Meadowlane Intermediate Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Meadowlane Intermediate Elementary School

2700 WINGATE BLVD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

http://www.meadowlane.is.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Barnett N   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 3-6
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)	43%
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 (64%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: B (60%)
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	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 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.

Table of Contents

Meadowlane Intermediate Elementary School

2700 WINGATE BLVD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

http://www.meadowlane.is.brevard.k12.fl.us

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 3-6	No	38%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

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

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 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.

Meadowlane Intermediate Elementary students will achieve life-long learning skills that will enable them to be productive and successful citizens in the future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Meadowlane Intermediate Elementary provides a successful and cooperative learning environment maximizing achievement through content complexity and student engagement.

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
Schwab, Adrienne	Principal	Principal supports the MTSS team and equips teachers with the tools they need to in order to disaggregate the students' performance data. She performs classroom observations, supports the mental health and social/emotional initiatives, participates in parent conferences, refers students and parents to appropriate resources, and continuously reviews school-wide progress monitoring data.
Oberbeck, Sarah	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal supports the MTSS team and support teachers as they disaggregate the students' performance data. She performs classroom observations, supports the mental health and social/emotional initiatives, participates in parent conferences, refers students and parents to appropriate resources, oversees the utilization of district curriculum, creates small groups for state testing, and submits the testing to the state.
Stein, Jessie	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal supports the MTSS team and support teachers as they disaggregate the students' performance data. She performs classroom observations, supports the mental health and social/emotional initiatives, participates in parent conferences, refers students and parents to appropriate resources, oversees the utilization of district curriculum, serves as the Title IX contact, creates small groups for state testing, and submits the testing to the state.
Olesnevich, Jessica	Other	The guidance service professional facilitates MTSS meetings, assists teachers as they analyze student data, attends parent conferences, organizes volunteers, supports social/emotional and mental health issues, addresses behavior concerns, serves as our ESOL contact, facilitates WIDA testing, tracks attendance records, and coordinates the PTO and SAC monthly meetings.
Pittman, Tysha	School Counselor	Guidance Counselors develop Tier I and II academic and behavioral plans, gather data on student academics and behavior, create 504 plans, conduct focus group sessions catered to the specific social/emotional needs of identified students, share the Caring School Community curriculum with specific activities that are focused on meeting the social/emotional needs of students, and conduct training to proactively combat bullying.
Santiago, Kristanne	School Counselor	Guidance Counselors develop Tier I and II academic and behavioral plans, gather data on student academics and behavior, create 504 plans, conduct focus group sessions catered to the specific social/emotional needs of identified students, share the Caring School Community curriculum with specific activities that are focused on meeting the social/emotional needs of students, and conduct training to proactively combat bullying.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Succar, Christiana	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach works with teachers to determine appropriate instructional strategies and interventions for students, assist in the development of Tier II and III academic plans, provide observation opportunities for new teachers, refers students and parents to appropriate resources, participates in parent conferences, performs classroom observations, assists third grade teachers with portfolio assessments, oversees the i-ready diagnostic procedure, reviews school-wide progress monitoring data, provide staff training on progress monitoring and interventions. She is a member of our MTSS team to support the social/emotional needs and mental health of students.

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	0	0	0	205	199	192	234	0	0	0	0	0	0	830
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	8	10	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	5	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	20	30	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	3	10	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Sunday 9/8/2019

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	65%	62%	57%	65%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	60%	58%	59%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	57%	53%	48%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	71%	63%	63%	74%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	73%	65%	62%	72%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	53%	51%	56%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	57%	53%	59%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	3	**4**	**5**	**6**	
Number of students enrolled	205 (0)	199 (0)	192 (0)	234 (0)	830 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 ()	10 ()	11 ()	12 ()	41 (0)
One or more suspensions	5 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)	17 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	6 (0)	15 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	3 (0)	20 (0)	30 (0)	29 (0)	82 (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	67%	64%	3%	58%	9%
	2018	65%	63%	2%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	61%	0%	58%	3%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	65%	60%	5%	54%	11%
	2018	65%	63%	2%	52%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	67%	61%	6%	62%	5%
	2018	71%	62%	9%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	64%	4%	64%	4%
	2018	70%	59%	11%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	60%	13%
	2018	63%	58%	5%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	76%	67%	9%	55%	21%
	2018	80%	68%	12%	52%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	56%	6%	53%	9%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	55%	2%
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	27	44	41	36	58	56	27				
ELL	61	70	64	63	77	70	57				
ASN	83	60		85	80		80				
BLK	37	46	43	40	52	45	30				
HSP	58	62	52	70	76	81	71				
MUL	62	62	64	62	74	73	54				
WHT	70	67	58	78	76	63	67				
FRL	50	57	51	54	64	58	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	21	32	30	39	46	40	17				
ELL	53	56	44	68	57						
ASN	84	72		90	69		79				
BLK	28	45	36	36	38	31	17				
HSP	54	48	39	65	56	50	38				
MUL	51	44	33	59	56	44	52				
WHT	67	54	41	81	64	51	68				
FRL	47	44	31	58	53	40	35				

| **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	22	38	41	38	52	43	26				
ELL	54	59		78	89	91					
ASN	86	78		92	91						
BLK	29	39	38	43	57	50	16				
HSP	54	58	61	63	61	52	48				
MUL	66	56	31	58	58	29	54				
WHT	71	62	51	82	77	63	66				
FRL	49	49	45	58	64	53	43				

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	64
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	66
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	75
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	42
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	67
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	64
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	68
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	54
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.

In 2019 the lowest performing data components were the Lowest 25% subgroup for ELA and Math. In 2019 53% of the Lowest 25% subgroup scored at proficiency in ELA which was an increase from the 38% proficiency in 2018. Math Lowest 25% proficiency was 61% increasing from the 2018 proficiency rate of 44%. While both of these components showed an increase, ELA was still 4% below the district average proficiency for the Lowest 25%. Science data was a close second to these two areas. Science data in 2018 showed 57% of fifth grade students meeting proficiency. 2019 data indicates that 62% of students are meeting proficiency. While this is an increase, this was the lowest performing subject area in regards to proficiency for the 2018 - 2019 school year. Science proficiency at Meadowlane Intermediate continues to be stagnant when looking at strand data. Over the past two years the Nature of Science strand data shows 70% proficiency, Earth and Space increased from 63% to 69% proficiency, Physical Science decreased by 6% from 75% to 69%, and Life Science has remained the same at 71%. Many students in the Lowest 25% population are bus riders and are unable to attend the before and/or after school academic support program or Science Saturday programs. There is a continued need to provide additional support for these students during the school day. Students will receive access to grade level complex text daily in order to increase achievement success.

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

The largest decline in the school grade data for the 2018 - 2019 school year was math proficiency. In 2017 - 2018 math proficiency was 72% and in 2018 - 2019 it decreased by 1% to 71%. This seems minimal, however, looking at trend data over several years shows a steady decline in proficiency in math schoolwide for Meadowlane Intermediate. Looking at grade level proficiency, 3rd grade declined by 4% from 2018 to 2019 going from 71% proficiency to 67%. 4th grade declined 2%, going from 70% to 68% while 5th grade showed a 10% increase from 63% proficient to 73%. 6th grade declined by 4% in proficiency from 80% to 76%. There has been a large focus on ELA instruction and increasing proficiency in this area for the past several years decreasing the focus on math. Implementing Eureka this year will bring a focus back to math in turn increasing proficiency in this 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.

Meadowlane Intermediate performed above state average in all areas except ELA Lowest 25% learning gains. The state average was 53% and Meadowlane Intermediate performed at 53% in this component. This component also scored 4% lower than the district average. Lowest 25% students often received work based on their ability level instead of grade level complex text.

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

In 2019, Meadowlane Intermediate showed the most growth in the area of learning gains. In 2018 63% of students showed a learning gain schoolwide compared to 52% in 2018. This shows an 11% increase. 2019 data indicated that 73% of students made learning gains in mathematics compared to 60% in 2018. This data showed a 13% increase. In 2019, the lowest 25% group showed a 15% increase of students who made learning gains in ELA. 2019 ELA data shows 53% of students making gains as compared to 2018 where 38% made gains. Math data revealed that 61% of Lowest 25% students made gains compared to 44% in 2018. This data indicates a 17% increase in student gains.

In the 2018 - 2019 school year individual MTSS meetings were held with teachers to discuss the Lowest 25% population and interventions needed. Small group instruction was a focus for reading and math as well which is believed to have contributed to these gains.

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

There are two areas of potential concern that can be gleaned from the student performance data. Though the percentage of students making learning gains school-wide showed an increase from the previous year, it is concerning that there was only an 11% increase. This area is the lowest percentage change in student data. Specifically, the lowest 25% students only showed a 15% increase in their ELA performance scores. The student performance scores in Mathematics are also a potential area of concern. The performance scores of students in the lowest 25% made a 17% increase in their scores.

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

1. Increase percentage of students meeting proficiency in ELA
2. Increase percentage of students meeting proficiency in Science for 5th grade
3. Increase percentage of students meeting proficiency in Math
4. Continue meeting the social, emotional, and academic needs for all students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Standards based planning and instruction to increase ELA proficiency and learning gains.
Rationale	Data supports the need for teachers to to utilize standards aligned planning and instruction while continuing to focus on regular practice with complex text and text based writing across content areas. Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches, and administration.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	School wide ELA proficiency and learning gains will increase as a result of increasing teacher collaboration for standards aligned planning and instruction, providing regular practice with complex text and text based writing across content areas and small group reading instruction daily for the Lowest 25% population. In 2019 63% of students scored a learning gain and 65% of students in grades 3-6 were proficient on the ELA FSA. The Lowest 25% population showed 53% learning gains on FSA ELA. The goal for 2020 is to increase students showing a learning gain schoolwide to 70%, Lowest 25% learning gains to 60% and students meeting proficiency to 72% on the ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Adrienne Schwab (schwab.adrienne@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilization of collaborative planning with standards aligned quality resources implementing cooperative engagement strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence supports that student achievement increases when collaborative planning and professional development utilizing standards aligned resources occurs for instructional staff. When paired with administration walkthroughs, immediate feedback, and data driven decisions, this strategy can increase achievement for all learners.

Action Step	
Description	1. Administrators will provide a full day common planning time each nine weeks for grade level teachers to build standards based ELA lessons to include complex text, text based writing utilizing the TEA method , small group instruction and formative and summative assessments 2. Daily small group instruction in ELA for Lowest 25% 3. Administrators will provide professional development on implementing small group instruction within the classroom utilizing complex texts 4. Administrators will meet with teachers for Individual data meetings with teachers to discuss Lowest 25% ELA data 5. Administrators will arrange coverage provided for teachers to observe peers in ELA 6. MTSS meetings to discuss the Lowest 25% population, MTSS process, and strategies for intervention to increase student achievement. 7. Literacy Coach will model lessons in classrooms 8. Classroom teachers will examine last year's FSA scale scores and will calculate the number of points each student will need to make a learning gain for this school year. 9. Administrators will schedule Focus Board training for staff 10. Continue the TEA school wide writing framework. 11. Administrators will conduct classroom walk throughs utilizing the IPG tool focusing on the 4Ts. 12. Administrators will arrange and/or provide professional development on standards aligned instruction of complex text and text based writing across content areas

13. Required I-Ready instructional tool 30 - 45 minutes weekly in ELA
14. Send new teachers to Kagan cooperative learning training

Person Responsible	Adrienne Schwab (schwab.adrienne@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Standards based planning and instruction to incraese math proficiency
Rationale	Data supports the need for teachers to utilize standards aligned planning and instruction while continuing to focus on the Lowest 25% population in Math. Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches, and administration.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	School wide math proficiency will increase as a result of increasing teacher collaboration for standards aligned planning and instruction. In 2019 71% of students in grades 3-6 were proficient on the math FSA. The Lowest 25% population showed 61% learning gains on FSA math. The goal for 2020 is to increase students meeting proficiency to 76% on the math FSA and to increase the Lowest 25% population math learning gains to 66%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessie Stein (stein.jessie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilization of collaborative planning with standards aligned quality resources implementing cooperative engagement strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence supports that student achievement increases when collaborative planning and professional development utilizing standards aligned resources occurs for instructional staff. This strategy when paired with administration walkthroughs, immediate feedback, and data driven decisions can increase achievement for all learners.

Action Step	
Description	1. Implement Eureka math in grades 3, 4 and 5 2. Required math instruction utilizing I-Ready online component 30 - 45 minutes weekly for the Lowest 25% population in Math 3. Administrators will hold individual data meetings with teachers to discuss Lowest 25% Math data 4. Administrators will provide coverage provided for teachers to observe peers in Math 5. MTSS meetings to discuss the Lowest 25% population, MTSS process, and strategies for intervention to increase student achievement. 6. Classroom teachers will examine last year's FSA scale scores and will calculate the number of points each student will need to make a learning gain for this school year. 7. Administrators will schedule Focus Board training for staff 8. Send new teachers to Kagan cooperative learning training
Person Responsible	Jessie Stein (stein.jessie@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Standards based planning and instruction to increase Science proficiency in 5th grade
Rationale	Data supports the need to increase collaborative planning for standards aligned instruction and hands on instruction for Science utilizing the 5 E model to increase student proficiency.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Fifth grade FCAT Science proficiency will increase as a result of increasing teacher collaboration for standards aligned planning and instruction as well as increasing hands on Science requirements. In 2019 62% of students in grade 5 were proficient on the Science FCAT. The goal for 2020 is to increase students meeting proficiency to 70% on the Science FCAT.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessie Stein (stein.jessie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilizing the 5 E model of inquiry to plan and implement hands on Science learning for students and utilization of collaborative planning with standards aligned quality resources implementing cooperative engagement strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence supports that student achievement increases when collaborative planning and professional development utilizing standards aligned resources occurs for instructional staff. This strategy when paired with administration walkthroughs, immediate feedback, and data driven decisions can increase achievement for all learners. Increasing hands on Science will ensure that students are "doing" the Science.

Action Step	
Description	1.Team to plan Science labs for the year based on standards 2. Required time in the Science Lab twice a month for 3rd - 5th grade utilizing labs based on Florida standards 3. Administrators will provide professional development on the 5 E model for hands on Science instruction 4. Review Science standards prior to FCAT Science. Each student will rotate through 9 labs 5. Utilize standards based district resources on the district Science website 6. Send new teachers to Kagan cooperative learning training
Person Responsible	Jessie Stein (stein.jessie@brevardschools.org)

#4	
Title	Continue to meet the social/emotional needs of all students
Rationale	School-wide data supports the need for continued social/emotional supports for students. In 2019 there were 180 students who received a discipline referral and 595 discipline events at Meadowlane Intermediate.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Continuing to focus on the social/emotional needs of the students will result in decreased discipline referrals, decreased bullying investigations, increased student attendance and increased academic achievement. The goal for 2020 is to decrease the number of events reported by 50% to 298 with continuous implementation of social/emotional supports.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sarah Oberbeck (oberbeck.sarah@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Caring School Community, Guidance Counselors Small groups
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Caring School Community, promotes positive behavior through direct teaching of responsibility, empathy, and cooperation, creating a setting where students feel heard, known, and cared for. Caring School Community is an effective, proven SEL program that succeeds by focusing on relationships. Relationships underpin teaching, learning, and prosocial development.

Action Step	
Description	1. Continue morning meeting Caring School Community curriculum and home school connection schoolwide. 2. Small group sessions with guidance counselors for social and emotional student development 3. Maintain the schoolwide common language "Give Me Five" and Above the Line/Below the Line character traits. 4. School-wide procedures and expectations shared in each classroom 5. Bullying presentations presented by guidance counselors for each grade level 6. Officer Erenstoft from West Melbourne PD to present online safety presentation to 6th grade students and an evening presentation for parents 7. Guidance counselors to do whole class lessons using Mind Up curriculum in the counselor's cottage 8. Review discipline data monthly to monitor frequent incidents and provide supports as soon as possible for individual students and/or classrooms
Person Responsible	Sarah Oberbeck (oberbeck.sarah@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).