

Brevard Public Schools

Meadowlane Intermediate Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	28
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 1/6/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2020-21 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%)
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	

* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Meadowlane Intermediate Elementary School

2700 WINGATE BLVD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School 3-6</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>43%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>39%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	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.

We will provide a safe and engaging environment every day so that all students will acquire lifelong learning skills that will enable them to be productive and successful citizens today, tomorrow and always!

(Revised 2021)

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hirschy, Lisa	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 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.
Barnett, Sarah	Principal	Principal is an Instructional Leader and ensures a focus on academics throughout the school day. She 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.
Coudle, Carol	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.
Moorer, Robert	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,

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		tracks attendance records, and coordinates the PTO and SAC monthly meetings.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/6/2020, 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.*

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

840

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

13

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	220	209	194	212	0	0	0	0	0	0	835
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	14	18	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	4	37	32	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	3	29	40	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
	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	4	21	30	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/17/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				65%	62%	57%	60%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	60%	58%	52%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	57%	53%	38%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				71%	63%	63%	72%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				73%	65%	62%	60%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	53%	51%	44%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				62%	57%	53%	57%	57%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	67%	64%	3%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	61%	0%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
06	2021					
	2019	65%	60%	5%	54%	11%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	61%	6%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	64%	4%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	60%	13%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
06	2021					
	2019	76%	67%	9%	55%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	62%	56%	6%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

- iReady
- Summative Science Tests

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53%	75%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%(35/84)	64% (54/84)	68% (57/84)
	Students With Disabilities	25% (11/44)	48% (21/44)	55% (24/44)
	English Language Learners	0% (0/10)	10% (1/10)	40% (4/10)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16%	40%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7% (6/84)	27% (23/84)	55% (46/84)
	Students With Disabilities	0% (0/44)	20% (9/44)	34% (15/44)
	English Language Learners	10% (1/10)	10% (1/10)	50% (5/10)
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43%	61%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29% (26/91)	53% (48/91)	63% (57/91)
	Students With Disabilities	21% (10/48)	38% (20/52)	52% (27/52)
	English Language Learners	0% (0/8)	25% (2/8)	38% (3/8)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23%	44%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9% (8/91)	29% (26/91)	47% (43/91)
	Students With Disabilities	12% (6/52)	25% (13/52)	35% (18/52))))
	English Language Learners	13%(1/8)	38% (3/8)	38% (3/8)

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41%	53%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27% (22/83)	42% (35/83)	45% (37/83)
	Students With Disabilities	13% (6/48)	25% (12/48)	19% (9/48)
	English Language Learners	33% (3/9)	44% (4/9)	33% (3/9)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27%	45%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17% (14/83)	29% (24/83)	42% (35/83)
	Students With Disabilities	6% (3/48)	15% (7/48)	29% (14/48)
	English Language Learners	33% (3/9)	44% (4/9)	78% (7/9)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48%	51%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32% (25/79)	34% (27/79)	54% (29/79)
	Students With Disabilities	13%(4/31)	6% (2/33)	18% (6/33)
	English Language Learners	0% (0/6)	0% (0/6)	0% (0/3)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44%	52%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27% (21/79)	37% (29/79)	55% (34/79)
	Students With Disabilities	6% (2/33)	6% (2/33)	15% (5/33)
	English Language Learners	0% (0/6)	0% (0/6)	33% (2/6)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	34	31	23	41	37	24	37				
ELL	52	78	67	67	72	73	58				
ASN	73	77		80	77		64				
BLK	38	37	17	33	41	36	38				
HSP	66	55	47	67	58	62	63				
MUL	61	55		51	21						
WHT	67	55	39	71	57	30	60				
FRL	50	41	26	49	40	27	44				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	67
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	74
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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	47
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	54
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

SY20-21 data shows that, although 3+ proficiency was above the district average in ELA, Math and Science, as a school we decreased significantly in both ELA and Science. Our overall ELA proficiency decreased by 2%, Math decreased by 6% and Science also decreased by 6%. Moreover, our learning gains decreased in all areas; in ELA we saw a 9% decrease in learning gains and in Math we saw a 19% decrease in learning gains. Our most notable area of decline was with our Lowest 25% subgroup in both ELA (15% decrease in proficiency) and Math (24% decrease in proficiency).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

SY20-21 FSA data shows that our greatest areas for improvement are in ELA proficiency (57%) and Science proficiency (55%) overall. Additionally, our Lowest 25% learning gains in both ELA (38%) and Math (37%) are areas that need improvement. (Update when FSA data populates if needed.)

iReady data from SY20-21 shows that our SWD population continues to be under performing. In Reading, SWD showed only 37% proficiency and in math, the same group showed only 29% proficiency.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors to lower student achievement include the lack of consistency in instruction due to a great number of students changing between eLearning/Brick and Mortar teaching multiple times during the year; thus changing classes. There were also times when teachers were absent for long periods of time due to required quarantines or when teachers left mid-year. Other contributing factors include the fact that we did not have standards aligned ELA curriculum to use last year and, although we started schoolwide intervention last year, there were times that it was inconsistent due to lack of instructional materials and to the difficulties associated with hybrid intervention groups. Contributing factors to our drop in Science proficiency include the fact that our students missed valuable opportunities for hands-on Science instruction while learning at home, including missing instruction the previous year during distance learning as well.

This year, there will be no elearning/hybrid teaching options, which will help to increase consistency in instruction. Additionally, small group instruction can take place with more fidelity since difficulty logging into or monitoring breakout rooms will no longer be an issue. We will be using new standards-aligned ELA curriculum (Benchmark Advance and Savaas) with fidelity schoolwide and will also be obtaining, training on and utilizing intervention materials from the Decision Trees with fidelity. Additionally, we will address mastery of Science standards by increasing opportunities for hands-on learning and by utilizing Penda science on the computer as well.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

In all 4 grade levels, we made the most growth in Math based on the iReady diagnostic. Additionally, on FSA, our math scores did decline slightly, but we showed the least amount of regression in this area. 3+ proficiency went from 67% or 63%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Teachers used Eureka with fidelity across grades 3-5 and 6th grade all utilized Big Ideas in conjunction with iReady math weekly.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Continue school-wide strategic reading intervention in phonics, vocabulary and comprehension and add fluency interventions
Implement Academic Support Program (ASP)
PLCs - teachers/admin/coach using data to plan for instruction; this will be monitored by our literacy coach and admin
Implementation of new ELA Curriculum with admin/coach support
Weekly iReady lessons in both reading and math - monitored for passage; reteach when necessary
Penda Science with fidelity
Small group instruction daily
Monitor Lowest 25% through MTSS
Monitor SWD, AA and Economically Disadvantaged student data through MTSS

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

PLCs - coach will be supporting teacher planning with new ELA curriculum
Training on new BEST standards
Penda Science training

Data training - looking at data by class and subgroup with teachers (new teachers will learn to use PM)

Planning using the data with support from admin/coach

Training/Modeling/Feedback on Small Group instruction

Training/Modeling/Feedback on intervention instruction

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will monitor data bimonthly (2x per month) to determine efficacy of our strategies and make changes as needed and continue with what is working. We will continue to focus on intervention and small group instruction, making changes as needed to ensure health safety for all, while not giving up on these strategies that promote learning for all students. Admin will set clear expectations for use of new ELA curriculum and will stay focused on these expectations, providing support in order to ensure that teachers continue to use the curriculum, which is aligned to the new standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Description: Teachers will work collaboratively with administration and our Literacy Coach in PLCs to learn the new BEST standards for ELA, to dig into the new ELA curriculum, and to plan daily instruction that is fully aligned to the ELA standards. This planning will include plans for small group instruction that will ensure that all students have daily opportunities to interact with grade-level text and tasks, which will contribute to all students experiencing 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 standards-aligned 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.

Measurable Outcome:

In 2021, 54% of students made a learning gain in ELA and 63% of students were proficient on the FSA ELA. Of our Lowest 25% population, 38% made learning gains. The goal for 2021 is to increase students showing a learning gain school-wide to 60%, Lowest 25% learning gains to 43% and overall students meeting proficiency to 65% on the FSA ELA.

On the initial iReady diagnostic in 2021, 48% of students were on or above grade level in Reading. By the final iReady diagnostic for the 2021-2022 school year, that will increase to at least 65% of students will be on grade level as measured by the iReady reading diagnostic.

Monitoring:

Each quarter, students will take iReady Standards Mastery assessments and teachers and administration will analyze the data in PLCs to determine areas of additional instructional need. iReady diagnostics will also be used 3 times per year to monitor student progress toward grade level reading proficiency. Additional assessments, such as Tier 2/3 OPM, will be used to closely monitor the Lowest 25%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Barnett (barnett.sarah@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will implement PLCs at which teachers will plan lessons aligned to the full intent of the standards, including fully implementing with fidelity the new Benchmark/Savaas Curricula, which are aligned to the new BEST standards. 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 to include instruction that address vocabulary, fluency and comprehension strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-

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.

based Strategy: Authentic professional development opportunities utilizing this action/reflection routine, paired with peer observation opportunities, coaching cycles with our Literacy Coach, administrative walk-throughs, and immediate feedback, will increase achievement for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Administrators will dedicate common planning time monthly for grade level teachers to plan standards-aligned lessons using the new ELA curriculum, 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 BPS pacing guide and providing small group instruction to all students to include a vocabulary and comprehension skills focus.

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

Administrators and Coach will participate in PLCs to review individual student data and class data with teachers and will work with teachers to use that data to plan subsequent lessons, including scaffolding and acceleration opportunities for students who need them based on their individual data. Data will include iReady weekly data, Standards Mastery data and district assessments aligned to the new curriculum.

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

Teachers will implement small group instruction for all students in ELA several times a week, and will implement small group instruction daily for the lowest 25% population.

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

Administrators will conduct classroom walk-throughs and provide feedback on tier 1 ELA instruction and on small group instruction.

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

Literacy Coach will model ELA lessons from the new curriculum in classrooms and will observe/provide feedback to teachers on the same.

Person Responsible Lisa Hirschy (hirschy.lisa@brevardschools.org)

The leadership team will arrange and/or provide professional development on the new BEST standards and on the new curriculum including action-research embedded into PLCs.

Person Responsible Lisa Hirschy (hirschy.lisa@brevardschools.org)

Administrators will provide coverage for teachers to observe peers implementing BEST standards -aligned ELA lessons using the new curriculum. This will include small group instruction.

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

All students will be required to use the iReady instructional tool 45 minutes weekly in ELA. Teachers will monitor the progress of the instructional path, with a concentration on the Lowest 25%.

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

Parents will receive iReady data along with clear explanations after each diagnostic so that they can participate in helping from home and are aware of their child's areas of strength and weakness.

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

Teachers will close achievement gaps for all subgroups, including students with disabilities, African American students and Economically Disadvantaged students by using a Walk to Intervention model 5 days a week with fidelity and through the Academic Support Program (before/after school).

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: For years, stagnant Science FCAT data supports the need to increase student proficiency. Our 2021 FCAT Science proficiency plummeted to 56%, the lowest its been since 2018. Our subgroup data reflects poorly on this assessment as well. In 2021, FCAT Science proficiency was only reached by 25% of ESE students, 35% of African American students, and 44% of our ELL students. To achieve an increased overall proficiency of 70% on Science FCAT, our focus will be geared toward utilizing Penda Science in conjunction with collaborative planning using the 5 E model for standards aligned science instruction.

Measurable Outcome: Fifth grade FCAT Science proficiency will increase as a result of increasing teacher collaboration for standards aligned planning and instruction as well as the implementation of Penda Science. In 2021, 56% of students in grade 5 were proficient on the Science FCAT. The goal for 2022 is to increase students meeting proficiency to 65% on the Science FCAT.

Monitoring: Weekly, teachers will receive a standards-based "Class Mastery Report" detailing every student's progress towards standards mastery. Monthly, this report will be monitored by admin and addressed in grade level data chats. Teachers will use the District Science Assessments to monitor student progress. Administration will monitor this data and support planning for Science instruction based on the data-determined needs.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: The 5E Instructional Model and Penda Science

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The 5E Instructional Model is used to design science units that can be based upon cognitive psychology, constructivist-learning theory, and best practices in science teaching. The 5E cycle consists of cognitive stages of learning that engage, explore, explain, elaborate, and evaluate. Research states that "using this approach, students redefine, reorganize, elaborate, and change their initial concepts through self-reflection and interaction with their peers and their environment. Learners interpret objects and phenomena, and internalize those interpretations in terms of their current conceptual understanding".

Penda Science will allow us to better support our struggling readers by providing inclusive differentiated science instruction. Individual learning gaps will be monitored and addressed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Designate and monitor science time in the master schedule for each grade level.

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

2. Utilize Penda Science to expand and monitor science knowledge.

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

3. Data team meetings will occur on a monthly basis to review data (including Penda Science data) and decide on next steps. Particular attention will be paid to our SWD, AA and ED subgroups.

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

4. Grades 3-5 will be working to utilize lesson plans and tasks that are engaging and that meet the depth of the standards using the 5 E Instructional Model.

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

5. Grades 3-5 will complete all District science summative assessments.

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

6. Science ASP will be offered to our 5th grade students.

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

7. Schedule instructional monitoring, feedback, coaching, and follow-up based on student data trends and observational data. Data for our SWD, AA and ED subgroups will be monitored closely.

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

8. Teachers will participate in Penda Science professional development opportunities in order to learn to effectively use this resource and monitor the data it provides.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Learning Gains is the greatest area of need for our students schoolwide. In years past, small group instruction has only been provided to the students in the lowest 25%. However, daily small group instruction is where teachers can differentiate instruction in order to ensure that all students make progress, even those who are already showing proficiency. We will provide small group ELA instruction daily as part of our Tier 1 instruction. Additionally, students in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will receive strategic, systematic instruction daily. All students in need will take part, including students with disabilities, as that is a subgroup that demonstrates the lowest levels of proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: We will increase ELA learning gains by 5% so that we go from 54% learning gains to 59% learning gains in ELA. Additionally, we will increase ELA learning gains for our Lowest 25% from 38% to 42%. This small group instruction will also help us to increase ELA proficiency, increasing by 2% from 63% to 65%.

Monitoring: Each quarter, students will take iReady Standards Mastery assessments and teachers and administration will analyze the data in PLCs to determine areas of additional instructional need with scaffolding and/or acceleration. iReady diagnostics will also be used 3 times per year to monitor student progress toward grade level reading proficiency. Additional assessments, such as Tier 2/3 OPM, will be used to closely monitor the Lowest 25% and our priority subgroups: SWD, AA and ED.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sarah Barnett (barnett.sarah@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will implement a walk to intervention/acceleration model during which phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension strategies will be systematically instructed. Students will be grouped strategically to receive consistent, systematic instruction in an area of data-demonstrated need in order to increase ELA proficiency by addressing unfinished learning. Additionally, we will provide standards-aligned small group lessons in order to provide opportunities for learning growth for all students. These lessons will include reteaching standards after Standards Mastery assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The learning gains for our lowest 25% continue to be an area of need in ELA. Research has shown that when students receive consistent, systematic intervention in small groups, they will make academic gains. Tier 2 instruction includes instruction in small groups while Tier 3 instruction also includes intensive instruction. Each level of intervention should include specific instructional program components and each program should be implemented consistently and with fidelity.

Action Steps to Implement

- Intervention
1. Administration will build master schedule so that intervention time will happen daily schoolwide. The time will be at 8:15 to ensure that chronically tardy students do not miss this important instructional time.
 2. Teachers will use diagnostic data, such as iReady diagnostic, DORF, Running Records and/or PSI, and the Decision Trees for each grade level to determine the need for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention.
 3. Teachers, administration and literacy coach will participate in grade level teams to analyze data, including intervention OPM data, at bi-monthly 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 model small group lessons for groups of teachers.
5. Literacy coach will provide professional development in small group instruction and and intervention instruction. This will include direct instruction using intervention materials such as the Phonics Lesson Library, Vocabulary Surge, Comprehension Toolkit and Rewards.
6. Teachers will implement small group lessons after observing literacy coach and will receive feedback from coach/admin.

Person Responsible Lisa Hirschy (hirschy.lisa@brevardschools.org)

7. Teachers will use data to form small groups and to plan for differentiated small group instruction.
8. Teachers will utilize the small group books and plans from the new ELA curriculum as well as Toolbox lessons from iReady to ensure that small group instruction is standards-aligned.

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

9. Additional small group instruction in ELA, Math and Science will be provided to students before and after school as part of our Academic Support Program.

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

10. As noted as a need in our BPIE, our Instructional Assistants will also receive professional development on various intervention tools so that they can effectively support Tier 2 instruction when provided plans by certified teachers.

Person Responsible Lisa Hirschy (hirschy.lisa@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

SY19-20 (lagging data) in the SafeSchools for Alex data base shows Meadowlane Intermediate 1.0 incidents per 100 students. Meadowlane Intermediate showed 0 property incidents, 4 violent incidents (or a rate of .48 incidents per 100 students), and and 4 drug/public order incidents (or a rate of .48 incidents per 100 students).

The root cause of many major behavior referrals is related trauma, mental health needs or other social emotional risk factors.

In SY21-22, teachers and staff are dedicated to improving behavior/discipline by implementing both Caring School Community curriculum, and starting to roll-out Conscious Discipline school-wide. We will also use these strategies: guidance intervention groups, clear schoolwide expectations, and teacher training and implementation support of SEL and culture curriculum.

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.

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, Insight Survey and Youth Truth Survey, we determined that a continued focus on positive discipline would be important to continue to improve school culture. In the 21-22 school year, Meadowlane Intermediate will continue using the Caring School Community curriculum to support social-emotional learning of students, incorporating pieces of the curriculum into our day during school-wide morning meeting time which is built into the master schedule.

Additionally, staff participated/will participate in Conscious Discipline training during bonus pre-planning, pre-planning and throughout the year. We are incorporating pieces of Conscious Discipline into our school-wide culture as well into our classrooms. Many teachers have already starting implementing parts of the Brain Smart start, including the Safekeepers, the Wish Well routine and the School Jobs for all into their classrooms. As a school, we have done things such as clearly define expectations for different areas, such as the hallways, and then we took pictures and made a video of students following the rules so that we could provide visuals to support our expectations.

To involve students, we initiated Safety Ambassadors this year. Although we hope to expand this program and it's purpose in the future, for now these students give safety reminders in the hallway to give tickets to students seen doing the right thing. We draw tickets every/other week and announce student names on the announcements to positively recognize students doing the right thing. This peer recognition helps us gain student buy-in, thus promoting a positive culture.

We are also continuing with Professional Learning Communities/MTSS this year. This planning and learning as grade level teams helps to promote collaboration between teachers while providing a positive culture in which to improve instruction.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Parents - parents give input through surveys, such as the annual Parent Survey and the annual ESE Parent survey. Parents are also invited to join our SAC and PTO, which meet monthly. Parents are encouraged to give feedback on various topics, such as our School Improvement Plan, though these venues. We are excited to have parent volunteers back on campus this year, as their support contributes to a positive

school culture.

Teachers/Staff - teachers and staff give input through surveys such as the Insight Survey and the End of the Year survey send out by administration last year. Teachers are asked to sign up for committees so that they can participate in aspects of our school outside of their classrooms. Teachers also participate in PLCs and in implementing daily Morning Meetings with their students, both of which contribute to our positive school culture.

Students - students give input through the Youth Truth Survey. In addition to recognizing students for positive behavior choices, through our Safety Ambassadors program and through our Excellence in Action program, students are also encouraged to participate outside of their classrooms in various clubs, such as NEHS, chorus and orchestra. This helps to contribute to a positive school culture.

Community - we are working to expand our Partners in Education program this year. We believe that these relationships contribute to a positive school culture by building important connections in the neighborhoods and business surrounding our schools. For example, our partners from Launch Credit Union volunteered on campus during our Meet the Teacher event, helping us to maintain social distancing in our line of people waiting to enter the building. This is an example of how our Partners in Education volunteer to promote safety and academic success on our campus.