school year will be planned by October 2023.

1-1 student to device ratio will allow all students to utilize adaptive technology in all academic content areas.
a. Provide teachers with professional development to ensure appropriate use of adaptive technology.
b. Teachers will analyze student data from adaptive technology use to provide differentiation in small groups and inform the MTSS process. Students with Disabilities who are working below grade level will be provided multiple opportunities for remediation and support.

Person Responsible: Wendy Dunegan (dunegan.wendy@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 2023-May 2024

a. All staff will support in daily interventions during a dedicated time frame. Reading endorsed teachers (T) will be prioritized to implement Tier 3 interventions as required by state statute.
b. Monthly MTSS meetings (T) will analyze ongoing assessment data to make subsequent decisions regarding evidence-based interventions and more intensive instruction.
c. Administrative walkthroughs will take place weekly to ensure fidelity to the Response to Intervention framework.

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

By When: September 2023-May 2024

a. Ongoing progress monitoring will be measured through MTSS intervention progress monitoring data, iReady diagnostic data, and PM 2 / PM 3 FAST data.
b. Monthly data chats (T) will require teachers to dig deep into student data to identify grade level, classroom, and individual student skill gaps while planning for small group, ASP support, and interventions.

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

By When: September 2023-May 2024

Audubon will hire a certified teacher during the school day to support small group instruction in remedial skills and push-in support to classrooms. This individual will work in tandem with the general education teacher to reteach, assess, and provide feedback for improved academics.

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

By When: November 2023-May 2024

Audubon will hold Parent and Family Engagement Literacy Based Trunk or Read and Literacy Nights created to facilitate parent involvement and support for their child in reading at home. (T)

Person Responsible: Gina Loggins (loggins.gina@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 2023-February 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Although Audubon increased its overall science proficiency by 6% from 49% in 2021-2022 to 55% in 2022-2023 on the Science Standardized Assessment, this is below the district average of 57%.

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

On the 2023-2024 Science Standardized Assessment, Audubon will increase its 5th grade science proficiency from 55% to 65%.

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

Ongoing progress monitoring to include weekly PENDA lessons, unit tests and Science Review Parts 1 and 2 will be administered and analyzed to inform instruction. On the 2023-2024 Grade 5 Review Part 1 administered at the beginning of the school year, the average score was a 58%. 25% of the students showed mastery of tested standards, with 75% of students yet to show proficiency. Performance Matters identifies those standards in which additional instruction is needed and remediation will occur.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jaime Slentz (slentz.jaime@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Audubon will use PENDA Science in grades 3-6 to ensure that the standards are being taught with fidelity while holding teachers accountable for providing quality instruction in Science.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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. Penda employs Webb's Depth of Knowledge to expand students' skill sets and offer new challenges, creating new pathways in the brain. Penda's standards-aligned, differentiated activities support Tier 1 instruction and interventions for learners who require extra support. Its standards-aligned assessments and reports provide insightful data to guide instruction, monitor progress and target interventions within the MTSS framework.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Every student in grades 3 through 6 will complete a minimum of 30 minutes weekly within their PENDA pathway, as well as complete (and pass with 80% accuracy) assigned lessons that correspond with the Scope and Sequence of the BPS science curriculum. Teachers will submit usage reports weekly to

administration to ensure fidelity to the program. Teachers and students will access Discovery Education (T) for resources and curriculum to support the science curriculum.

Person Responsible: Wendy Dunegan (dunegan.wendy@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

Teachers will attend ongoing professional development in the way of online trainings offered through PENDA. Each training focuses on a different aspect of the program and how to best utilize it to support academic growth in science.

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

By When: August 2023-May 2024

A science club for fourth and fifth grade students taught by a certified teacher will encourage students to attend either a morning help session or after school session, or both. The goal of this program is to reteach those SSA assessed standards that were taught in third and fourth grade as a review.

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

By When: September 2023-May 2024

A science club for fourth and fifth grade students taught by a certified teacher will encourage students to attend either a morning help session or after school session, or both. The goal of this program is to reteach those SSA assessed standards that were taught in third and fourth grade as a review.

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

By When: September 2023-May 2024

A monthly schoolwide PENDA Challenge has been created to recognize the top 10 student performers in the school and the top performing classes based on total points. Points are earned by completing lessons and earning a score of 80% or higher. The winning class per grade level each month will be awarded the Penda Panda trophy to keep for that month. The top 10 students will be awarded a fun STEAM activity utilizing science materials (T) to be completed alongside the Title 1 Science Coach(T).

Person Responsible: Wendy Dunegan (dunegan.wendy@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 2023-May 2024

Audubon will hold Parent and Family Engagement STEAM and Math Nights created to facilitate parent involvement and support for their child in math and science at home. (T)

Person Responsible: Gina Loggins (loggins.gina@brevardschools.org)

By When: November 2023-March 2024

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

*PM1 Percentages by grade of students who are in need of intervention:
Kindergarten: 36% (17 out of the 48 students tested as of 9/13/23)
First: 25% (14 out of the 57 students tested as of 9/13/23)
Second: 22% (9 out of 42 students tested as of 9/13/23)
*D3 iReady Data from 22-23 shows that we have an average of 27% of students in grades K-2 who are not on track to score grade level or above on the statewide ELA assessments and are scoring 1 or more grade levels below.
*KLS data for the 23-24 school year shows that 72% of students know their upper case, 57% know their lower case, and 31% know their sounds.
*22-23 PM3 data shows that 40% of kindergarteners scored below the 50th percentile
*22-23 PM3 data shows that 32% of first graders scored below the 50th percentile
*22-23 PM3 data shows that 22% of second graders scored below the 50th percentile

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

*PM1 Percentages of students who are scoring below a level 3
Third- 67%
Fourth- 68%
Fifth- 63%
Sixth- 53%
*PM3 data from 22-23 of students who are scoring a Level 1 or 2:
Third: 42%
Fourth: 49%
Fifth: 41%
Sixth: 36%
There are currently no grade levels that have 50% or more scoring below a level 3 based off of PM3 scores from the 2022-2023 school year.
*D1 iReady data from this year of students who are scoring 1 or more grade levels below:
Third- 27%
Fourth- 66%
Fifth- 63%
Sixth- 59%
*D3 iReady data from 22-23 shows that we have an average of 39% of students in grades 3-5 who are

not on track to score grade level or above on the statewide ELA assessment and are scoring 1 or more grade levels below

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Short Term PM1 to PM2 proficiency increases
Kindergarten: PM1 64% will increase to 74% proficiency
First Grade: PM1 75% will increase to 85% proficiency
Second Grade: PM1 78% will increase to 88% proficiency

Long Term Goal: By the Spring 2024 FAST assessment, less than 15% of students in grades K-2 will be in the "urgent intervention" or "intervention" category. We currently have an average of 34% of students in grades K-2 in those categories (Test scores as of 9/13/23)

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Short Term- PM1 to PM2 proficiency increases:
3rd Grade: PM1 33% will increase to 45% proficiency
4th Grade: PM1 32% will increase to 45% proficiency
5th Grade: PM1 37% will increase to 45% proficiency

Long Term- By the Spring 2024 FAST assessment, literacy achievement across the board in grades 3-5 will increase to 60%.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

*Continue the use of the Data wall using PM1, PM2, FAST and iReady D1 and D2 data to create differentiated small groups and identify students who need interventions
*Use groups identified during summer planning (focus on ESSA groups- African American and ESE) and utilize Title 1 staff and ASP funds to help target these instructional groups.
*Literacy Coach will work with ESE staff to increase targeted instruction of ELA goals
*iReady refresher training for teachers to pull lessons that focus on skills students need to work on.
*Walkthroughs with feedback using portions of the Literacy Walkthrough checklists.
*Benchmark Advance District Required quarterly assessments; this data will be used to drive instruction and help create small groups within Tier 1 instruction
*Planning Sessions; sessions will have a clear focus and will use the ELA Benchmark Advance Planning protocols, Daily Overviews, sequencing, B.E.S.T. spiral, grade level analysis sheets, and scaffolded

questions spiral, along with the Benchmark Curriculum, to ensure that teachers are planning a comprehensive 90 minute reading block that includes all components of literacy.
*Teachers will set goals during each planning session (examples include: differentiation, small group rotations, writing, increasing engagement, etc.) These goals will help the coach provide targeted mini PD's and know what to look for during walkthroughs.
*Intervention data; Intervention instruction to specifically target identified groups. The teachers and Coach will analyze OPM data and adjust interventions as needed according to OPMs, state assessments, and the decision trees. Tier 3 students will be instructed by a reading endorsed teacher.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Slaughter, Lauren, slaughter.lauren@brevardschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

*Explicit Instruction- introducing new information clearly/directly; modeling/demonstrating the use of new information; providing visual and auditory examples

*Systematic Instruction- a logical progression; a cumulative review that enables students to make connections; opportunities for students to practice previous content

*Scaffolded instruction- temporary; open ended questions, prompts, smaller steps, visual aids, examples, encouragement; gradual release

*Collaborative planning- to support consistent, high quality implementation of the Benchmark Advance curriculum, B.E.S.T benchmarks, iReady Magnetic Reading, and intervention materials (95%, UFLI, Barton, iReady, and more)

*iReady- the Universal Screener data will be used to start conversations and form groups within in the 90 minute reading block and intervention groups. Teachers will access the formative data from students pathways to differentiate instruction and scaffold supports.

*iReady Magnetic Reading Foundations- Using the science of reading, this program will complement Benchmark Advance and increase phonological awareness in our primary grades and lead to greater connections and comprehension of text.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All evidence-based practices/programs above address the identified need that is improving literacy achievement. The identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population** as they are:
B.E.S.T standards aligned
Aligned with the Brevard K-12 reading plan and can be found on Decision Trees
Meet with Florida's definition of evidenced based
Systematic and/or Explicit
Geared towards struggling readers and include an emphasis on Foundational Skills

**target population includes: students scoring a Level 1 or 2, students below the 50th percentile on iReady, and ESSA Subroups (African American and ESE)

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Planning- -Coach will continue to facilitate benchmark aligned planning with a focus on the current 5th grade cohort who originally put us in RAISE status. -Planning sessions will include: using the ELA Benchmark Advance Planning protocol checklists, daily overviews, sequencing, B.E.S.T spirals, scaffolded questions spiral, grade level analysis sheets, and Benchmark Advance Curriculum. -During planning sessions the coach will also ensure that teachers are updating their data in the required Data Collection tool that is housed on our school's Google Sharedrive. This data will help with planning of small groups during the 90 minute reading block.	Slaughter, Lauren, slaughter.lauren@brevardschools.org
Coaching and PD -The coach will have teachers set goals during each ELA planning session. These goals will allow the coach to provide more targeted PD and set a plan for observations/walkthroughs. -The coach will identify and plan for the supports that teachers will need before, during, and after a lesson -Maximize PD by infusing small chunks during grade level meetings -Identify teachers who need coaching. Follow the coaching cycle by modeling, co teaching, follow ups, and allowing teachers to observe other colleagues on campus. -Use PD provided by used curriculums such as UFLI, 95%, and Benchmark Advance to ensure teachers are using curriculum correctly and with fidelity. -Coach will attend all Literacy Coach Endorsement courses and bring back pertinent information and learned practices. -Coach and teachers from grades K-3 will attend HIITS grant classes in person and online to bring back theories of the Science of Reading to implement in the classroom and share with colleagues.	Slaughter, Lauren, slaughter.lauren@brevardschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be discussed, edited and revised as needed with the input of the Audubon SAC committee and school personnel. Once finalized, the SIP will be published to the Audubon Website at https://www.brevardschools.org/AudubonES. It will be listed on the homepage as well as under the About Us, Title 1 tab. Families will also be notified of the SIP through our monthly newsletter, The Eagles Express. The link to the SIP and its availability will be posted to the Audubon Facebook Page and the Audubon PTO Facebook Page. A printed copy of the SIP is available to families in the front office of Audubon. Translation of the SIP is available upon request.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Audubon Elementary is highly committed to involving families in the decisions that are made in the best interest of our students. Families provide input through surveys, given throughout the year and accessible through the school website, Facebook, and FOCUS, in an effort to plan and implement meaningful Family Engagement Activities at our school. Families are also invited to serve on our School Advisory Council to help in the development, the revision, and the implementation of the School-Family Compact for Learning, the School Improvement Plan, and the Parent and Family Engagement Plan. Family engagement events(T) will be held throughout the year and will be based on family input and school based needs. Each event will be designed with the intent of families taking information with them and continuing the learning process at home to help build academic achievement. Materials(T) will be provided during family engagement events in order to support social and academic learning at home. The school has a resource area in the Title 1 office where materials are available for check-out and for distribution for parents, students, and/or teachers. Ideas will also be posted on the school website and shared through social media throughout the year in an effort to assist families in working with their children at home.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Two full time Title 1 Teachers (T) will work in small groups of K-6th Tier 2 and Tier 3 students in reading, identified through ESSA subgroups and MTSS data team meetings, They will use a pull out model as well as push in to classrooms to work with these intervention groups. The Literacy Coach(T) and Math Coach(T) will provide support to K-6th grade teachers through the coaching cycle, meet regularly with grade level teams for planning of rigourous B.E.S.T standards based instruction, iReady data disaggregation, and assist with the MTSS process and intervention framework.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A