Meadowbrook Elementary School

2020-21 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: 1/18/2012

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
2019-20 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%)
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 was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	28%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Burklew, Brad	Principal	
Gonzalez, Lynn	Assistant Principal	
Strack, Landon	Dean	
Morris, Lisa	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 1/18/2012, Brad Burklew

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
56

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
53

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	144	143	133	160	159	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	890
Attendance below 90 percent	17	6	9	8	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	12	2	6	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	12	0	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	0	0	4	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/17/2020

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	
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	

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**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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%	0
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	70

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	79
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Based on the 2019 School, State and District Comparison chart, the two data components that showed the lowest performance were the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile (64%) and the Math Lowest 25th Percentile (66%). Similar trends included both components being that of the lowest quartile students. Contributing factors include learning gaps, prior year retentions, and home support.

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

Based on the seven school grade categories, Math Learning Gains (-13%) and Math Lowest 25th Percentile (-12%) showed the greatest decline from last year. The greatest factor that contributed to this decline was effective interventional lessons for our ESE students. Actions taken to improve this factor includes data driven intervention lessons for all students, monthly Math ISIP assessments,

Math Mini AIMS, and frequent math fluency checks in class.
Fortunately, Meadowbrook did not experience any decline in grade level comparison scores from year 2018 to year 2019. We showed 2-10% increase in all areas.

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.

Meadowbrook out-performed the state average in all seven areas. The greatest gap between Meadowbrook and the state average was the ELA achievement (difference of 23%) and Math achievement (difference of 21%). Factors that contribute to this trend are as follows: Highly effective teachers, effective use of resources, individualized professional development, and data driven progress monitoring plans for all students.

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

Meadowbrook's greatest improvement was in 5th Grade Science - an increase of 9%. The new action that contributed to this improvement was strategic pacing of the curriculum. The fifth grade team took a few weeks to review standards covered in third and fourth grade. This greatly contributed to student success.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Kindergarten is an area of concerns in attendance, course failure in math and course failure in reading. Our kindergarten teachers are coming together to come up with solutions to solve these concerns. Ideas include attendance incentives, data driven intervention lessons, and progress monitoring of all students. Another area of concern is the 20 students who scored a level 1 on the third grade math and/or ELA FSA. To achieve the gains need for our current fifth graders, our fifth grade team is coming up with solutions such as engagement strategies, data driven intervention lessons, and student led individualized data driven folders.

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

1. Increase gains of the ELA and Math Lowest Quartile students
2. Increase learning gains in both ELA and Math
3. Increase achievement in both ELA and Math
4. Decrease percentage of course failure in ELA and Math
5. Decrease percentage of students who have less than 90% attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase the percentage of ELA and Math Lowest Quartile student gains and increase the percentage of science achievement. Rationale: Continue to meet the needs of all students on state assessed areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Meadowbrook's measurable outcomes include increasing ELA Lowest quartile student gains from 64% to 67%, increasing Math Lowest Quartile student gains from 66% to 69%, and increasing our 5th grade science achievement from 82% to 85%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lynn Gonzalez (gonzalezlm@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ongoing review of student data by administrators, teacher leaders, and classroom teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring by school leaders ensures that students needs are being met.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Progress monitoring using student data to conduct data chats during team meetings.
2. Monitor teacher planning and pacing through the use of formal and informal observations.
3. Planning of research based learning strategies during team meetings.
4. Administrative monitoring of attendance of planning meetings and professional development opportunities.

Person Responsible Lynn Gonzalez (gonzalezlm@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase ELA and Math achievement of African American Students, while increasing proficiency levels for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increasing African American Achievement in in ELA from 51% to 54% and Math from 59% to 62% while increasing proficiency levels for all students in ELA from 80% to 83% and Math from 84% to 87%.
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 Steps to Implement

1. Progress monitoring using student data to conduct data chats during team meetings.
2. Monitor teacher planning and pacing through the use of formal and informal observations.
3. Planning of research based learning strategies during team meetings.
4. Administrative monitoring of attendance of planning meetings and professional development opportunities.

Person Responsible	Brad Burklew (burklewb@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reducing African American Out of School Suspensions. Rationale - Reducing OSS will help ensure that students are being exposed to content and classroom instruction and increase student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Decreasing the percentage of African American out of school suspenions by at least 33% or 1 less than last year (2).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Landon Strack (stracklm@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. It's practices replace fear, uncertainty, and punishment as motivators with belonging, connections and the willingness to change because people matter to each other.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor student behavior (behavioral paraprofessional as additional support)
2. Assess individual student needs
3. EPT (FBA and BIP as determined)
4. Restorative Discipline Strategies
5. Individualized Behavior Management Plan as needed

Person Responsible	Landon Strack (stracklm@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

4. Decrease percentage of course failure in ELA and Math
The school leadership team will address the concern of course failure by continuous of progress monitoring data, administrative support in professional development opportunities needed, and collaboration of school leaders and teachers during PLC and planning meetings.
5. Decrease percentage of students who have less than 90% attendance
The school leadership team will address the concerns of attendance by collaboration between school leaders and teachers to provide students will attendance incentives.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Meadowbrook Elementary has built a positive culture and environment ensuring all stakeholder are involved. Administrators and staff truly believe that they can reach the goal of ALL students achieving academic success. Meadowbrook stakeholders have the belief that we are "in this together" and that "it takes a village" to support our students. Teachers and parents both feel a responsibility for student learning. The positive atmosphere and care is evident in all staff members. We believe in high expectations for all students. Meadowbrook faculty and staff work with parents, the community, and build many partnerships with different community members including businesses, clubs, high education institutions and other groups. Meadowbrook has a number of business partners including: Publix, Florida Credit Union, Campus Credit union, and more. In addition, Meadowbrook teachers and staff hold events such as "Burger Night" as a family outreach program in Sante Fe Oaks.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00