

Brevard Public Schools

Audubon Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Audubon Elementary School

1201 N BANANA RIVER DR, Merritt Island, FL 32952

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

Demographics

Principal: Eli Lea A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	<p>Black/African American Students</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged Students</p> <p>English Language Learners</p> <p>Hispanic Students</p> <p>Multiracial Students</p> <p>Students With Disabilities</p> <p>White Students</p>
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	<p>2017-18: C</p> <p>2016-17: B</p> <p>2015-16: B</p> <p>2014-15: A</p> <p>2013-14: A</p>
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To create a community of empowered life-long learners in an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust.

Provide the school's vision statement

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lea, Elia	Principal	As the principal, Mrs. Lea 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.
Cox, Maureen	Instructional Coach	As the instructional coach, Mrs. Cox coaches and supports school staff to design and improve instructional practices to ensure students' academic needs are met. As the MTSS facilitator, Mrs. Cox monitors common assessment data, including district purchased iReady, to support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.
Crawford, Karolyn	Teacher, ESE	As the leader of the ESE team, Mrs. Crawford participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional strategies into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers to co-teach while providing students with disabilities rigorous, standards-based instruction. Mrs. Crawford monitors the development and implementation of all IEPs to ensure compliance.
Loggins, Gina	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the Title 1 team, Mrs. Loggins is responsible for following all district and federal guidelines regarding Title 1 funding. She completes and submits routine required paperwork for compliance. Mrs. Loggins serves as the Science Lab Teacher for 4th and 5th grades on the activity wheel. Within this role, she administers and analyzes assessment data to identify gaps in student understanding and creates and implements instruction to review these science concepts. Mrs. Loggins is a member of the MTSS team, using research-based programs to provide small group interventions for students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups. She develops partnerships with parents as she organizes family engagement events that bridge the gap between home and school to support student learning.
Saltsman, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the Title 1 team, Mrs. Saltsman is responsible for following all district and federal guidelines regarding Title 1 funding. She completes and submits routine required paperwork for compliance. Mrs. Saltsman serves as the Science Lab Teacher for 4th and 5th grades on the activity wheel. Within this role, she administers and analyzes assessment data to

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		identify gaps in student understanding and creates and implements instruction to review these science concepts. Mrs. Saltsman is a member of the MTSS team, using research-based programs to provide small group interventions for students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups. She develops partnerships with parents as she organizes family engagement events that bridge the gap between home and school to support student learning.
Sutherland, Scott	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Sutherland works with teachers and students in an effort to improve academics with the implementation of Math and Reading interventions, mentor students that need additional support, and address grade level concerns by providing resources and/or mini-lessons.
Hastings, Kalie	Guidance Counselor	As the guidance counselor, Miss Hastings is responsible for the Social/Emotional program at Audubon, providing counseling to students individually and in the whole class setting. She works with all faculty to coordinate the IPST process, students with disabilities, and those with 504s. Miss Hastings serves as the point of contact for our ELL student population and monitors attendance for students of concern.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	66	76	64	66	59	73	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	499
Attendance below 90 percent	5	26	20	19	10	25	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	8	1	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	8	4	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	2	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on FSA Math	0	0	0	6	8	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	2	13	5	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	5	5	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

45

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/19/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	18	11	9	8	11	7	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	1	5	2	3	6	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	3	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	2	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	1	8	5	7	2	24	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%	62%	57%	59%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	60%	58%	53%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	57%	53%	34%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	55%	63%	63%	60%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	61%	65%	62%	49%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	53%	51%	26%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	52%	57%	53%	49%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	66 (0)	76 (0)	64 (0)	66 (0)	59 (0)	73 (0)	95 (0)	499 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 ()	26 ()	20 ()	19 ()	10 ()	25 ()	21 ()	126 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	2 (0)	2 (0)	8 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	7 (0)	25 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)	4 (0)	13 (0)	3 (0)	28 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (0)	2 (0)	10 (0)	16 (0)	38 (0)
Level 1 on FSA Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	8 (0)	13 (0)	18 (0)	45 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	64%	0%	58%	6%
	2018	61%	63%	-2%	57%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	61%	12%	58%	15%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	56%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	56%	60%	-4%	56%	0%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	58%	60%	-2%	54%	4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	64%	63%	1%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	56%	-3%	53%	0%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	35	33	27	46	33	18				
ELL	36			27							
BLK	25	47	46	18	21	15					
HSP	48	47		40	53		20				
MUL	48	50		48	58		42				
WHT	71	61	36	64	67	39	63				
FRL	55	52	32	42	54	33	45				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	30	40	38	29	32	17	35				
BLK	19	38	36	19	44	42					
HSP	56	68		56	59						
MUL	44	45	36	47	45	31					
WHT	66	55	29	66	48	19	56				
FRL	53	49	31	53	43	27	41				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The lowest 25% student population in both ELA and Math showed the lowest performance at 35% proficiency (Math) and 36% (ELA) respectively.

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

Audubon experienced a 5% school-wide decline in the percentage of students scoring at proficiency in Math as evidenced by a score of a Level 3 or above on the Florida Standards Assessment. We believe this can be attributed to the focus that the school placed on ELA for the 2018-2019 school year, as grade level teams were provided time for shared ELA planning with the support of the school's Instructional Coach. Administrative classroom walkthroughs focused on identifying areas for instructional improvement within the ELA block, and feedback was primarily provided to support this subject area.

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

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

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

Audubon showed an 11% increase in the percentage of students who exhibited learning gains in math, up from 49% in 2017-2018 to 61% in 2018-2019. Upon reflection, this increase may be the direct result of professional development provided to all teachers by district personnel in the use of written responses during math instruction, requiring students to think critically and justify responses to mathematical calculations. The MTSS process also analyzed math data to identify those students who would benefit from Tier 2 and Tier 3 intensive instruction, and this was provided during the regular Rtl block daily.

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

As the suspension rate, and the attendance rate <90% increases, so does the number of students scoring at a Level 1 in either ELA, Math, or both. Students learn when they are in class. Efforts to decrease student suspensions and increase student attendance will influence the achievement rate and lower the Early Warning Systems data. Additional work in our Social/Emotional curriculum and PBIS will influence this outcome.

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

1. Lowest 25% for ELA and Math
2. Math and ELA Proficiency
3. ESSA Subgroups
4. Science Proficiency
5. Social/Emotional and Behavior

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math 3+ Proficiency
Rationale	Audubon showed a 5% decrease in students scoring at a Level 3 or above in Math for the 2018-2019 school year, with 60% of students showing proficiency in 2017-2018 and only 55% in 2018-2019. This was 8% below both the district and state averages for this tested school grade component.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Audubon Elementary plans to improve the overall achievement in Math from 55% to 63% for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jaime Slentz (slentz.jaime@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Audubon will implement a new mathematics curriculum, called Eureka, in grades K-5 for the 2019-2020 school year.</p> <p>The Eureka Math program, also known as Engage NY, has been used by many schools within the district with positive results. It is the most widely used curriculum in America, with 57% of teachers using this program within their classrooms. After adopting Eureka Math at Scholarship Prep Charter School in Santa Ana, California, the school showed the highest year-to-year percentage growth in students meeting or exceeding expectations on their state standardized assessment with a 36 point increase. Andrew Crowe, Chief Academic Officer at Scholarship Prep, states that "Eureka Math gives teachers methodologies for grouping material, organizing lessons, and creating small group sessions. The Mid-Module Assessments also help teachers identify student needs and adjust instruction before the End-of-Module Assessments." This is just one of many schools with proven success using the Eureka Math curriculum within their classrooms.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement Eureka Math in grades kindergarten through 5. 2. Hire a Math Resource Instructional Assistant using Title 1 funds to support classroom teachers with Eureka implementation. 3. Hold bi-weekly team meetings for collaborative planning time with school administration to plan, analyze data, and formulate small groups for additional instruction. 4. Provide half-day planning sessions for all teachers for each math module. 5. Use assessment data and the MTSS process to provide intensive interventions to students identified as struggling.
Person Responsible	Jaime Slentz (slentz.jaime@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Lowest 25%
Rationale	While Audubon showed an increase in both ELA and Math for its lowest 25% student population for the 2018-2019 school year (34% to 36% proficiency in ELA and 26% to 35% proficiency in Math), there is still significant work to be done in order to meet district and state averages.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	On the 2019-2020 FSA, Audubon Elementary will increase the overall proficiency for the lowest 25% in ELA from 36% to match the 2018-2019 state average of 53%. On the 2019-2020 Math FSA, Audubon will increase the overall proficiency for the lowest 25% from 35% to match the 2018-2019 state average of 51%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Maureen Cox (cox.maureen@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Audubon will incorporate common assessments within each grade level as additional data pieces to drive the MTSS process. This data will better inform the selection and use of evidence-based instructional programs to match appropriate interventions to student need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Audubon's MTSS process was revised last year to hold meetings on early release Fridays with one grade level at a time. Teachers were provided data binders and the MTSS process was clarified as we had more time to look at students and their academic needs in more depth with the early release schedule. We believe this is one contributing factor that led to the positive increase in proficiency levels of the lowest 25%. However, the primary and often only data that was used during the 2018-2019 school year was iReady Diagnostic scores. While iReady proved to be closely aligned with FSA scores, the IPST team strongly believes that more frequent data analysis and additional data sources will lend itself to more informed academic decision-making.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create spreadsheet to identify lowest 25% student population for ongoing data tracking. Share with faculty. 2. Meet with each grade level to determine additional common assessment data that will be used throughout the 2019-2020 school year to drive the MTSS process. 3. Create a master schedule to ensure that students with an IEP are included in daily Rtl groups. 4. Hold weekly MTSS meetings to analyze data and determine and modify intervention groups. 5. Utilize Title 1 funds to purchase evidence-based instructional programs that target specific, identified student academic needs. 6. Administration to use IPG documents during classroom walkthroughs to collect information regarding Tier 1 instruction and offer feedback to teachers.
Person Responsible	Jaime Slentz (slentz.jaime@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	While Audubon increased its overall science proficiency by 3% from 49% in 2017-2018 to 52% in 2018-2019, these results fall below both the district and state averages.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2019-2020 school year, Audubon will increase its science proficiency rate from 52% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jaime Slentz (slentz.jaime@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	5E Models of Inquiry collaborative planning science on activity wheel hands-on to be done in science lab, with writing about science to be done in the general education classroom Review 3rd and 4th grade standards in science lab
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe that because science is not tested until 5th grade, the 3rd and 4th grade science standards may not be taught with fidelity. By incorporating science into the activity rotation for 4th and 5th grades and focusing on those 3rd and 4th grade standards, the students will have access to those standards that can be taught with the rigor of which is intended.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to provide a science lab for 4th and 5th grade students on the activity wheel. 2. Students will take a pre and post assessment to monitor knowledge and effectiveness of instruction. 3. 5th Grade students will take weekly Unify assessments that will be analyzed by all stakeholders. 4. Science Lab teachers collaborate with 4th and 5th Grade science teachers to analyze unify, classroom data, and plan instruction.
Person Responsible	Jessica Saltsman (saltsman.jessica@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

The staff and administration at Audubon will monitor ESSA subgroups throughout the year through the MTSS process, as there were three subgroups who fell below the 40% threshold during the 2018-2019 school year. Whenever possible, these students will be provided small group and tiered instruction to help close the achievement gap. Student Discipline will continue to be an area of focus as Audubon implements the PBIS program for the first time during the 2019-2020 school year. Using established

S.O.A.R. expectations, students and faculty alike will be held accountable for following clearly defined rules for behavior.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

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

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

Parent attendance at conference nights and at after-school events is low. In an effort to have more families in attendance, we have collected information through surveys asking parents what topics they are interested in learning more about as well as times that are convenient for them to attend. By combining conference nights with these events as well as offering multiple session topics and times, we hope to increase the attendance and demonstrate how we are all stakeholders in their child's education.

PFEP Link

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

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

Teachers are using the Caring Classrooms Curriculum daily with students during morning meetings to build classroom community awareness and meet the needs of social emotional growth in the classroom.

Positive Behavior Incentive System (PBIS) is being implemented school wide. Students are given incentives for displaying positive behaviors on a daily basis based on the school's S.O.A.R. (Safety, Ownership, Achievement, Respect) pillars of success.

Teacher and community members are mentoring students throughout the week. Teachers are working closely with identified students to build their social and emotional needs.

Community members, such as Rolling Readers, visit weekly to work with classrooms on social and emotional needs.

An after School Enrichment Program is being offered to create and support a positive school culture in addition to helping increase student achievement. Our students will learn and practice the skills required to problem solve, work cooperatively, and understand each other, in order to support the positive school culture we are working to establish. Once these goals are accomplished, then academic achievement will benefit and increase.

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

Students who are transitioning from Pre-K to Kindergarten are scheduled for roll-up meetings. Parents are invited to be an active participant in the meeting. Other active participants are those involved in the implementation of the program such as teachers and administrators. Pre-K students who are rolling up to Kindergarten are invited to visit

Kindergarten classes so they have a better understanding of what Kindergarten is like. The Pre-K class at Audubon works closely with the Kindergarten teachers. They collaborate in doing hands-on activities and reading books.

Students who are transitioning from 6th grade to Middle school participate in presentations held by Jefferson Middle School and McNair Magnet School. Representatives from both schools come to Audubon and present their programs and hand out information brochures to the students. Jefferson Middle School holds a 6th grade evening at Jefferson so students can get a feel for and familiarize themselves with the school.

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

This school year, Audubon's data-based, problem-solving processes for implementing and monitoring the SIP and MTSS processes will be team-oriented, proactive, and continuous. The faculty will follow the MTSS Problem Solving Model in order to systematically and objectively determine the nature of student performance issues and to guide team members in the development of appropriate interventions. A proactive and inclusive approach will be utilized with an emphasis on monitoring all students. The assistant principal and instructional coach will facilitate MTSS meetings to ensure adherence to the Problem Solving Model. Meetings will occur every Friday where the focus will be on one specific grade level. Participants will include grade-level teachers, support staff, guidance, Title 1 team, and administration. Google Share documents, data binders, and tracking charts will be used to monitor progress.

Federal, state, and local funds are maintained in accounting strings. These balances are monitored and maintained by Audubon's bookkeeper, who furnishes the principal with accounting reports. The principal coordinates the use of these funds based on input from the MTSS team. Academic Support Programs (ASP) are developed for the lowest achieving students in reading, math, and science as determined by standardized assessments. These funds are used to fund student materials and teacher salaries. Title 1 funds are used to allocate three additional teachers, two instructional assistants, a literacy coach (50%), and purchase materials for student achievement. All materials and resources are maintained and inventoried through Title 1.

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

Business partners and local community agencies donate their time and resources for our school's use, including but not limited to, career presentations. The Science and Engineering Fair and Family Engagement Events focused on math and science careers encourage students to explore various fields of interests for college and future careers.