Orange County Public Schools

Meadow Woods Elementary

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 10

Planning for Improvement 15

Title I Requirements 18

Budget to Support Goals 19

Meadow Woods Elementary

500 RHODE ISLAND WOODS CIR, Orlando, FL 32824

https://meadowwoodses.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Edmi Figueroa Solis

Start Date for this Principal: 2/25/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 10

Planning for Improvement 15

Title I Requirements 18

Budget to Support Goals 19

Meadow Woods Elementary

500 RHODE ISLAND WOODS CIR, Orlando, FL 32824

https://meadowwoodses.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	96%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To lead students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vazquez Santiago, Aleli	Principal	The Principal will be responsible for cultivating, shaping and ensuring rigorous academic goals for all staff and students. The Principal will problem solve, coach and build capacity in staff to create a positive and effective school culture. The Principal will identify and monitor gaps in instructional practices and provide support in order to assure the school's mission and vision are achieved.
Bransford, Judy	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will support the principal in assuring the mission and vision are achieved. The Assistant Principal will monitor data to provide needed adjustments, assure building safety, coach and support all staff, and maintain and deepen current educational best practices to support the positive and effective school culture.
Morosetti, James	Other	The Curriculum Resource Teacher will provide materials and knowledge of content to assure equity among all students and classrooms. The Curriculum Resource Teacher will support the instructional coach in monitoring the teacher and student data to provide feedback to make critical adjustments to instruction to allow all students to be successful.
Rivera, Johanny	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor will maintain an understanding of all communication skills, decision making, relationship skills, conflict resolution and goal setting to ensure students receive support and to reduce all barriers to their academic success. The Guidance Counselor will confer with teachers to provide interventions, preventions and behavior modifications that will allow all students to achieve success and participate in rigorous instruction.
Freiberger, Randolyn Brooke	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach will maintain a knowledge of curriculum and instruction to develop staff and build capacity. The Instructional Coach will plan and organize teacher and student data to allow students to be successful in all academic areas. The Instructional Coach will be a resource for all teachers on a variety of instructional strategies to meet the needs of all student learners.

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	125	127	114	137	113	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	743
Attendance below 90 percent	23	21	18	20	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	1	4	1	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	15	2	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	61	38	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152

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	2	8	1	15	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

55

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/1/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	25	21	16	21	23	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	29	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	54	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

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	3	8	1	7	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	25	21	16	21	23	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	29	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	54	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

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	3	8	1	7	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	47%	57%	57%	51%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	58%	58%	52%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	52%	53%	42%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	63%	63%	63%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	61%	62%	57%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	48%	51%	38%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	56%	53%	49%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	125 (0)	127 (0)	114 (0)	137 (0)	113 (0)	127 (0)	743 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	23 (25)	21 (21)	18 (16)	20 (21)	16 (23)	17 (27)	115 (133)
One or more suspensions	1 (1)	4 (0)	1 (1)	5 (2)	6 (3)	9 (0)	26 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (5)	15 (29)	2 (1)	0 (3)	0 (1)	7 (0)	27 (39)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	61 (34)	38 (54)	53 (41)	152 (129)

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	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	57%	-9%	58%	-10%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
	2018	51%	61%	-10%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	63%	-7%	64%	-8%
	2018	45%	62%	-17%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	43%	57%	-14%	60%	-17%
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	43%	54%	-11%	53%	-10%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2017-18**	**C & C Accel 2017-18**
SWD	8	38	45	25	52	44					

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL	41	66	67	47	55	56	38				
BLK	46	58	58	47	50	46	39				
HSP	46	58	55	52	57	47	49				
WHT	64			73							
FRL	43	55	56	49	51	42	46				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	44	43	26	46	38	31				
ELL	41	45	40	50	44	27	33				
BLK	38	39	29	35	37	25	26				
HSP	50	52	49	55	44	31	43				
WHT	71	62		76	46						
FRL	48	48	39	53	43	27	41				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	16	40	36	42	60	64					
ELL	36	47	44	54	47	29	33				
BLK	43	44		54	50						
HSP	54	54	45	64	59	41	55				
WHT	35	36		65	45						
FRL	51	52	42	63	57	38	49				

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Math lowest 25th percentile performed the lowest at 45% followed by ELA Achievement and Science Achievement both of which were 47%. Even though the school showed growth from 28% in 2018 to 45% in 2019, academic vocabulary for mathematics will be a focus area in the 2019-2020 school year. ELA Achievement was the component in which a decline occurred from the previous year. Third Grade English Language Arts (ELA) scored the lowest for the 2018-2019 school year with 40% of students proficient on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA). The leadership team analyzed assessments administered by primary grade levels, as well as the scoring calibration. Through this analysis, the team found that assessments administered were not consistently aligned to the depth of knowledge and rigor required by the standard. Additionally, teachers were not consistently scoring the assessments with the same scale as others. This Tier 1 discrepancy in the primary grades contributed to a Tier II and Tier III overage in the intermediate grades, especially third. Additional evidence to support this can be found in the substantial increase in the number of students scoring a Level 1 on the 3rd Grade FSA Reading, while all other performance levels remained the same.

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

ELA Achievement was the only component which showed a decline of two percentage points from the previous year. The ELA Achievement in 2018 was 49% whereas in 2019 the percent was 47. For subgroups, fifth grade Math showed the greatest decline from the prior year with a 9% decrease. After analyzing the different domains tested on the FSA, the leadership team found that areas requiring academic vocabulary in Math showed significant decline in when compared to other testing grades. An intense focus on geometric and measurement vocabulary was the identified deficit in 5th grade performance on the Math FSA.

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.

Both ELA Achievement and Math Achievement were 10 percentage points below that of the state. Third grade reading proficiency has the largest gap when compared to the state, at 18 points below state proficiency average. Our analysis determined that this gap was caused by a historical lack of

alignment to the standards in grades Kindergarten through 2nd grade, as well as a lack of foundational literacy skill mastery. Our Tier I instructional accountability focus, as well as our intervention monitoring, have been revised in order to address and remediate this gap.

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 Learning Gains in Math for our Lowest 25% of students. This year we supported students with more small group instruction to help close achievement gaps. Small group instruction started off below the level of the required for standard mastery due to the need for remediation of foundational skills. Eventually we ended with each standard at the required level for mastery. Small group instruction was provided in the classroom daily with utilization of math centers and also through pull out twice weekly of students in the Lowest 25% subgroup.

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

Attendance improved from 2018 to 2019 school year but is still an area for growth. As part of our Title I Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) position, the PEL will meet with each parent who demonstrates low attendance in the first quarter to intervene and provide support early in the school year. The PEL will provide updates the to the leadership team and MTSS coordinator to review student data and monitor improvements in this early warning indicator.

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

1. We must improve Tier I instruction in order to stop the Tier II or III gap from increasing.
2. We will monitor instruction and task alignment to ensure equity for all students.
3. We will provide differentiated professional development to teachers in literacy for all content, writing, math and intervention systems.
4. We will closely monitor our lowest 25% to continue to increase learning gains in Math and ELA.
5. Teachers will implement UDL strategies with fidelity to ensure ESE students have access to all content.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Narrow Achievement Gaps
Rationale	Providing teachers and paraprofessionals with strategic and specific instructional development will ensure an equitable learning for all students, increase teacher and paraprofessional knowledge, and ensure that teachers and staff analyze data to increase achievement for all subgroups specifically our exceptional student education student population.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The achievement gap between all subgroups will remain closed and the exceptional students education students will achieve the same proficiency as their other subgroup peers. Overall ELA proficiency will increase from 47% to 50% and math proficiency will increase from 53% to 56%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Aleli Vazquez Santiago (aleli.vazquezsantiago@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	ESE and Tier III teachers will collaborate with general education teachers, paraprofessionals and support staff to direct students' learning toward measurable outcomes and to facilitate students' social and emotional well-being across all school environments and instructional settings. Collaboration with individuals or teams requires the use of effective collaboration including sharing ideas, active listening, questioning, planning, problem solving, and negotiating to develop and adjust instructional or behavioral plans based on student data, and the coordination of expectations, responsibilities and resources to maximize student learning. These strategies are essential to analyze student work across subgroups to improve culturally responsive practices and ensure equity for all learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our subgroup gap is small, we need to continue the instructional practices we have implemented and have led to growth, while improving our communication with all stakeholders. Last year, we did not have a common planning time for the ESE resource or ASD unit teachers and the general education teachers. Improved data based communication between all stakeholders will lead to continued improvement with this subgroup.
Action Step	
Description	1. The leadership team will create an intense focus on Tier I instruction and the tiered systems of support provided to all students. (August 12, 2019, weekly - Vazquez) 2. Administration will structure Professional Developments (PDs) to provide teachers with differentiated coaching and support on standards based instruction. (August 12, 2019, monthly - Vazquez) 3. Teachers will use culturally relevant content to increase student proficiency in all subject areas. (August 12, 2019, weekly - Bransford) 4. Teachers will provide differentiated instruction for intervention and enrichment. (August 12, 2019 , weekly - Freiberger) 5. Teachers will analyze summative and formative data in all academic areas to adjust instruction to match student needs. (September 2, 2019, monthly- Morosetti)

Person Responsible	Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Invest in Human Capital
Rationale	The leadership team will invest in continuous improvement by using strategies for building and sustaining high performing teams in order to support a culture of literacy across all content areas and to build capacity with sustainable teacher leadership. Our AdvancEd survey results indicate that our community stakeholders value the investment in staff, and know that this investment leads to increased student achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	All teachers will demonstrate strategies for developing students as writers. Teachers will use text dependent questions and structured academic discourse as a means of facilitating rigorous learning. Overall ELA proficiency will increase from 47% to 50% and math proficiency will increase from 53% to 56%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Aleli Vazquez Santiago (aleli.vazquezsantiago@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) team will meet to research and share strategies related to close reading, creating text dependent questions, and implementing structures to support academic discourse through written work.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Through data based Professional Learning Community (PLC) conversations, the leadership team identified that tasks required of students were recall level. In order to align tasks more closely to the depth of knowledge of the standards, students need to analyze and synthesize content. Text dependent writing and academic discourse are needed components for the extension of learning.
Action Step	
Description	1. The District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) team will provide professional development that expands writing strategies. (September 2, 2019, bimonthly- Vazquez) 2. The leadership team will provide resources that are culturally responsive. (August 12, 2019, completed- Bransford) 3. The exceptional student education (ESE) team will mentor general education colleagues to provide inclusive models of instruction and resources to support our ESE students. (August 12, 2019, weekly- Bransford) 4. The leadership team will provide professional development for new teachers on the previously learned content regarding close reading and text dependent questions. (August 12, 2019, bimonthly- Vazquez) 5. The leadership team will provide intensive support to new teachers in order to ensure equitable classrooms. (August 12, 2019, weekly- Freiberger)
Person Responsible	Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@ocps.net)

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).

We will continue to provide trauma informed professional development to sustain student and teacher relationships. We will also participate in additional science based activities and programs to enhance engagement and increase science literacy with all students.

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, Â§ 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.

Meadow Woods Elementary will provide sustained community engagement by educating and empowering all stakeholders to be involved in MWE student 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.

Meadow Woods Elementary School ensures the social-emotional needs of all students through various supports and structures. Meadow Woods Elementary School is a Title I school where all students receive free breakfast, lunch and supper daily. A social worker is available to all students and offers a wide variety of social services. These services include, mental health counseling, food and shelter needs, parenting programs and safe harbor for domestic violence. Meadow Woods Elementary is an official distributor for the Love Pantry which distributes food and hygiene products for needy families. As a result of the AdvancEd Parent Survey, we will
continue to provide families with opportunities for them to be involved and support all student needs.

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

Pre-K teachers collaborate with kindergarten teachers to discuss what children need to know before entering kindergarten. Pre-K teachers and kindergarten teachers work together to plan and implement extra-curricular activities. Meadow Woods Elementary hosts a Kindergarten Orientation during Kindergarten Roundup in March. During this time, first grade teachers host an orientation to bridge kindergarten students to the next grade level.
All students transitioning to middle school are welcomed to Meadow Woods Middle School during the Moving Up ceremony to celebrate this milestone with families. Additionally, Meadow Woods Middle School and other feeder schools schedule an orientation at Meadow Woods Elementary School to provide counselors who assist students in choosing electives and courses for the next year. Meadow Woods Elementary's principal meets with the middle school principal to discuss students who are likely ready to be involved in advanced coursework, and those who might have scored lower on statewide assessments but will need to be challenged. Meadow Woods Middle school also provides a Middle School Boot Camp in which we support our students applying and attending during the summer after their 5th grade year.

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.

Principal/Assistant Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents about school-based MTSS plans.

General Education Grade Level Lead Teachers (Primary and Intermediate): Provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Enrichment opportunities are provided for students during Tier 2 Intervention/Enrichment time.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Reading Coach: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans; facilitates Professional Learning Communities and common planning.

School Psychologist: Provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Title I, Part A
Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional intervention and remediation with resource teachers and through after-school programs. Title 1 funds were used to purchase I-Ready materials for students in an effort to close achievement gaps. Title I funds were used to secure a parent engagement liaison I in an effort to increase parental engagement and student achievement.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
SAI funds are allocated to schools to support students who scored level 1 on the Florida Standards Assessment. These funds are then used to either provide instructional support or tutoring services.

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

The Partner in Education Coordinator (PIE) invites community members and businesses to model and/or demonstrate their careers during Teach-In. These partners explain their career path as well as the varying educational requirements needed to work in their industry. The PIE Coordinator also facilitates a program called Camp Hyatt. Camp Hyatt allows 5th grade students to experience and work along side members of the hospitality profession. Meadow Woods Elementary students have the opportunity to work alongside experts respective fields while in the Garden Club, Science Olympiad Club or Student Council.

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Narrow Achievement Gaps**				**$33,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1041 - Meadow Woods Elementary	General Fund		$30,000.00
			Notes: Hire certified tutors to support intervention			
	6150	510-Supplies	1041 - Meadow Woods Elementary	Title, I Part A		$3,000.00
			Notes: Provide supplies for parent engagement for academic tasks			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Invest in Human Capital**				**$40,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	390-Other Purchased Services	1041 - Meadow Woods Elementary	General Fund		$25,000.00
			Notes: Substitutes to cover classrooms for teacher training			
	6400	390-Other Purchased Services	1041 - Meadow Woods Elementary	General Fund		$15,000.00
			Notes: Teacher registrations for academic and trauma informed conferences			
					Total:	**$143,000.00**