Alachua County Public Schools

Meadowbrook Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Meadowbrook Elementary School

11525 NW 39TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

https://www.sbac.edu/meadowbrook

Demographics

Principal: Brad Burklew

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: A (73%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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

Meadowbrook Elementary School

11525 NW 39TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

https://www.sbac.edu/meadowbrook

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 KG-5	Yes	35%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

Meadowbrook Elementary School is committed to the success of every student!

Provide the school's vision statement.

School District: We will graduate students who have the knowledge, skills, and personal character to be lifelong learners and independent thinkers. Our graduates will excel in their chosen careers and be productive and contributing members of the global community

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
Burklew, Brad	Principal	
Green, John	Assistant Principal	
Morris, Lisa	School Counselor	
Thurmond, Michelle	School Counselor	
Young, Brittani	Other	FCIM
Strack, Landon	Dean	

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	137	147	128	160	156	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	876
Attendance below 90 percent	2	18	6	10	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	5	5	6	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	0	1	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
60

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 8/28/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	80%	59%	57%	70%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	57%	58%	64%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	49%	53%	56%	48%	52%
Math Achievement	84%	60%	63%	75%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	61%	62%	67%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	49%	51%	56%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	82%	57%	53%	63%	55%	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	137 (0)	147 (0)	128 (0)	160 (0)	156 (0)	148 (0)	876 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ()	18 ()	6 ()	10 ()	9 ()	5 ()	50 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	7 (0)	10 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 ()	5 (0)	5 (0)	6 (0)	8 (0)	2 (0)	28 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (0)	17 (0)	31 (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	82%	57%	25%	58%	24%	
	2018	78%	56%	22%	57%	21%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	77%	55%	22%	58%	19%	
	2018	75%	54%	21%	56%	19%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison		-1%					
05	2019	79%	55%	24%	56%	23%	
	2018	72%	55%	17%	55%	17%	
Same Grade Comparison		7%					
Cohort Comparison		4%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	83%	58%	25%	62%	21%
	2018	81%	60%	21%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	60%	24%	64%	20%
	2018	77%	60%	17%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	81%	57%	24%	60%	21%
	2018	79%	61%	18%	61%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	80%	55%	25%	53%	27%
	2018	70%	55%	15%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	34	52	50	32	48	50	38				
ELL	91			82							
ASN	92	50		100	86						
BLK	51	62	57	59	56	58	63				
HSP	79	64		79	56		73				
MUL	79	75		85	50		73				
WHT	87	74	68	90	75	73	87				
FRL	64	67	68	67	64	67	64				
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	31	39	25	26	79	76	29				
ASN	94			94	91						
BLK	42	55	48	59	81	84	32				
HSP	80	80		78	64		94				
MUL	82	74		85	83		80				
WHT	86	69	52	88	78	83	87				

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
FRL	56	64	53	64	77	78	54				
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	24	60	57	39	68	65	14				
ASN	89	73		100	91						
BLK	40	53	53	42	49	47	23				
HSP	74	72		79	78		81				
MUL	70	70		91	79						
WHT	79	64	63	83	67	61	76				
FRL	48	53	50	57	64	57	38				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	87
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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
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	70
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	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	79
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	66
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.

ELA Lowest Quartile was our lowest performance. However, this data component increased 6% points from 58% in 2018 to 64% in 2019. Since 2016, this data component has increased every year.

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

Math Lowest Quartile dropped from 78% in 2018 to 66% in 2019. Strategic scheduling and placement of students contributed to this decline.

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.

Science Achievement was +29 compared to the state average. Fifth Grade is departmentalized and Science is scheduled for one hour a day (30 min on early dismissal). Fifth Grade teachers also revisit Fourth Grade standards that are covered on assessment.

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

Science Achievement increased by 9% points, from 73% in 2018 to 82% in 2019. Fifth Grade is departmentalized and Science is scheduled for one hour a day (30 min on early dismissal). Fifth Grade teachers also revisit and reteach Fourth Grade standards that are covered on assessment.

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

As indicated in our EWS data, attendance below 90% is one area of concern. Currently there are 50 students fall into this category. Another area of concern is students scoring Level 1 on statewide assessments. We currently have 31 students (10%) who fall into this category.

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

1. Increasing gains of the Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math from 64% to 67% and 66% to 79% respectively, and increase Science Achievement from 82% to 85%
2. Increasing African American Achievement in both ELA and Math from 53% to 56% and 60% to 63% while increasing proficiency level for all students in both ELA and Math from 80% to 83% and 84% to 87% respectively.
3. Reducing African American Out Of School Suspensions by at least 15% annually from 5 to 4.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase gains of Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math. Increase Science Achievement
Rationale	Continue to meet the needs of all students in state assessed areas.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increasing gains of the Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math from 64% to 67% and 66% to 79% respectively, and increase Science Achievement from 82% to 85%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brad Burklew (burklewb@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ongoing review of data by administration, teacher leaders, and classroom teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring by school leaders and teachers ensures that student needs are being met.
Action Step	
Description	1. Progress monitoring using student data to conduct data chats. 2. Monitor teacher planning and pacing through use of formal and informal snapshots and formal observation 3. Teachers will work with their team to plan lessons that include strategies such as CRISS, Marzano, Kagan, and Literacy Work Stations. 4. Administration will monitor attendance of PD that was offered on these strategies and monitor the effectiveness. 5. After school tutoring will also be available for the lowest-performing students in grades 2-5.
Person Responsible	John Green (greenje@gm.sbac.edu)

#2	
Title	Increase achievement in both ELA and Math for African American students, while increasing proficiency levels for all students.
Rationale	Continue to meet the needs of all students in state assessed areas.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increasing African American Achievement in both ELA and Math from 53% to 56% and 60% to 63% while increasing proficiency level for all students in both ELA and Math from 80% to 83% and 84% to 87% respectively.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brad Burklew (burklewb@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ongoing review of data by administration, teacher leaders, and classroom teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring by school leaders and teachers ensures that student needs are being met.
Action Step	
Description	1. Progress monitoring using student data to conduct data chats. 2. Monitor teacher planning and pacing through use of formal and informal snapshots and formal observation 3. Teachers will work with their team to plan lessons that include strategies such as CRISS, Marzano, Kagan, and Literacy Work Stations. 4. Administration will monitor attendance of PD that was offered on these strategies and monitor the effectiveness. 5. After school tutoring will also be available for the lowest-performing students in grades 2-5.
Person Responsible	John Green (greenje@gm.sbac.edu)

#3	
Title	Reducing African American Out Of School Suspensions
Rationale	Reducing OSS will help ensure that students are being exposed to content, high yield strategies, and classroom instruction that increase student achievement.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Reducing African American Out Of School Suspensions by at least 15% annually from 5 to 4.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Green (greenje@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Restorative Discipline
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Restorative Discipline is a whole-school, relational approach to building school climate and addressing student behavior that fosters belonging over exclusion, social engagement over control, and meaningful accountability over punishment. Its practices replace fear, uncertainty, and punishment as motivators with belonging, connections and the willingness to change because people matter to each other.

Action Step	
Description	1. Monitor student behavior (using behavioral paraprofessional) 2. Assess individual student needs 3. EPT (FBA and BIP as determined) 4. Restorative Discipline Strategies 5.
Person Responsible	Landon Strack (stracklm@gm.sbac.edu)

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).

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.

Meadowbrook faculty and staff work with parents, the community and build many partnerships with different community members, including businesses, clubs, higher education institutions, and other groups. Meadowbrook has a number of business partners, including: Publix, Florida Credit Union, Campus Credit Union, and more. Additionally, Meadowbrook faculty and staff work with local neighborhoods, setting up flyers and programs that include neighborhood communities and the school.

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.

It is very important at Meadowbrook that all students feel encouraged, safe, and happy while at school. The school counselor meets with all classrooms and does instructional guidance lessons throughout the year. Additionally, the school counselor meets with students and parents before and after school. The school leadership team and teachers have a close relationship with surrounding neighborhoods, businesses, and community groups. Teachers and staff are encouraged to do home visits to help relate to parents and students. These home visits also helps to build positive relationships between parents and teachers which help to ensure that social-emotional needs of students are being met.

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

Meadowbrook staff participate in transition IEPs for ESE students transitioning from PreK ESE to find the best placement for students.

A parent meeting is held by counselor each year to share middle school expectations and options as well as information about middle school Magnet Programs. ESE/Guidance staff work with middle schools to provide information for parents about school and information to school about individual students. Transition IEPs are held for all ESE students and middle schools are invited especially for higher needs students.

Counselor also shares information about middle/high school magnets with fourth grade students.

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: Provides a common vision for use of data-based decision-making, sees that RTI is implemented according to district guidelines, oversees implementation and documentation of interventions, and provides needed professional development for staff.

Assistant Principal: Supports and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in progress monitoring, data collection, data analysis, professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Selected General Education Teachers: Works with the principal in sharing data with other faculty and

works with teachers in developing intervention activities.

School Counselor: Arranges EPT meetings to discuss teacher concerns regarding students. Notifies parents of scheduled meetings so they may be in attendance. Assists in planning interventions. Meets with teachers on a regular basis to modify interventions. Assists teacher with record-keeping required for interventions. Oversees necessary documentation required by the district.

Exceptional Education Teachers: serve as resource in planning interventions.

School Psychologist: Participates in the collection of data and serves as a resource in planning intervention activities. Attends meeting with parents to share information about intervention process. Provides evaluation for selected students.

Speech Pathologist: Performs language screening on students who are being scheduled for EPT meetings. Serves as a resource for teachers when planning interventions that are language related.

Title I, Targeted Assistance: Meadowbrook has two Title I teachers that instruct low-performing students in reading skills, reading comprehension, and reading strategies. These students are observed on an ongoing basis and in some cases, students can enter and leave the program once satisfactory growth has been achieved.

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

Counselor provides a career unit for fourth grade students which introduces job skills, discusses college and technical education, includes information about middle/high school magnets, career clusters/ categories, and growing career trends.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase gains of Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math. Increase Science Achievement				$29,113.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5900	120-Classroom Teachers	0520 - Meadowbrook Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$24,960.00
			Notes: Teacher stipend for Extended Day Intervention			
	5900	210-Retirement	0520 - Meadowbrook Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,115.00
			Notes: Retirement benefits for Teacher stipend for Extended Day Intervention			
	5900	220-Social Security	0520 - Meadowbrook Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,910.00
			Notes: SSI benefits for Teacher stipend for Extended Day Intervention			
	5900	290-Other Employee Benefits	0520 - Meadowbrook Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$128.00
			Notes: Early Retirement benefits for Teacher stipend for Extended Day Intervention			

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase achievement in both ELA and Math for African American students, while increasing proficiency levels for all students.				$157,584.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0520 - Meadowbrook Elementary School	Title, I Part A	2.0	$117,574.00
		Notes: Salaries for a 50% FCIM Instructional Coach and 1.5 Intervention Teachers				
	5100	210-Retirement	0520 - Meadowbrook Elementary School	Title, I Part A	2.0	$9,959.00
		Notes: Retirement benefits for a 50% FCIM Instructional Coach and 1.5 Intervention Teachers				
	5100	220-Social Security	0520 - Meadowbrook Elementary School	Title, I Part A	2.0	$8,994.00
		Notes: SSI benefits for a 50% FCIM Instructional Coach and 1.5 Intervention Teachers				
	5100	230-Group Insurance	0520 - Meadowbrook Elementary School	Title, I Part A	2.0	$20,457.00
		Notes: Group Insurance benefits for a 50% FCIM Instructional Coach and 1.5 Intervention Teachers				
	5100	290-Other Employee Benefits	0520 - Meadowbrook Elementary School	Title, I Part A	2.0	$600.00
		Notes: early Reitrement benefits for a 50% FCIM Instructional Coach and 1.5 Intervention Teachers				
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reducing African American Out Of School Suspensions				$0.00
					Total:	$186,697.00