Meadowbrook Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Meadowbrook Elementary School

11525 NW 39TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

https://www.sbac.edu/meadowbrook

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Meadowbrook Elementary School is committed to the success of every student by meeting their educational needs in a safe, caring, and respectful environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our students will have the knowledge, skills, and personal character to be lifelong learners and independent thinkers. They will be contributing members of a community, encouraging one another to excel, lifting up each other in actions and words.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Creamer, Laura	Principal	Advises school policies and procedures, evaluate teacher performance, monitor student achievement, communication with all stakeholders, manage budget, hire staff.
Hardy, David	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 databased 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). 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)

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We begin with the administrative team and then present the SIP to the school leadership team for feedback.
From there, we expand the process to include the school faculty / staff and SAC to ensure that all stakeholders are represented. At each stage of the process, the input of everyone involved will be valued and discussed before appropriate edits are made.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be reviewed at monthly leadership meetings as well as quarterly SAC meetings. Recent behavior and progress monitoring data will be examined to determine what has been successful and what needs to change moving forward.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	50%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	36%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	23	23	24	24	24	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	5	5	4	4	4	0	0	0	22
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	12	10	5	12	6	0	0	0	45
Course failure in Math	0	10	10	5	6	7	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	32	29	28	33	27	0	0	0	149
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	13	26	30	22	22	0	0	0	113
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	28	32	29	28	33	0	0	0	150
	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	13	11	4	23	21	21	0	0	0	93

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	6	31	20	24	9	18	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	2	1	4	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	5	15	19	10	11	4	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	4	8	14	9	5	11	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	17	11	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	17	18	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	9	25	23	28	19	0	0	0	108
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	14	19	16	24	20	0	0	0	98

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	6	31	20	24	9	18	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	2	1	4	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	5	15	19	10	11	4	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	4	8	14	9	5	11	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	17	11	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	17	18	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	9	25	23	28	19	0	0	0	108
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	14	19	16	24	20	0	0	0	98

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	64	52	53	66	53	56	71		
ELA Learning Gains				64			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			40		
Math Achievement*	74	53	59	74	40	50	72		
Math Learning Gains				62			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34			19		
Science Achievement*	69	54	54	55	54	59	66		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					43	52			
Graduation Rate					47	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	47	61	59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	320
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	402
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	2	
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	27	Yes	2	2
HSP	75			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	41			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	28	Yes	1	1
HSP	63			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	41			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	64			74			69					47
SWD	28			42			27				4	
ELL	73			91							3	47
AMI												
ASN	77			87							3	
BLK	20			37			19				4	
HSP	74			74			65				4	
MUL	65			82			64				4	
PAC												
WHT	74			83			82				4	
FRL	38			53			45				5	30

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	66	64	47	74	62	34	55					
SWD	28	38	40	31	29	29	21					
ELL												
AMI												
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					
PAC												
WHT	78	69	57	84	69	46	68					
FRL	43	47	36	49	50	36	24					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	71	62	40	72	48	19	66					
SWD	36	38		46	33		25					
ELL	70			70								
AMI												
ASN	89	92		85	75		92					
BLK	33	43	31	29	26	20	30					
HSP	63	60		77	60		70					
MUL	64			76								
PAC												
WHT	81	64	50	82	49	9	75					
FRL	41	32	18	44	21	15	31					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	54%	10%	58%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	63%	49%	14%	50%	13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	47%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	69%	52%	17%	59%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	58%	23%	61%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	54%	16%	55%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	51%	12%	51%	12%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

ELA Achievement for the SWD (students with disabilities) and African American/Black subgroups showed the lowest performance. 13% of our SWD (specifically SLD) scored a 3 or above on PM3 while African 18% of American/Black students did so. This is likely related in part to the long-term effects of COVID and also to the fluid nature of school personnel during the 22-23 school year.

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

ELA Achievement decreased from 66% in 2022 to 61% in 2023. One of the factors was the decrease in achievement for the SWD and African American/Black subgroups. In 2022, 26.2% of African American/Black students scored 3 or higher on the ELA test compared to 18% in 2023. Similarly, in 2022, 27.8% of SWD scored 3 or higher compared to 13% in 2023. As is the case with analyzing the overall performance, COVID and personnel issues are potential factors in this decline, as is the change in the assessment from FSDA in 2022 to FAST in 2023.

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.

ELA achievement in the white subgroup (78%) and math achievement (83%) in the white subgroup are both above the state average (ELA 63% and Math 64%). However, ELA achievement in the African American/Black subgroup was 25% and Math achievement was 29%.

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

Science showed the highest improvement, from 55% to 63% achievement. However, African American/ Black achievement dropped from 14.3% to 10%. The overall increase may have been due in part to a focus on Gifted science instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Each grade level had 20 or more students who had missed >10 days of the school year. Absences are an area of concern.

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

1. Address achievement gap of white subgroup and SWD and African American/Black subgroups. It is currently 55% for ELA (White 73% - Black 18%), 51% for Math (White 84% - Black 33%), and 68% for Science (White 78% - Black 10%)

2. Increase attendance rate to 95%. Last year, an average of 23.5 students per grade level (+/-1.5) missed 10% or more of the school year.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Improve achievement of two ESSA subgroups in ELA, Math and Science. During
the 2023 school year FAST scores showed a low percentage of students showing achievement in two subgroups - students with disabilities and black/African American students.

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

Increase the ELA achievement level of students in the SWD (students with disabilities) and African American/Black subgroups by 20%. Current ELA achievement levels for the SWD subgroup is 13% and the African American/Black subgroup is 18%.

Increase the Math achievement level of students in the SWD and African American/Black subgroups by 20%. Current Math achievement levels for the SWD subgroup is 40% and 33% for the African American/ Black subgroup.

Current achievement in Science is 0% for the SWD subgroup and 10% for the African American/Black subgroup.

Raising all ESSA groups to a score of 41% or higher on the ESSA Federal Index.

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

Achievement in ELA will be monitored through FAST, Benchmark Unit Assessments, Dibels, IReady and UFLI progress monitoring. Achievement in Math will be monitored through FAST, district achievement tests and chapter tests. Achievement in Science will be monitored through chapter tests, and district achievement tests. This data will be reviewed after each progress monitoring event and at biweekly team data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Creamer (creamerl@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Early identification of students in the under performing subgroups. Progress Monitoring through bi weekly data meetings. Provide extended day remediation sessions, small group ELA intervention using UFLI interventions or SIPPS and Achieve 3000 for extended day. Use of HMH Waggle, IXL and small group instruction for Math intervention. Emphasis on instruction that is aligned to grade level standards. Use of IXL science and small group intervention for Science.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Under performing subgroups did not receive small group interventions or extended day remediation during the 2022-2023 school year.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Use data from IReady diagnostic report, monthly ISIP assessments, UFLI and SIPPS assessments for ELA.
2. Utilize the Benchmark Advanced Reading program to target reading instruction, both whole group and small group, to student needs with instruction aligned to grade level benchmarks.
3. Teachers will attend data chat meetings with the leadership team.
4. Implement UFLI interventions, SIPPS and small group interventions consistently and with fidelity.
5. Ongoing progress monitoring with adjustments made as needed as shown by the data.
6.. Increase student access to extended learning opportunities (Extended Day)
7. District Literacy Coach will provide modeling of ELA lessons, coaching cycle and ELA support to teachers. District Math Coach will provide district wide Math PD to support teachers.
8. Small group instruction will be monitored weekly for differentiation based on data for SWD and AA subgroups. Use of the walkthrough tool will be used during monitoring.
9. SWD groups will be serviced through push in support facilitation and/or pullout small group instruction. Data of SWD groups will be monitored and reviewed with ESE teachers in addition to the grade level data chats. Monitoring of SWD groups will occur through the walkthrough tool with feedback.

Person Responsible: Laura Creamer (creamerl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: SWD and African American subgroup interventions will be ongoing beginning 09/23-05/24.

1. Use data from HMH Go Math chapter tests and HMH Science chapter tests to identify specific skill deficits of students.
2. Utilize the HMH Go Math program to target Math instruction both whole and small group. Instruction will be aligned to grade level benchmarks. Utilize the HMH Florida Science curriculum to target science instruction aligned with grade level benchmarks.
3. Teachers will attend data chat meetings with the leadership team.
4. Implement Waggle, IXL and small group interventions consistently and with fidelity.
5. Ongoing progress monitoring with adjustments made as needed as shown by the data.
6.. Increase student access to extended learning opportunities (Extended Day)
7. District Math Coach will provide district wide Math PD to support
teachers.
8. Small group instruction will be monitored weekly for differentiation based on data for SWD and AA subgroups. Use of the walkthrough tool will be used during monitoring.
9. SWD groups will be serviced through push in support facilitation and/or pullout small group instruction. Data of SWD groups will be monitored and reviewed with ESE teachers in addition to the grade level data chats. Monitoring of SWD groups will occur through the walkthrough tool with feedback.

Person Responsible: Laura Creamer (creamerl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: SWD and African American subgroup interventions will be ongoing beginning 09/23-05/24.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Meadowbrook will focus on positive culture and environment as a way to promote attendance. There is a strong data correlation between students in our lowest performing subgroups and an increase in absenteeism. Meadowbrook looks to address this by ensuring that all students feel safe and welcome at school and are subsequently more inclined to attend regularly.

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

Meadowbrook aims to maintain a truancy percentage of less than 4%. As a related goal, we would like to see 10% gains in ELA and Math performance on FAST PM3 (Spring '23 to Spring '24) within our lowest quartile.

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

Meadowbrook will use weekly attendance data from Skyward to monitor truancy trends. We will also use State progress monitoring, DIBELS, and monthly data chats to monitor ELA and Math growth throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Hardy (hardydl@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our family liaison will work with administration and the truancy officer to identify at-risk students and proactively reach out to families and offer support. Simultaneously, administration will work with the teachers of those students to ensure that they are receiving proper classroom support and that the students are being offered opportunities for engagement and enrichment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategy involves all of the key stakeholders who have an impact on the students' attendance. It ensures proper communication and collaboration throughout the school year with periodic monitoring to encourage fidelity.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Set up meetings with the Family Liaison and Admin to review data

Person Responsible: David Hardy (hardydl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Starting after Labor Day, every week thereafter

Set up conferences between grade level teams and the school counselor

Person Responsible: Lisa Morris (morrisla@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Starting after Labor Day, Monthly thereafter

Admin. team meetings including family liaison and counselor to compare notes and develop correlations between school issues and attendance issues.

Person Responsible: David Hardy (hardydl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Starting after Labor Day, weekly thereafter.

Student Survey to determine ongoing school climate. (How are the students feeling about Meadowbrook?) Administered by teachers but written and compiled by Mr. Hardy.

Person Responsible: David Hardy (hardydl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: At the end of each quarter.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The principal and district (support Principal or executive director) will review the data to ensure the identified areas of focus and action steps align to school needs as the data indicates. Subgroup data will be identified in addition to overall goals. Ongoing progress will be monitored on regular intervals to ensure alignment of action steps and student needs, including identified subgroups. Subgroups will be monitored in addition to school-wide, overall group data. The Federal Grants and programs department will aid in the budget alignment processes to ensure the student needs are met.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No