

Orange County Public Schools

Audubon Park School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Audubon Park School

1500 FALCON DR, Orlando, FL 32803

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

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 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, 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
Fritz, Jason	Principal	<p>The Principal provides a common vision and direction for Audubon Park School aligned with the district's vision, placing student success at the forefront. Progress monitoring data and teacher observations are used to inform the decision making process. The Principal works with the team to ensure the School Improvement Plan is being implemented, monitored and updated as needed throughout the school year to ensure student achievement. As the leader of the team, he monitors all aspects of the school including but not limited to: student achievement; social and emotional well being; high quality teams; climate and safety; efficient operations and an engaged community.</p>
Dawkins, Machael	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal works to support the vision and mission of Audubon Park School. They analyze behavioral and academic data to determine areas of focus. They work with faculty and staff to ensure student achievement and provide professional development to staff to support student success. In addition, these individuals monitor the safety and security of the school environment for students, staff, and the community.</p>
King, Teresa	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal works to support the vision and mission of Audubon Park School. They analyze behavioral and academic data to determine areas of focus. They work with faculty and staff to ensure student achievement and provide professional development to staff to support student success. In addition, these individuals monitor the safety and security of the school environment for students, staff, and the community.</p>
Long, Penny	Instructional Coach	<p>The instructional coach provides content area support across grade levels. They work with the department members as they plan and deliver standards-based instruction focusing on the cognitive demands of the standards. The coach is a member of the MTSS team and participates in the process as they assist teachers and the team to develop appropriate intervention plans based on available data. They also assist in ensuring that progress monitoring is conducted on a regular basis in all content areas. These staff members may provide academic support directly to students in the form of intervention and remediation with the intention of increasing student academic success.</p>

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.

The school leadership team reviews the data then meets with grade level leads and other members of the MTSS team in order to determine goals for the school year. Multiple data points are reviewed in order to determine student needs and appropriate actions. The School Improvement plan is shared with the School Advisory Committee; The SAC is made up of parents, faculty and students from our student government. The School Advisory Committee will review the School Improvement plan and use to guide their work through out the school year. Once the SIP is finalized, it will shared again with all stakeholders for monitoring and updates.

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 leadership team will monitor the school improvement plan using multiple points of data including progress monitoring data from FAST PM's for ELA and Math in 3-8 grade levels, Exact path for ELA in grade 3-5, Success maker for math in grades 3-5, Reading Plus for level 1 middle school aged students, DIEBELS for k-1, behavioral data and data from intervention groups. Teachers will also provide input to leadership team through data collected from formative assessments in class. As data is gathered, the leadership team will review data and discuss with instructional staff before making adjustments to the School Improvement Plan.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	37%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	24%
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) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) 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: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A
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	0	0	2	0	0	2	5	3	5	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4	15
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	14	11	14	12	16	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	8	5	22	8	3	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	14	11	14	12	16	76

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	0	2	0	0	2	7	8	9	28

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

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	0	0	1	2	4	3	8	8	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	3	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	15	9	14	13	16	73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	15	15	14	13	11	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	6	15	9	14	13	16	73

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	0	0	1	2	8	8	11	11	41

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	0	0	1	2	4	3	8	8	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	3	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	15	9	14	13	16	73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	15	15	14	13	11	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	6	15	9	14	13	16	73

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	0	0	1	2	8	8	11	11	41

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	76	56	53	78	57	55	77		
ELA Learning Gains				66			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			48		
Math Achievement*	82	59	55	78	41	42	74		
Math Learning Gains				76			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			51		
Science Achievement*	80	56	52	74	57	54	73		
Social Studies Achievement*	90	68	68	89	63	59	80		
Middle School Acceleration	81	74	70	78	52	51	82		
Graduation Rate		82	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		46	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	71	55	55		73	70	67		

* 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	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	563
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	653
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	48			
ELL	76			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	54			
HSP	76			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	88			

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%
FRL	62			

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	48			
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	50			
HSP	63			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	57			

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	76			82			80	90	81			71
SWD	43			53			53	56			5	
ELL	74			74			85				4	71
AMI												
ASN	79			82			100				3	
BLK	38			52			38	86			4	
HSP	72			75			76	74	69		7	72
MUL	76			92			86				4	

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
PAC												
WHT	83			88			86	95	86		6	
FRL	52			60			57	79	60		7	71

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	78	66	54	78	76	60	74	89	78			
SWD	41	55	42	37	53	38	38	78				
ELL	67	57	42	66	73	58						
AMI												
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							
PAC												
WHT	87	68	61	87	78	61	84	94	84			
FRL	59	55	45	53	64	52	48	73	61			

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	77	69	48	74	66	51	73	80	82			67
SWD	44	44	30	41	45	29	36					
ELL	58	61	53	58	71	67						67
AMI												
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					
PAC												
WHT	84	73	59	82	70	50	78	83	83			
FRL	59	50	35	52	51	51	56	62	73			73

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	76%	54%	22%	54%	22%
07	2023 - Spring	71%	45%	26%	47%	24%
08	2023 - Spring	66%	46%	20%	47%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	60%	22%	58%	24%
06	2023 - Spring	74%	44%	30%	47%	27%
03	2023 - Spring	80%	52%	28%	50%	30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	82%	53%	29%	54%	28%
07	2023 - Spring	70%	38%	32%	48%	22%
03	2023 - Spring	86%	59%	27%	59%	27%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	62%	24%	61%	25%
08	2023 - Spring	90%	58%	32%	55%	35%
05	2023 - Spring	68%	55%	13%	55%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	68%	50%	18%	44%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	87%	59%	28%	51%	36%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	47%	52%	50%	49%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	45%	55%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	63%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	61%	29%	66%	24%

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.

Across all grade levels, Reading scores decreased by 3% on statewide assessment from 78% the previous school year to 75%. The middle school grades had the lowest scores on the FAST Reading test with 6th scoring 74%, 7th scoring 72% and 8th scoring 66% proficient. Trends for decline in the overall reading proficiency score could be a school-wide focus on math and science for the 2022-2023 school year and the the implementation of the new standards for ELA. In middle school, we could be still experiencing some delays in reading skills from covid. Our current 7th grade students were the students who were in 2nd and 3rd grade during the onset of the covid and completed 2nd grade at home and started their 3rd grade year possible from home.

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

The overall ELA data component showed the greatest decline from 78% in 2022 to 75% in 2023. If we look at the ELA data by the grade levels, ELA data in the middle school grades is lagging behind the elementary school levels. The lagging middle school reading scores could be explained by the time scheduled for reading instruction and the intricate schedule of interventions to ensure students success in elementary school grade levels. Students who were at home during the pandemic are now in middle school and might be missing some fundamental skills. (8th in 4th during 2020 school)

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.

This section will be updated when state releases data.

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

Our overall Math scores showed the most improvement from 78% proficient to 82% proficient. Students in elementary grades received additional support for math in interventions groups. Students in middle school were placed in math courses based on data from previous year ensuring appropriate placement helping to ensure students success.

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

From the EWS data, two area of the most concern are the:

- Students identified as having a substantial reading deficiency as defined by by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.
- Reading proficiency for students in our subgroups.

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

- Improve student achievement in reading across the grade levels
- Improve student achievement in reading with a special focus on the middle school grades (6th- 8th)
- Improve student achievement in reading among our bottom 25% and subgroups.
- Improve student achievement on the 8th Statewide Science test
- Provide additional support for reading in the 3rd grade

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 ELA

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.

ELA reading scores are lagging in middle school reading as measured by the FAST test in May 2023. English Language Arts and Reading teachers will focus on implementing standards aligned instruction and use of high effect instructional practices in order to ensure student achievement as measured by FAST test.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency will increase in the middle school grades from 70% to 75% and overall school proficiency from 75% to 80%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur by grade level teams and the leadership using several different data points. Grade level teams, the leadership team and the MTSS team will monitor data on a regular basis in order to make necessary adjustments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net)

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.)

Grade level teams and the leadership teams will meet on a regular basis to review data and implement effective instructional strategies. The leadership team and the MTSS team will monitor system of interventions being used to ensure student achievement among our subgroups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of effective instructional strategies school-wide will provide a basis for all students to receive standards aligned instruction. The system of interventions and enrichment helps to provide students with more individualized instruction based on their needs ensure all students are able to be successful.

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.

Data analysis for instructional planning- use of small group instruction or whole review

Person Responsible: Machael Dawkins (machael.dawkins@ocps.net)

By When: Regular basis

Walkthroughs and Observations

Person Responsible: Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net)

By When: Regular basis

System of interventions and enrichment

Person Responsible: Machael Dawkins (machael.dawkins@ocps.net)

By When: Reoccurring

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Teacher retention and recruitment is current issue impacting all schools. With the two new members to the administration team at APS it is particularly important to maintain our current positive school culture to ensure retention of current staff members.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on our practices, APS administration hopes to maintain all instructional staff and maintain current staff scores based on the staff surveys.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will monitor input from FAC committee and grade level leads. We will also compare the staff survey in March with data from the staff survey from last year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net)

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.)

Leadership team will meet regularly to discuss input from FAC to come to solutions for teacher concerns. During this time, we discuss ways to support teachers with students discipline and ways for teachers to collaborate among grade levels for added support (PLC's).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers and Staff are positive and more productive when they feel valued and their inputs in school decisions is heard and considered.

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.

Monitor culture of the faculty and staff through interactions, meetings, and surveys.

Person Responsible: Teresa King (teresa.patterson2@ocps.net)

By When: Regularly

Meet regularly with leadership team to provide discuss discipline concerns and ways to support teachers.

Person Responsible: Teresa King (teresa.patterson2@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly- ongoing

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No