

Brevard Public Schools

# Meadowlane Intermediate Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>24</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# 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: 6/1/2020

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>3-6   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 43%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (64%)<br>2017-18: B (55%)<br>2016-17: A (62%)<br>2015-16: B (59%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Meadowlane Intermediate Elementary School

2700 WINGATE BLVD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

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

## School Demographics

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School<br/>3-6</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>43%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>             | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>         | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>40%</p>               |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2019-20</b> | <b>2018-19</b> | <b>2017-18</b> | <b>2016-17</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | A              | A              | B              | A              |

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

| Name                | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Barnett, Sarah      | 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.   |
| Stein, Jessie       | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal supports the MTSS team and supports 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.   |
| Steger, Michelle    | 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 and gives feedback as part of the coaching cycle, assists third grade teachers with portfolio assessments, oversees the i-ready diagnostic procedure, reviews school-wide progress monitoring data, provide staff |



| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------|-------|--|
|      |       | 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. |

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Monday 6/1/2020, Sarah Barnett N

**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.*

13

**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.*

13

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

55

**Demographic Data**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>3-6   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 43%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (64%)   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | 2017-18: B (55%)<br>2016-17: A (62%)<br>2015-16: B (59%) |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>                 |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |  |

**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 | 188 | 192 | 190 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 756   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 5   | 4   | 11  | 6   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2   | 2   | 6   | 4   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 4   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0   | 3   | 17  | 27  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 47    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0   | 3   | 16  | 29  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |
|   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|   | 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 | 3 | 12 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |

**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 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 5  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 6  |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 9/4/2020

**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     | 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  |

**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  |
| 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  |

**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   |       |
|   | (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 | 67%    | 64%      | 3%                         | 58%   | 9%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 65%    | 63%      | 2%                         | 57%   | 8%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 61%    | 61%      | 0%                         | 58%   | 3%                      |

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 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%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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 |

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>  |     |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 8   |
| Percent Tested   | 98% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>   |     |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>  |     |
| 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%      | 0   |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |     |
| 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%       | 0   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 75  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| 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% | 0   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 67  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 64  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| 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   | 68  |
| 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                                | 54  |
| 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.**

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 and was even with the State average for proficiency for the Lowest 25%. Many students in the Lowest 25% population are bus riders and are unable to attend the before and/or after school academic support program. There is a continued need to provide additional support for these students during the school day, or virtually after school so that they can access the support in spite of riding the bus home. For this reason, we will have ASP during the school day this year as well. Additionally, a large portion of students in the lowest 25% are also students with disabilities. Prior to the 2019 school year, they received mainly pull-out support and were not consistently exposed to grade-level text and instruction. SWDs also did not participate in intervention groups. There is need to provide push-in support and include SWDs in intervention groups, so that they will achieve proficiency at a greater rate.

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

When looking at FSA data, we see that in 2018, 72% of students in our school showed proficiency in math, and in 2019, that dropped to 71%. Moreover, when we look at our iReady data, the 2019-2020



Winter diagnostic showed that 54% of our students were on or above grade level at the time, and on our initial 2020-2021 diagnostic, only 28% of our students were on or above grade level in math. Several factors likely contributed to this, the greatest being that all of our students participated in distance learning during the final quarter of the 2019-2020 school year. During this time, students did not receive daily direct instruction in math, resulting in unfinished learning of many of the math standards in each grade level.

**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.**

Although our school scores are not below the State average in any area, in the area of ELA achievement of our lowest 25%, our percentage, 53%, was the same as the State's. Additionally, this data point was 5% below the district average.

Additionally, on the 2019-20 Winter Diagnostic, 61% of students school wide performed on or above grade level in ELA. On the initial iReady diagnostic in August, 2020, that number had dropped; only 46% of students school wide performed on or above grade level in ELA. Additionally, on this same initial diagnostic, 33% of students performed one grade level below expectation, 13% of students performed two grade levels below expectation, and 7% of students performed 3 or more grade levels below expectation.

Several factors likely contributed to this, the greatest being that all of our students participated in distance learning during the final quarter of the 2019-2020 school year. During this time, students did not receive daily direct instruction in reading, resulting in unfinished learning of many of the reading standards in each grade level.

Additionally, in years past, students in our lowest 25% group often received assignments based on their ability level, instead of receiving grade-level text and assignments with support.

**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 2019, 63% of students school wide showed a learning gain in ELA, compared to only 52% in 2018, which was an 11% increase. In 2019, 73% of students school wide made a learning gain in math, compared to only 60% in 2018, which was a 13% increase. Meadowlane Intermediate began implementing small group instruction for reading and math in 2019, which was believed to have contributed to these gains. Additionally, data meetings were held monthly, and teachers were able to determine need to reteach skills using data so that students could work toward mastery of grade level content, thus making learning gains.

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

The main area of concern is the number of students scoring a Level 1 on FSA math and reading. Another area of concern is attendance. It is difficult to improve students' academic proficiency when they are not in school to receive instruction and intervention.

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

1. Increasing overall percentage of students meeting proficiency in ELA.
2. Increasing the percentage of students with disabilities (SWD) that meet proficiency in ELA and Math.
4. Supporting the social/emotional learning of all of our students.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

Description: Teachers will work collaboratively to plan standards-based instruction, tasks and assessments to increase ELA proficiency and learning gains for all students. By ensuring that instruction and tasks are aligned to the full intent of the standards, and by giving all students opportunities to interact with grade-level text and tasks, then all students will experience greater learning gains and achievement in ELA.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Impact on Student Learning: School wide ELA proficiency and learning gains will increase as a result of increasing teacher collaboration time for planning standards aligned whole group and small group instruction, by providing regular and consistent opportunities for all students to interact with complex text and to write in response to text across content areas, and by providing small group reading instruction daily for the Lowest 25% population.

Rationale: Data indicates a need for continued structure and time as supports for teachers to plan for inclusive, standards-based instruction and tasks for all students. Additionally, data shows a need for continued focus on giving students consistent practice with complex, grade-level 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.

In 2019, 63% of students made a learning gain and 65% of students were proficient on the FSA ELA. The Lowest 25% population showed 53% proficiency on FSA ELA. The goal for 2021 is to increase students showing a learning gain school-wide to 68%, Lowest 25% proficiency to 58% and overall students meeting proficiency to 70% on the FSA ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

On the initial iReady diagnostic in 2020, 51% of students were on or above grade level in the domain of Comprehension: Literature, and 48% of students were on or above grade level in the domain of Comprehension: Informational text. By the final iReady diagnostic for the 2020-2021 school year, that will increase by at least 5% so that 56% of students will be on grade level in the domain of Comprehension: Literature, and 53% of students will be on grade level in the domain of Comprehension: Informational text.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sarah Barnett (barnett.sarah@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

We will implement bi-monthly PLCs at which teachers will plan lessons aligned to the full intent of the standards, including standards aligned quality resources, questions, tasks and assessments. Teachers will use assessment data to determine student mastery of the standards and to collaboratively plan subsequent lessons to address student learning needs in the area of ELA.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Evidence supports that student achievement increases when teachers have consistent opportunities to plan collaboratively with peers, implement those plans, and then review student data to plan subsequent instruction. Authentic professional development opportunities utilizing this action/reflection routine, paired with peer observation opportunities, administrative walk-throughs, and immediate feedback, will increase achievement for all learners.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Administrators will dedicate common planning time monthly for grade level teachers to plan standards based lessons to include complex text, text based writing, small group instruction, and formative/

summative assessments for all students. An emphasis will be placed on keeping pace with the Standards Focus Documents and designing opportunities for all students to interact with grade-level material and text.

2. Teachers will bring individual student data and class data and be ready to discuss with their grade level teams and with administrators to plan subsequent lessons, including scaffolding opportunities for students who need them based on their individual data. Data will include iReady weekly data, Standards Mastery data and standards-aligned formative assessment data.

3. Teachers will administer 2 Standards Mastery iReady assessments each quarter (for standards in bold) and then will provide small group lessons, including scaffolded support to students in need, based on Standards Mastery data.

**Person Responsible** Sarah Barnett (barnett.sarah@brevardschools.org)

4. Classroom teachers, ESE teachers, and administration will monitor the growth of our ESE subgroup on a weekly basis using iReady data.

5. Administrators will conduct classroom walk-throughs utilizing the IPG tool and will give feedback to teachers based on these observations.

6. Administrators will provide coverage for teachers to observe peers implementing standards-based ELA instruction.

7. Literacy Coach will model standards-based ELA lessons in classrooms.

8. The leadership team will arrange and/or provide professional development on standards-based instruction and assignments, including action-research embedded into PLCs.

9. All students will be required to use the iReady instructional tool 30 - 45 minutes weekly in ELA. Teachers will have follow-up data chats with students regarding their individual data.

**Person Responsible** Sarah Barnett (barnett.sarah@brevardschools.org)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Meadowlane Intermediate will continue to focus on the social/emotional needs of all students. School-wide data supports the need for continued social/emotional supports for students. In 2020 there were 126 students who received a discipline referral and 358 discipline events at Meadowlane Intermediate. Additionally, on our Insight survey, only 22% of teachers said there were consistent expectations and consequences for student behavior and only 41% of teacher felt that misbehavior was addressed immediately in shared spaces. Additionally, on our parent survey, when asked what wasn't working at the school, parent responses included "need stronger discipline and consequences" or "behaviors should be addressed fairly". This data helped us to see that improving the culture and creating consistent expectations school-wide is opportunity for improvement.

**Measurable Outcome:** Continuing to focus on the social/emotional needs of the students and creating schoolwide rules and expectations will result in decreased discipline referrals, decreased bullying investigations, increased student attendance and increased academic achievement. The goal for 2021 is to decrease the number of events reported by 25% to 269 with continuous implementation of social/emotional supports. Additionally, teachers response will increase to at least 65% regarding consistent expectations and immediate consequences.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jessie Stein (stein.jessie@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The Caring School Community program is a yearlong, schoolwide SEL program that provides comprehensive support.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** This program helps to build caring relationships among students and adults. It directly teaches social skills that students need in school and in life. Caring School Community integrates SEL and academic learning. The program also uses classroom management strategies that create calm, productive learning environments. One last component is the implementation of student-centered discipline that teaches students self-management and self-discipline.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. The master schedule was built around the continuation of school-wide morning meetings using the Caring School Community curriculum and the Home/School Connection.
2. All students will receive Tier 1 Social/Emotional Support weekly as part of the Activity Wheel.
3. School-based mental health providers will facilitate small group sessions to further enhance social and emotional student development.
4. Stakeholders created 3 essential school rules. Those rules were further developed to describe the procedures and expectations for the hallway, in the cafeteria, at the playground, etc. Posters were created and are displayed in each classroom, as well in common areas around campus.
5. Students will take part in Wellness Wednesdays where teachers will implement the Child Trafficking Prevention and Substance Abuse Education.

**Person Responsible** Jessie Stein (stein.jessie@brevardschools.org)

6. The Leadership Team will meet monthly to review discipline data and monitor frequent incidents. Supports will be provided as soon as possible for individual students and/or classrooms. Data will be shared at MTSS meetings.
7. Not only will academic concerns be discussed during the MTSS process, but starting the 20-21 school

year, students with behavioral concerns will be monitored using specific interventions from the Caring School Community Program.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Olesnevich (olesnevich.jessica@brevardschools.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**

Description: Students in need of Tier 2 or Tier 3 reading interventions will receive strategic, systematic instruction daily. Unlike in years past, this will include all students in need, including our students with disabilities.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Impact on Student Learning: School wide ELA proficiency and learning gains will increase as a result of providing tiered, specific instruction to students using data systematically to determine need.

Rationale: Our data indicates a need for specific, small group intervention instruction that will help to close the learning gaps that already existed and/or were exacerbated by the period of distance learning that took place at the end of the 2019-2020 school year due to Covid-19 school closures.

**Measurable Outcome:**

We will increase our school wide proficiency so that at least 65% of students will be on or above grade level in on the final iReady reading diagnostic. Additionally, we will decrease the number of students below grade level, so that less than 3% of our students will be 3 grade levels below or more and only 10% or less will be two grade levels below expectation on this final iReady diagnostic.

Additionally, by including our students with disabilities in our intervention groups, their ELA achievement on FSA will increase by at least 5%, so that 32% of them will meet proficiency on the FSA ELA section, decreasing the gap between their achievement and that of the non-SWD to 38%, a 5 % decrease.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sarah Barnett (barnett.sarah@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

We will implement a walk-to-intervention model in which students will be grouped strategically to receive consistent, systematic instruction in an area of data-demonstrated need in order to increase ELA proficiency by closing learning gaps and addressing unfinished learning needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Research has shown that when students receive consistent, systematic intervention in small groups, they will make academic gains. Tier 2 instruction includes mild interventions and Tier 3 includes intensive instruction. Each level of intervention should include specific instructional program components and each program should be implemented consistently and effectively.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Administration will ensure that the master schedule will be built so that a walk-to-intervention model can be implemented school-wide. The schedule will allow for key personnel to assist with interventions and will ensure that intervention time takes place consistently on a daily basis. All students who need Tier 2 or Tier 3 instruction, including students with disabilities, will receive targeted reading interventions consistently and systematically.
2. Teachers will use diagnostic data, such as iReady, running records, DORF and PSI to determine unfinished learning and need for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention.
3. Teachers, administration and our literacy coach will participate in grade level teams to analyze data, including intervention OPM data, at bi-monthly MTSS meetings to create strategic intervention groups and to then adjust reading interventions during subsequent intervention rounds to meet students' academic needs and to increase student achievement.

**Person Responsible** Sarah Barnett (barnett.sarah@brevardschools.org)

4. Literacy coach will work with administration to arrange coverage for teachers to observe peers teaching small group reading interventions.
5. Literacy Coach will model lessons in classrooms and support teachers in planning for reading interventions.
6. The leadership team will plan for or provide professional development opportunities for teachers to address targeted reading interventions and using data to determine Tier 2 and Tier 3 student needs.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Steger (steger.michelle@brevardschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**Another schoolwide improvement priority that was identified was to increase the numbers of students, and the number of students with disabilities, that achieve proficiency in math. The leadership team will address this by continuing to support teachers in their planning for math instruction by incorporating the Math Focus Documents into grade level planning and reviewing math instructional materials (Eureka and Big Ideas) with teachers at the collaborative planning time. The leadership team will also work with teachers to use data to determine which students need additional math support, and then will provide opportunities for students to receive this support with additional personnel using ASP funds and Cares Act funds.**

## 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.

Meadowlane Intermediate school has a positive school culture, consisting of a school-wide discipline plan, professional learning communities, and excellent community and parent involvement.

Based on feedback from our Parent Survey and our teachers' Insight Survey, we determined that focusing on positive discipline in order to improve school culture would be important this year. In the 2020-2021 school year, Meadowlane Intermediate will continue to use the Caring School Community program for the social-emotional learning of students, incorporating pieces of the new, updated curriculum into our day. This year, we are also adopting the CSC school-wide discipline component. As a part of the Caring School Community program, teachers and staff members collaborated to create a shared vision for positive school



culture. The faculty of Meadowlane Intermediate agrees that students need an environment in which everyone feels safe, loved and respected, and that all students should make consistent progress, exceeding their diverse personal achievement levels. For this vision to become a reality, Meadowlane Intermediate believes in high expectations for all students academically and behaviorally. The leadership team and then later the entire staff collaborated to create a new set of school-wide rules which provide a common language across grade levels. These will be shared with all students and parents. The Meadowlane Intermediate School rules are to be safe, be respectful, and be responsible. A shared vision for excellence and consistent rules will help ensure consistency resonates throughout the school. We believe this approach will be successful because there is buy-in from administration, teachers, parents, and students.

Professional learning communities will be used in conjunction with the MTSS process to help ensure the academic progress of all students at Meadowlane Intermediate. Grade level teams will meet weekly on Tuesdays during their planning periods to collaborate and plan for instruction. The leadership team will work with each team to discuss interventions, collaboratively plan lessons, and evaluate data. Meeting in professional learning communities will foster collaborative learning among colleagues while focusing on improving their practice.

Meadowlane Intermediate School has great support and partnerships from its families and the community. We have an active Parent Teacher Organization which meets monthly to plan events and raise funds to help engage the families of all students. Based on feedback we received on our Parent Survey, we've decided to provide a Zoom link to all meetings (even when this is no longer a requirement) so that parents can attend from work, from home, etc. Some events we plan to continue (when allowed) include family movie nights, a trunk or treat event, and an annual Boosterthon Fun Run. In addition, partnerships with our faith-based organizations Calvary Chapel and Wesley Church ensure that all students are fed and loved with the weekly backpack program and holiday assistance. Members of Wesley Church also provide mentoring to students when needed. Meadowlane Intermediate has many community partners who help support various school needs, and we value their partnership greatly.

Many aspects of Meadowlane Intermediate ensure that we have a positive school culture with all stakeholders.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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