

Alachua County Public Schools

Meadowbrook Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Meadowbrook Elementary School

11525 NW 39TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

<https://www.sbac.edu/meadowbrook>

Demographics

Principal: Brad Burklew

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (57%) 2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (73%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Meadowbrook Elementary School

11525 NW 39TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

<https://www.sbac.edu/meadowbrook>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	36%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Burklew, Brad	Principal	Advises school policies and procedures, evaluate teacher performance, monitor student achievement, communication with all stakeholders, manage budget, hire staff.
Steinke, Amber	Assistant Principal	Develop and edit school/staff schedules, oversee facilities, evaluate teacher performance, monitor student achievement, communicate with stakeholders. Provides leadership and direction to ESE department; Provides expertise in Florida BEST Standards; assists in the collection of assessment data from all K-5 students in the area of language arts, math, writing, and science; Participates in interpretation and analysis of data; facilitates data analysis with teachers; Hires and develops high quality paraprofessionals; facilitates data-based decision making activities; Meets with students, teachers, and parents to develop plans to assist with student success.
Morris, Lisa	School Counselor	Day to day behavioral intervention, teacher behavioral intervention support, writing Functional Behavioral Assessments (FBAs) and Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIPs).
Thurmond, Michelle	School Counselor	Oversee Exceptional Student Education (ESE) programs, serves as the local educational agency representative for IEP (Individual Educational Plan), 504, and Gifted Educational Plans (EP) meetings, oversees ESE scheduling and documentation compliance, provides student counseling services and class counseling intervention lessons.
Ambrose, Ashley	Dean	Day to day behavioral intervention, teacher behavioral intervention support, writing Functional Behavioral Assessments (FBAs) and Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIPs)

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/22/2021, Brad Burklew

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

847

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	128	151	142	157	137	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	853
Attendance below 90 percent	6	31	20	24	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	5	15	19	10	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	4	8	14	9	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	17	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	9	25	23	28	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	5	14	19	16	24	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/28/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	15	6	10	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	2	12	8	11	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	2	5	5	5	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	28	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	20	14	28	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	4	1	0	1	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	1	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	15	6	10	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	2	12	8	11	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	2	5	5	5	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	28	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	20	14	28	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	4	1	0	1	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	1	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%	53%	56%				80%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	56%	61%				69%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	43%	52%				64%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	74%	55%	60%				84%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	62%	58%	64%				68%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	46%	55%				66%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	48%	51%				82%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	82%	57%	25%	58%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	77%	55%	22%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2022					
	2019	79%	55%	24%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	83%	58%	25%	62%	21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	84%	60%	24%	64%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2022					
	2019	81%	57%	24%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	80%	55%	25%	53%	27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	28	38	40	31	29	29	21				
ASN	79	82		93	94		83				
BLK	26	38	33	31	29	23	14				
HSP	64	64		80	55		54				
MUL	52	67		61	59		30				
WHT	78	69	57	84	69	46	68				
FRL	43	47	36	49	50	36	24				
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	36	38		46	33		25				
ELL	70			70							
ASN	89	92		85	75		92				
BLK	33	43	31	29	26	20	30				
HSP	63	60		77	60		70				
MUL	64			76							
WHT	81	64	50	82	49	9	75				
FRL	41	32	18	44	21	15	31				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	34	52	50	32	48	50	38				
ELL	91			82							
ASN	92	50		100	86						
BLK	51	62	57	59	56	58	63				
HSP	79	64		79	56		73				
MUL	79	75		85	50		73				
WHT	87	74	68	90	75	73	87				
FRL	64	67	68	67	64	67	64				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	402
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
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	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

We experienced steady improvement in almost all areas, including, ELA improvement in learning gains, ELA improvement in lowest 25th percent, Math Achievement, Math learning gains, and math lowest 25 percent.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement would be the lowest quartile gains in both ELA and Math. More specifically, the students with disabilities subgroup and African American subgroup were the lowest achieving in both proficiency and gains.

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

One of the contributing factors is Meadowbrook was cut almost \$8000 in AP funds in 2021-22. This funding source was the primary means of support for afterschool tutoring for our lowest quartile students. It was something that has been very effective at Meadowbrook in the past at closing the achievement gap. Another contributing factor was high teacher absences with the continuation of the COVID-19 pandemic throughout the year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The most improvement was show in math learning gains (up 14%) and math lowest 25th percentile (up 15 %).

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

The biggest contributing factor to the growth in multiple areas was due to the students being back in school brick and mortar in front of a teachers. Most of the students were in the bottom quartile chose to come back in person which was very beneficial to their learning and being able to pull them in small group.

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

After school tutoring of bottom quartile students
 High Dose Tutoring
 Small group pullout during computer specials
 Small group instruction of struggling students during ELA, before school, afterschool or during recess with parent permission

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.

The professional development that will be offered so far this school year is from Houghton Mifflin Harcourt on being prepared, planning and resources available. The same company will also be training teachers on differentiation and creating small groups in math. Teachers and leaders will have professional development opportunities regarding new and existing instructional resources, including the University of Florida's Literacy Initiative (UFLI), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS, and Benchmark Advanced.

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

Additional services to ensure sustainability will include individualized professional development and frequent progress monitoring by grade-level and admin teams. After school tutoring provided to students who are not proficient. Use of UFLI with fidelity in K-2, and as an intervention in grades 3-5. Common assessments for progress monitoring in reading and math K-5. Use of supplemental curriculum like iReady Reading in (3-5) and/or software programs such as IXL, Reflex Math, Generation Genius (STEM).

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description****and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Increase the proficiency of student achievement in ELA and Science as well as the growth of students who are in the ELA and Math lowest quartile.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Meadowbrook's measurable outcomes include increasing ELA student achievement from 66% to 70%. Increasing Science student achievement from 55% to 70%. Increasing Math and ELA lowest quartile. Math lowest quartile from 34% to 50%. ELA lowest quartile from 47% to 60%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring by school leaders to ensure that students' needs are being met (F.A.S.T., DIBELS, AIMS, ISIP, etc).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Steinke (steinkeal@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Ongoing review of student data by administrators, teacher leaders, and classroom teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Utilizing professionals in different roles will increase the probability of success through collaboration and peer review.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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

Person Responsible

Amber Steinke (steinkeal@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Our ESSA subgroup score for African Americans student achievement in ELA (26%), Math (31%) and Science (14%) was below the 41% threshold.

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

We would like our African American ELA achievement from ELA 26% to 50%, Math from 31% to 50% and Science from 14% to 50%.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Common Assessments through Benchmark Advance, AIMS, Go Math as well as state F.A.S.T. testing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Steinke (steinkeal@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Instruction using the adopted Benchmark Curriculum that is directly tied to BEST standards. UFLI will be used with fidelity at KG-2nd . Formative assessment and small groups for remediation will be implemented in all classrooms. All African American student who are below grade level will have an intervention in place that may include high dose tutoring or after school tutoring.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Standards based, individualized instruction at the students' level is the best way for students to show academic progress.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Assess individual student needs
2. Progress monitoring using student data to conduct data chats during team meetings.
3. Monitor teacher planning and pacing through the use of formal and informal observations.
4. Administrative monitoring or attendance of planning meetings and professional development opportunities.
5. Monitor student behavior and referrals.

Person Responsible

Amber Steinke (steinkeal@gm.sbac.edu)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The teachers and staff at Meadowbrook Elementary understand the importance of having a positive school culture and environment and take pride in bringing joy to the school campus every day. There is a shared belief that "it takes a village" to successfully teach a child, and each staff member uses their role to create and foster relationships and promote positivity at Meadowbrook that allow all students to reach academic success. High expectations, positive reinforcements, and collaboration are all used to meet our goals.

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

Meadowbrook faculty and staff work with parents and other members of the community, including businesses, clubs, higher education institutions, and various groups. Meadowbrook has several business partners including Publix, Florida Credit Union, Campus Credit Union, and more.