Meadowlane Intermediate Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Meadowlane Intermediate Elementary School

2700 WINGATE BLVD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

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

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.

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, 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
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.
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 procedures, 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.
Inghram, Dana	Other	The guidance service professional facilitates MTSS meetings, assists teachers as they analyze student data, attends parent conferences, organizes volunteers, supports social/emotional and mental health issues, addresses behavior concerns, serves as our ESOL contact, facilitates WIDA testing, tracks attendance records, and coordinates the PTO and SAC monthly meetings.

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.

Staff members were involved in the development of the school improvement plan throughout the process. The Instructional Cultural Insight Survey results for 2022-2023 indicated a need for our school in the area of Instructional Planning for Student Growth, specifically indicated was that teachers felt they needed more support with instructional planning and more time to collaborate with teachers and leaders to plan instruction based on students' responses to tasks. Based on the feedback from the Insight Survey, we designed a SIP needs survey that was given to grade level teams at our school. The feedback from this survey indicated that teachers at our school feel that increased and protected time for collaboration as well as time to analyze student work and data in groups to drive instruction would be beneficial to student achievement. These results were then shared with team leaders who sought feedback on SIP initiatives from their teams. Then our leadership team met and discussed teacher feedback on these surveys and begun to develop our school's professional development plan for 2023-2024. Teacher leaders and administrators attended all related trainings this summer to gain insight and research for SIP initiatives to bring back to share with the staff throughout the school year. Input from the 2022-2023 parent feedback from the BPS Parent Survey was also used when developing the school improvement plan, as well as input from parents and other community members gathered at the April SAC meeting of the 2022-2023 school year as we looked ahead to the upcoming year. A draft of the plan was shared with the staff for review during the beginning of the year, and then a version of the school improvement plan will be shared with staff, the SAC committee and the general parent population via school newsletter and SAC/PTO meetings. Student feedback is gathered through the Youth Truth survey and is shared with students and staff alike and then incorporated in our SIP.

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 and referenced by staff and parents throughout the school year and we will monitor progress of Action Steps and SIP goals as a staff and alter them as necessary throughout the 2022-2023 school year.

Evidence of Implementation: In PLCs and MTSS meetings, we will monitor student progress toward goals as well as specifically monitoring the progress of the students in our two identified subgroups - Students with Disabilities and African American students. These meetings will take place weekly and instruction will be adjusted accordingly. We will conduct classroom walk throughs and give feedback on instruction, and then adjust professional development as needed.

Evidence of Impact: We will be looking at student achievement data throughout the year including FAST progress monitoring, iReady, Lexia and District Assessments. We will monitor student achievement and adjust instruction to support student growth.

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 3-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	43%
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) 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: B
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	0	0	19	23	30	28	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	6	17	17	16	0	0	56
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	2	4	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	32	47	42	0	0	128
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	32	55	0	0	93
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	8	9	9	0	0	30

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	0	0	0	6	17	19	27	0	0	69

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	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	0	8

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	0	0	0	48	48	49	45	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	6	5	4	9	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	23	39	27	0	0	100
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	28	59	43	0	0	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	30	38	32	12	0	0	112

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	0	0	0	11	32	37	41	0	0	121

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	12	0	0	1	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	13	0	1	2	0	0	16

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	0	0	0	48	48	49	45	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	6	5	4	9	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	23	39	27	0	0	100
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	28	59	43	0	0	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	30	38	32	12	0	0	112

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	0	0	0	11	32	37	41	0	0	121

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	12	0	0	1	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	13	0	1	2	0	0	16

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*	59	58	53	64	61	56	63		
ELA Learning Gains				62			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			38		
Math Achievement*	57	58	59	58	49	50	65		
Math Learning Gains				52			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			37		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	51	58	54	62	60	59	56		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	68	54	59	62			70		

* 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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	300
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	451
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	36	Yes	2	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	29	Yes	2	1
HSP	61			
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	49			

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	63			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	48			

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	59			57			51					68
SWD	32			35			29				5	50
ELL	44			58			33				5	68
AMI												
ASN	62			78			67				3	
BLK	28			35			17				4	
HSP	59			56			41				5	75
MUL	54			54			17				4	
PAC												
WHT	66			60			60				4	
FRL	46			46			34				5	71

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	64	62	49	58	52	42	62					62
SWD	36	51	39	34	39	33	34					
ELL	53	69	63	52	56	31	33					62
AMI												
ASN	74	79		72	72							55
BLK	37	44	29	28	37	26	30					
HSP	66	63	68	59	54	53	60					77
MUL	56	47	50	58	47		50					
PAC												
WHT	69	64	51	63	53	41	68					
FRL	53	55	47	44	42	35	48					56

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	63	54	38	65	54	37	56					70
SWD	34	31	23	41	37	24	37					
ELL	52	78	67	67	72	73	58					70

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
AMI												
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							
PAC												
WHT	67	55	39	71	57	30	60					
FRL	50	41	26	49	40	27	44					

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	53%	59%	-6%	54%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	61%	-9%	58%	-6%
06	2023 - Spring	60%	61%	-1%	47%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	61%	56%	5%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	63%	67%	-4%	54%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	60%	4%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	61%	-5%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	55%	-7%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	51%	57%	-6%	51%	0%

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.

Overall, we showed the lowest performance in Science, with 51% proficiency. Over the past two years, there has been significant teacher turnover and vacancy, specifically in 4th grade two years ago and then in 5th grade last year. Inconsistent instruction may have contributed to this decline, as is evidenced by this decrease in student proficiency in Science. Additionally, while adopting new benchmarks and curriculum in ELA two years ago and in Math last year, teachers were likely focused on those subjects.

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

Our 5th grade Science proficiency showed the greatest decline from the previous year, decreasing by 11%. Over the past two years, there has been significant teacher turnover and vacancy, specifically in 4th grade two years ago and then in 5th grade last year. Inconsistent instruction may have contributed to this decline, as is evidenced by this decrease in student proficiency in Science. Additionally, while adopting new benchmarks and curriculum in ELA two years ago and in Math last year, teachers were likely focused on those subjects.

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.

We showed the greatest gaps compared to the State in ELA. In 3rd grade, we were actually 11% above the State average for ELA proficiency and in 6th grade we were 13% above the State average for ELA proficiency. However, in 4th grade we were 5% below the State average for ELA proficiency and in 5th grade we were 1% below the State average for proficiency. As stated above, inconsistent instruction with teacher vacancies and turnover in 4th and 5th grades likely contributed to the gap in these grades. There were also significant gaps in achievement in ELA for our African American subgroup as compared to the State. This is a trend we've for several years. Factors that contribute to this could include the need for more time for small group instruction and the fact that many students in this subgroup ride a bus to school and are unable to stay for our before/after school Academic Support Program.

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

School-wide, we showed the most improvement in math, increasing proficiency by 6%. In both 4th grade and 6th grade, we increased proficiency in math. 4th grade increased by 12% and 6th grade increased by 3%. Because we had new math benchmarks and curriculum last year, we focused on math as a school, focusing instruction on the new benchmarks using the newly adopted curriculum. Additionally, for the first time, Meadowlane Intermediate had an assigned math coach that came monthly to work with

teachers as they learned the new benchmarks and curriculum and also worked with small groups of students who demonstrated a need for additional learning with specific math skills.

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

The greatest areas of concern in our Early Warning Systems data are attendance, Level 1 on ELA or Math, and suspension numbers. There are a large number of students in each grade, 3-6, that have more than 10% of absences in the school year. Additionally, the number of 4th, 5th and 6th grade students that scored Level 1 on the FAST ELA or Math is also large. There could be a correlation between absences and low academic proficiency.

Data Analysis by Grade Level:

3rd Grade
Absent 10% or more days: 19
Level 1 on FAST ELA: 11
Level 1 on FAST Math: 6
Substantial Reading Deficiency: 30

4th Grade
Absent 10% or more days: 23
Level 1 on FAST ELA: 23
Level 1 on FAST Math: 28
Substantial Reading Deficiency: 38

5th Grade
Absent 10% or more days: 30
Level 1 on FAST ELA: 39
Level 1 on FAST Math: 59
Substantial Reading Deficiency: 32

6th Grade
Absent 10% or more days: 28
Level 1 on FAST ELA: 27
Level 1 on FAST Math: 43
Substantial Reading Deficiency: 12

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

1. Increase ELA Proficiency
2. Increase Math Proficiency
3. Increase Science Proficiency
4. Increase proficiency for low-performing ESSA subgroups - SWD and Black/African-American

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.

Subgroup data as an Area of Focus is a crucial need for Meadowlane Intermediate because there is a two year trend that two of our subgroups (SWD and Black) have performed below the Federal Index of 41% or higher proficiency.

Students with Disabilities proficiency for the 21-22 school year was 38% and for the 22-23 school year was XX%. In all four grade levels, the students in this subgroup are below the state average for proficiency in both math and ELA.

3rd ELA - 27% proficient (State - 50%)
3rd Math - 42% proficient (State 59%)
4th ELA - 21% proficient (State 58%)
4th Math - 38% proficient (State 61%)
5th ELA - 23% proficient (State 54%)
5th Math - 28% proficient (State 55%)
6th ELA - 24% proficient (State 47%)
6th Math - 26% proficient (State 54%)

Black students' proficiency for the 21-22 school year was 33% and for the 22-23 school year was XX%. In all four grade levels, the students in this subgroup are below the state average for proficiency in both math and ELA.

3rd ELA - 35% proficient (State - 50%)
3rd Math - 52% proficient (State 59%)
4th ELA - 27% proficient (State 58%)
4th Math - 34 % proficient (State 61%)
5th ELA - 15% proficient (State 54%)
5th Math - 25% proficient (State 55%)
6th ELA - 27% proficient (State 47%)
6th Math - 23% proficient (State 54%)

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

Our goal is to help each of these subgroups increase to at least 41% proficient in both reading and math.

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

After the iReady diagnostic and also after PM1 and PM2, we will analyze specific subgroup data by cohort and note which students are making growth towards end of year proficiency. Individual students will be monitored to determine how many additional points would be needed to be considered proficient. Subgroup data on District Assessments will also be analyzed at bi-weekly data meetings with teachers, administration and Literacy/Math Coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Barnett (barnett.sarah@brevardschools.org)

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.)

In order to increase proficiency in these underperforming subgroups, the following evidence-based interventions will be put into place:
• Scaffolded Supports
• Explicit Instruction
• 95% Group
• Lexia
• Flexible Grouping

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

The programs and practices listed above address the identified need to improve our underperforming subgroup data. The identified practices and programs show proven record of effective for the target population as they are:
• B.E.S.T. Standards Aligned
• Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan

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.

1. Teachers and Admin will ensure that benchmark-aligned curriculum is being used with all students, including SWD students.
2. Weekly planning with coach for ELA and Math to include strategies to support students in underperforming subgroups.
3. Teachers and administration will track and monitor ESSA subgroup data for ongoing progress on intervention (Form 7) progress monitoring, i-Ready diagnostics, FAST progress monitoring and quarterly assessments.
4. Teachers will deliver additional small group instruction to students in subgroups in grades 3-6 if they are demonstrating need for additional intervention in reading and math.
5. Incorporate visuals - anchor charts - and manipulatives into instruction for additional scaffolding and support.
6. Teachers will ensure that all students in these subgroups receive invitations to ASP.

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

By When: September

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction
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.

Description:
Teachers will work collaboratively with administration and our assigned coaches in PLCs to plan for daily instruction that is fully aligned to the Math, ELA and Science benchmarks. This planning will include plans for small group instruction in ELA and Math that will ensure that all students have daily opportunities to interact with grade-level content and tasks, which will contribute to all students experiencing greater proficiency across subjects.

Rationale:

ELA
In the 22-23 school year, our schoolwide proficiency as measured by FAST decreased in ELA from 64% to 57%, which is just 1% above the state average of 56%.

By Grade Level:
3rd - 61% (3+)
4th - 52% (3+)
5th - 54% (3+)
6th - 60% (3+)

Math
In the 22-23 school year, our schoolwide proficiency in Math as measured by FAST increased by 6% from 52% to 58% and we would like to see this increase continue.

By Grade Level:
3rd - 64% (3+)
4th - 55% (3+)
5th - 49% (3+)
6h - 63% (3+)

Science
In the 22-23 school year, our schoolwide proficiency in Science as measured by the 5th grade NGSS test, decreased from 62% to 51%, a decrease of 11%.

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

We plan to achieve increased student proficiency in all grade levels. We will look at cohort data to track this progress. On FAST PM 3, student achievement will be as follows:

ELA - increase by at least 5% in proficiency for every grade level:
3rd - 66%
4th - 66% (this cohort was 61% proficient last year)
5th - 57% (this cohort was 52% proficient last year)
6th - 59% (this cohort was 54% proficient last year)

Math - increase by at least 5% in proficiency in every grade level:
3rd - 69%

4th - 69% (this cohort was 64% proficient last year)
5th - 60% (this cohort was 55% proficient last year)
6th - 54% (this cohort was 49% proficient last year)

Science
We will increase Science proficiency by at least 10%, increasing to 61%.

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

iReady weekly and diagnostic data, FAST progress monitoring data and Penda data will be monitored and analyzed by teachers with administration and coaches. Additionally, students will take quarterly (ELA and Math) and Unit (Science) assessments throughout the year. Teachers, coaches and administration will analyze the data in PLCs to determine areas of additional instructional need. We will also use this assessment data to closely monitor our Lowest 25%, and our SWD and black populations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Barnett (barnett.sarah@brevardschools.org)

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.)

*Benchmark-aligned district curriculum implementation for Reading, Math and Science
• Small group instruction- Targeted, data-driven, and structured
• Explicit instruction
• Systematic instruction
• Scaffolded Instruction
• bi-weekly Structured Planning in Reading, Math and Science
• 95% Group Reading Intervention
• Lexia Reading
• i-Ready Reading and Math
• PENDA Science

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

The identified practices/programs show proven record of effective instruction for students. They are:
• BEST and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards for Science aligned instruction
• Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan
• Meet Florida's definition of evidence-based
• Systematic and/or explicit
• Science- Use District assessments and data generated to drive whole group instructional and plan for small group remediation.

Our data indicates a need for continued structure and time as supports for teachers to plan for standards-aligned instruction and tasks for all students. Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers, coaches and administration to build their skills utilizing quality, aligned materials. Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between peers, coaches, and administration.

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.

ELA Action Steps
1. Administrators will dedicate common planning time monthly for grade level teachers to plan standards-aligned lessons using the ELA curriculum, to include complex text, text based writing, small group instruction, anchor charts 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.
2. Administrators and Coach will participate in PLCs to review individual student data and class data with teachers and 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/ diagnostic data, FAST Progress Monitoring data and district assessments aligned to the curriculum.
3. Teachers will implement small group instruction for Lowest 25%, SWD and AA students daily and will include weekly small group lessons for all students to address unfinished learning.

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

By When: Begin by September

ELA Action Steps Continued
4. Administrators will conduct classroom walk-throughs and provide feedback on tier 1 ELA instruction including anchor charts, small group instruction and intervention direct instruction.
5. Administrators will arrange for teachers to observe modeled BEST benchmarks-aligned ELA lessons. This will include small group instruction and intervention.
6. Parents will receive iReady data and FAST PM 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.
7. All students will be required to use the iReady instructional tool 45 minutes weekly in ELA. Students will also be required to meet Lexia minutes during scheduled school-wide intervention time. Teachers will have follow-up data chats with students regarding their individual data.

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

By When: Parent Report sent home after each testing window iReady and Lexia will begin in September

Math Action Steps
1. Administrators will dedicate common planning time monthly for grade level teachers to plan standards-aligned lessons using the math curriculum, to include hands on lessons, 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.
2. Administrators and Coach will participate in PLCs to review individual student data and class data with teachers and 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 and diagnostic data, FAST Progress Monitoring data and district assessments aligned to the curriculum.

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

By When: by September and monthly

Math Action Steps Continued
3. All students will be required to use the iReady instructional tool 45 minutes weekly in Math. Teachers will have follow-up data chats with students regarding their individual data.
4. Administration will schedule time in the master schedule for Math Intervention. This time will be used for small group instruction.
5. Administrators will conduct classroom walk-throughs and provide feedback on tier 1 math instruction and small group instruction.
6. Administrators will arrange for teachers to observe modeled BEST benchmark-aligned small group

math lessons.

7. Parents will receive iReady data and FAST PM 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)

By When: Parent Report sent home after each testing window iReady will begin in September

Science Action Steps

1. Academic Support Program for Science grade 5; participants determined by district assessments. Standards-aligned materials will be used in this program.
2. Administration will designate science time for each grade level and monitor with admin walk-throughs, providing feedback to teachers.
3. Teachers, administration and our Science teacher will utilize Penda Science to expand and monitor science knowledge. We will track and monitor Penda mastery data and assessment data to plan subsequent lessons.
4. Grades 3-6 will complete all District science summative assessments. Teachers will use the data to plan instruction. Lowest 25%, SWD and AA data will be monitored. Our dedicated Science teacher will use data to plan for intervention and reteach opportunities in the Science lab.
5. All students in grades 4-6 will participate in the Science Fair, focusing on the scientific method and real-life Science learning.

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

By When: Starting in September and throughout the year

Science Action Steps Continued

6. 3rd and 4th grade standards will be spiraled in 5th grade
7. 5th grade Science teachers will participate in Science PD in January, focusing on Penda and standards with demonstrated need for reteaching based on data.
8. Students who are unable to attend ASP but have demonstrated need for small group reteach/intervention will be invited to Science Club during the school day.
9. 5th grade students will participate in standards-aligned Science rotations focusing on highest-need standards in April.

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

By When: Starting in September and throughout the year

#3. 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.

To improve behavior and culture in our school, we are focusing on creating and maintaining common classroom and schoolwide expectations, sharing these expectations with parents, and then increasing student engagement in class to decrease opportunities for misbehavior. We reviewed data from several sources. Our EWS data indicates an increase of 11 in suspensions from 3rd to 4th grade; the number stays as high in 5th and 6th grades. In our Insight Survey, only 16% of teachers responded yes to "Across my School, there are consistent expectations and consequences for student behavior" and only 25% of teachers responded yes to "Teachers and leaders at my school immediately address misbehavior in shared school spaces...". Only 45% of teachers said "students at my school support their answers and explain their thinking" and on the Youth Truth Survey, 49% students said their teacher lets them explain their thinking. 12% of students responded yes to "Do students behave in class?" and on the Parent Survey, parents stated that there is too much focus on students who have discipline issues and said they feel like behavior can and should improve.

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

We will decrease suspension numbers by 25% in 4th, 5th and 6th grades. Additionally, on the Insight Survey, teacher responses will increase by at least 50%, so that at least 66% of teachers will indicate that there are consistent expectations and consequences for student behavior and 75% of teachers will indicate that misbehaviors are addressed immediately. Additionally, student responses to "Do students behave in class?" will also increase by at least 50%, so that 62% of students indicate yes. Responses to questions regarding student engagement and students explaining their own thinking will increase by 25%.

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

We will monitor suspension data, including that of our SWD and AA subgroups, monthly as a leadership team. Additionally, administration will monitor referrals to determine if classroom and schoolwide expectations are being implemented and followed or if reteaching is needed. Administration will be doing walk-throughs with Look Fors regarding students engagement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

As is aligned with evidence from MTSS in the Classroom from the Center for Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, we will begin by creating a robust system of support in Tier 1 behavior systems and classroom management. We will use the Tier 1 Behavior Checklist as a guide. For students needing additional support, we will implement Tier 2 supports, such as small group instruction, check-in/check-out and reteaching routines. For students needed additional support still, we will provide Tier 3 supports, such as individualizing routines and intensifying supports. We will also focus on positively reinforcing those who are following expectations.

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

We want to provide equitable academic and social-emotional outcomes for all students. When students have clear expectations and Tier 1 systems are in place, the likelihood of improved behavior increases.

Additionally, when students can engage positively in academic routines and stay actively engaged in their own learning, inappropriate behaviors decrease and the learning environment improves for students and teachers alike.

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.

1. Teachers will work collaboratively to identify classroom behavioral procedures and routines. This will be documented, explicitly taught to students and posted so that any adult in the classroom is aware and can hold students accountable. Classroom rules will also be posted in each classroom. Administration will monitor during classroom walkthroughs.

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

By When: September

2. Schoolwide expectations will be shared with all staff by administration during pre-planning. Lesson plans with videos will be provided to teachers so that all students will learn explicitly what is expected of them. Expectations will be reviewed with all students during quarterly assemblies facilitated by administration. Classes will earn points for following expectations and will be recognized weekly on the announcements and with a Golden Horseshoe trophy.

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

By When: August and throughout the year

3. Teachers will participate in Professional development regarding Active Engagement Strategies, such as those by Anita Archer. This will be provided by our Literacy Coach, District Peer Mentor Teachers, our tech integrator, and teachers trained in cooperative learning strategies.

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

By When: Starting in August and throughout the year

4. Teachers will have the opportunity to see lessons modeled using active student engagement strategies.

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

By When: October and throughout the year

5. Administration will provide feedback to teachers during walk-throughs regarding implementation of active student engagement strategies.

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

By When: October and throughout the year

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).

Meadowlane leadership team reviews allocations, schedules and other resources to ensure all students receive high quality instruction.