Brevard Public Schools

MEADOWLANE INTERMEDIATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

SIP Authority 1

I. School Information 2

A. School Mission and Vision 2

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2

C. Demographic Data 7

D. Early Warning Systems 8

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 11

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 12

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 13

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 14

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 15

E. Grade Level Data Review 18

III. Planning for Improvement 19

IV. Positive Learning Environment 31

V. Title I Requirements (optional) 35

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 38

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 40

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on Brevard School Board approved Sept. 9, 2025.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. 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 2025)

Provide the school's vision statement

Meadowlane Intermediate Elementary provides a successful and cooperative learning environment maximizing achievement through content complexity and student engagement.

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name
Sarah Barnett

barnett.sarah@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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 participates in the school's BPIE and ensures that stakeholders are committed to improving on the BPIE indicators of focus. 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.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name
Jessie Stein

stein.jessie@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Lisa Hirschy

hirschy.lisa@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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, 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.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Dana Inghram

inghram.dana@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Guidance Service Professional / MTSS Chair

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Guidance Service Professional serves as our ESOL contact, our MTSS Chair and as our Academic Point of Contact. In these roles, she facilitates ELL committee meetings and MTSS meetings, assists teachers as they analyze student data and plan for interventions, attends parent conferences, organizes volunteers, supports social/emotional and mental health issues, addresses behavior concerns, facilitates WIDA testing, tracks attendance records, and coordinates the PTO and SAC monthly
meetings.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name
Jamie Richey

richey.jamie@brevardschools.org

Position Title
School Counselor / Behavior Point of Contact

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Our School Counselor serves as our Behavior Point of Contact and develops Tier I, II and III behavioral plans and supports teachers with data collection and implementing interventions. She gathers data on student academics and behavior, create 504 plans, conduct focus group sessions catered to the specific social/emotional needs of identified students, shares the approved curriculum with specific activities that are focused on meeting the social/emotional needs of students, and conduct training to proactively combat bullying. She works closely with families to remove barriers that contribute to attendance concerns and collaborates with administration as part of our Threat Assessment team. She supports mental health and social/emotional initiatives and implements the Sources of Strength program on our campus.

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

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

Stakeholders were **involved** in the development of the school improvement plan throughout the process.

In January 2025, a diverse team of staff members and parents collaborated to complete our School Best Practices for Inclusive Education **(SBPIE)** assessment for the 2024-2025 cycle. Positives included meeting the state's Indicator 5A and 5B targets for educational environment/LRE and indicated needs included priority indicators 18, 28, and 29. **Indicator 18** refers to providing time for Activity teachers regularly scheduled opportunities to consult with special education teachers and related service providers to implement strategies that support the learning of all SWD in their classes. **Indicator 28** refers to general and special education teachers use regularly scheduled collaborative planning time to clarify their roles and responsibilities while planning effective instruction and assessment for all students. **Indicator 29** refers to ensuring that family members of SWD are contributing members of school decision-making groups.

Staff participated in the **Thought Exchange Staff Survey** in the Spring of 2025. The results indicated that the areas of Belonging and Peer Collaboration (overall 77% favorable) and Relationships (overall 82% favorable) were strengths, with an additional strength in Teachers are made to feel welcome at this school being 85% favorable. The results also indicated areas of need in the Engagement (overall 68% favorable) and Academic Challenge (overall 62% favorable) areas, specially focused on Professional Development being aligned to our schools mission (57% favorable) and and being helpful and meaningful for our teachers (52% favorable).

These results were then used to create a **staff survey** requesting additional input for the upcoming school year, including professional development topics and methods that staff felt would be the most beneficial. Our leadership team met and discussed this feedback and included teacher leaders in the initial development of our School Improvement Plan at the Ascend Conference. Teacher leaders and administrators attended all related trainings over the summer to gain insight and research for our SIP initiatives to bring back and share with the staff throughout the school year. A draft of our SIP Areas of Focus was then shared during pre-planning and teachers were able to give feedback prior to final submission.

Parents and community members were able to give input for our 25-26 School Improvement Plan through our **SAC meetings** and also through the **Thought Exchange Parent Survey**. The Parent Survey indicated that strengths were in the areas of Culture (overall 81% favorable) and Relationships (overall 84% favorable), with additional high scores in My Child's School responds in a

timely manner (82% favorable), School administration treats families with respect (84% favorable), I would recommend this school to other parents (83% favorable) and I feel my children are safe at this school (91% favorable). The results indicated areas of need to be with increasing diverse family engagement, specifically My opinion matters at this school (63% favorable) and I feel represented by parent/family groups at my school (57% favorable).

Student feedback was gathered from our 5th and 6th grade students on the **Thought Exchange Student Survey.** The results showed areas of strength to be Our teacher respects all the students (69% favorable) and I feel safe at my school (60% favorable). Areas of need, according to the student surveys, are students at this school get along with everyone (5% favorable) and people at this school make me feel good about myself (14% favorable).

This survey data is shared with staff, students and parents and then used to develop our SIP. A draft SIP is shared with our SAC at the beginning of the year and their input is used to make updates before our final submission. Throughout the year, we will **monitor** the plan and share evidence of implementation and impact with our SAC and staff and make changes as needed to work toward our goals.

3. 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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 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 quarterly. As a staff and SAC, we will analyze our progress and alter our action steps as necessary throughout the 2025-2026 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 three identified subgroups - Students with Disabilities, ELLs 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, PENDA, Imagine, Lexia and District Assessments. We will monitor student achievement and adjust instruction to support student growth.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	**ACTIVE**
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	**ELEMENTARY** **3-6**
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	**K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION**
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	**NO**
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	**46.5%**
CHARTER SCHOOL	**NO**
RAISE SCHOOL	**NO**
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	**ATSI**
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 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.*	**2024-25: B** **2023-24: A** **2022-23: B** **2021-22: B** **2020-21:**

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 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	
School Enrollment	0	0	0	204	184	182	189	0	0	759
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	36	28	30	43	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	6	12	11	39	0	0	68
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	3	1	2	3	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	1	1	7	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	42	33	34	48	0	0	157
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	27	31	46	0	0	145
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	0	0	0	57	0	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Current Year 2025-26

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				23	17	22	45	0	0	107

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	0	0	0	9	1	1	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	0	0	10

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last 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 school days				36	18	30	29			113
One or more suspensions				9	5	17	27			58
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)				3	5	2	8			18
Course failure in Math				3	4	2	4			13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				49	23	37	36			145
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				40	17	38	33			128
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)				19						19
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)				18	8					26

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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				18	13	24	29			84

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year				7	1		1			9
Students retained two or more times				4	3	3				10

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	63	62	59	64	61	57	59	58	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	60	58	59	68	59	58	65	57	53
ELA Learning Gains	59	62	60	66	64	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55	57	56	61	60	57			
Math Achievement*	68	63	64	66	62	62	57	58	59
Math Learning Gains	67	67	63	71	68	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50	54	51	62	59	52			
Science Achievement	57	62	58	58	60	57	51	58	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	68	62	63	68	57	61	53	54	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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	61%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	547
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
61%	65%	60%	56%	55%		64%

* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

** Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 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%
Students With Disabilities	39%	Yes	1	
English Language Learners	61%	No		
Asian Students	85%	No		
Black/African American Students	47%	No		
Hispanic Students	56%	No		
Multiracial Students	51%	No		
White Students	67%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	No		

D. 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.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	63%	60%	59%	55%	68%	67%	50%	57%					68%
Students With Disabilities	32%	28%	49%	44%	37%	49%	41%	25%					42%
English Language Learners	55%	63%	55%	55%	67%	75%	65%	47%					68%
Asian Students	86%		77%		94%	81%							
Black/African American Students	42%	48%	52%	53%	45%	51%	43%	38%					
Hispanic Students	56%	45%	48%	57%	63%	64%	40%	54%					76%
Multiracial Students	56%	59%	52%	46%	58%	54%	33%	48%					
White Students	69%	65%	64%	58%	75%	74%	61%	66%					73%
Economically Disadvantaged Students	55%	55%	56%	52%	55%	58%	44%	37%					78%

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	64%	68%	66%	61%	66%	71%	62%	58%					68%
Students With Disabilities	38%	42%	59%	56%	40%	57%	53%	31%					36%
English Language Learners	52%	58%	71%	69%	70%	79%	68%	53%					68%
Asian Students	82%		67%		89%	91%		79%					70%
Black/African American Students	42%	42%	55%	53%	45%	57%	58%	31%					
Hispanic Students	63%	73%	66%	55%	66%	72%	71%	52%					60%
Multiracial Students	60%		66%	50%	61%	70%	73%	64%					
White Students	67%	75%	69%	68%	70%	72%	59%	63%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	55%	62%	63%	64%	53%	63%	59%	55%					58%

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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%	65%			57%			51%					53%
Students With Disabilities	32%	33%			35%			29%					50%
English Language Learners	44%	63%			58%			33%					68%
Asian Students	62%				78%			67%					
Black/African American Students	28%	36%			35%			17%					
Hispanic Students	59%	73%			56%			41%					75%
Multiracial Students	54%	60%			54%			17%					
White Students	66%	74%			60%			60%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	46%	48%			46%			34%					71%

E. 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.

2024-25 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	57%	58%	-1%	57%	0%
ELA	4	59%	58%	1%	56%	3%
ELA	5	56%	60%	-4%	56%	0%
ELA	6	68%	70%	-2%	60%	8%
Math	3	60%	59%	1%	63%	-3%
Math	4	69%	60%	9%	62%	7%
Math	5	52%	57%	-5%	57%	-5%
Math	6	78%	72%	6%	60%	18%
Science	5	55%	60%	-5%	55%	0%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

Our overall Math Proficiency for our school showed the most improvement, increasing by 4% schoolwide to 68%.. In the 23-24 school year, we were slightly below the District and State average for proficiency in Math. In the 24-25 school year, we departmentalized in grades 4-6 and we have been above the District and State average for proficiency since then. This year, we were 4 points above the State average (which was 64%) and 5 points above the District average (which was 63%). In both 4th and 6th grades, math proficiency increased significantly - 8% in 4th grade and 4% in 6th grade. We were departmentalized in 4th, 5th and 6th grades last year for the second year in a row, which we believe allowed Math teachers to specifically plan for focused instruction in that subject area. We also created designated planning times for subject-area teachers to analyze data and plan for instruction collaboratively, which contributed to targeted, standards-aligned instruction. Additionally, specific Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention materials for math were used during designated 20 minute math intervention periods, which also contributed to this increase in proficiency by filling student unfinished learning gaps.

Lowest Performance

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

Learning gains for our lowest 25% in both ELA and MATH showed the lowest performance, with only 55% of students in our L25 making learning gains in ELA and 50% of students in our L25 making learning gains in Math. Many of the students in our L25 are also students with disabilities. This suggests the need for better alignment of instruction between our ESE and Gen Ed teachers, which also will require the need for more collaborative planning time for our gen ed and ESE teachers to plan together. Small group instruction starting in January was specifically focused on increasing proficiency, which may have contributed to a change in focus from filling unfinished learning gaps that still needed to be filled.

Greatest Decline

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

Our SWD Federal Index showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Our SWD Federal Index for the 21-22 school year was 38%, and for the 22-23 school year was 36%. The index increased to 46% during the 23-24 school year. During the 24-25 school year, the SWD proficiency rate decreased to 39%. Contributing to this overall decline in Federal Index were the decline with this subgroup in ELA Learning Gains by 10% (from 59% to 49%), the decline in L25 Math Learning Gains by 12% (from 53% to 41%) and in 3rd grade proficiency by 14% (from 42% to 28%).

One factor that contributed to this decline was turnover on our ESE team; we had several new teachers that were learning how to provide aligned instruction. Additionally, the master schedule had set time for resource teachers to push-in to classrooms, but for some classrooms that set time was at the beginning of the block, making push-in instruction more challenging. Our BPIE indicated the need for additional opportunities for Gen Ed and ESE teachers to collaborate to plan for the implementation of specific strategies that will support all SWDs in the class as well.

Greatest Gap

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.

Our 5th grade Science Proficiency stands out as trending as having the largest gap when compared to the state average. in 2023, our Science proficiency was 51%, which was 3% below the state average and 7% below the District average. In 2024, our Science proficiency increased to 58%, which was actually 1% above the State average of 57%, but still below the District average of 60%. This past year, 2025, our Science proficiency decreased by 1% to 57%, which put us 1% below the State average of 58% and 5% below the District average. While our District has increase incrementally over the past 3 years, we have not seen commensurate growth at our school. Possible factors could include that our Science teachers were also responsible for teaching Math, which took some focus away from this subject. This year, we have redesigned our 5th grade schedule to ensure that there are two teachers that can focus solely on Science instruction throughout the day and can collaborate with our STEM teacher.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Early Warning Systems data show that 14% of students have two or more risk indicators, with the most common being Level 1 scores in ELA and Math. Over half of these students also exhibit multiple indicators, highlighting the strong correlation between academic struggles and other risk factors. 18% of our students have more than 10% absences, with the biggest group of concern being our 6th graders, who have a 23% rate of 10% or more absences. Our 6th grade cohort as a whole has the greatest percentage of 2 or more EWS indicators, with 24% of our 6th graders falling into this category. In addition to the 23% of 6th graders with 10% or more absences, 25% of 6th graders scored a Level 1 on ELA and 24% scored a Level 1 on Math. Targeted interventions in attendance

and student support will address these root causes and promote academic growth.

Highest Priorities

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

1. Increase ELA learning gains
2. Increase Math learning gains
3. Increase Science proficiency

4. ESSA subgroups - specifically increasing proficiency and learning gains for our Students with Disabilities.

5. EWS - focus on multiple Early Warning Systems indicators, specifically Level 1 on ELA/Math and Absenteeism

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Description: Teachers will work collaboratively with administration and our assigned coach in PLCs to plan for daily instruction that is fully aligned to the ELA benchmarks. This planning will include plans for small group instruction in ELA 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 learning gains and proficiency in ELA.

Rationale: Learning gains for our lowest 25% in both ELA and MATH showed the lowest performance, with only 55% of students in our L25 making learning gains in ELA. Many of the students in our L25 are also students with disabilities. This suggests the need for better alignment of instruction between our ESE and Gen Ed teachers, which also will require the need for more collaborative planning time for our gen ed and ESE teachers to plan together.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

3rd Grade Proficiency

We will increase 3rd grade proficiency from 60% to 63%, a goal aligned with the BPS Strategic Plan.

ELA Learning Gains:

- We will increase whole school Learning Gains from 59% to 64% (+5%).
- We will increase L25 Learning Gains from 55% to 60% (+5%).

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach

the desired outcome.

iReady weekly and diagnostic data, intervention data and FAST progress monitoring data will be monitored and analyzed by teachers with administration and coach. Additionally, students will take ELA unit 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 populations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Sarah Barnett

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
*Benchmark-aligned district curriculum implementation for Reading • Small group instruction-Targeted, data-driven, and structured • Explicit instruction • Systematic instruction • Scaffolded Instruction • Structured Planning in Reading twice/month • 95% Group Reading Intervention • Lexia Reading • i-Ready Reading

Rationale:
The identified practices/programs show proven record of effective instruction for students. They are aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and meet Florida's definition of evidence-based, systematic and/or explicit instruction. Our data indicates a need for continued structured collaborative planning time 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:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Tier 1 Instruction

Person Monitoring:
Sarah Barnett

By When/Frequency:
August and monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

1. Administrators will dedicate common planning time for ELA teachers, including Resource teachers, to plan benchmark-aligned lessons using the ELA curriculum, to include small group instruction, planned benchmark-aligned questions and tasks to include exit tickets (formative assessment) for all students. An emphasis will be placed on delivering rigorous instruction using ELA benchmarks, with scaffolds for vocabulary, text structure, and comprehension strategies. Teachers will use collaborative planning protocols to plan for explicit instruction, questions and specific student tasks to monitor student progress. 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 all students, ensuring participation of Lowest 25% and SWD students weekly. Small group lessons should include benchmark-aligned lessons and be informed by student data to address unfinished learning in phonics and fluency as needed. Small group instruction will take place while Resource/ESOL is in the room, if applicable, so that students can receive double instruction in small group with their classroom teacher and then resource/ESOL teacher. 4. Administrators will conduct classroom walk-throughs and provide feedback on Tier 1 ELA instruction including benchmark-aligned questions, small group instruction and intervention direct instruction using the Walk-Through tool. 5. Teachers will have the opportunity to observe highly effective teachers during the ELA block. 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. Teachers will have follow-up data chats with students regarding their individual data. 8. Students will track their data and set goals for continued growth.

Action Step #2
Tier 2 and Tier 3 Instruction

Person Monitoring:
Lisa Hirschy

By When/Frequency:
August and monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
1. Teachers will be trained by our Literacy Coach to use all intervention materials needed for their intervention groups. 2. Teachers will implement a Walk to Intervention model and will regroup students every 6 weeks based on student data and the Decision Tree. Changes will be made in intervention program or interventionist if students are not making adequate progress as indicated by their OPM data. 3. Administration will conduct walk-throughs and give feedback on Tier 2 and 3 instruction during designation intervention times. 4. Teachers will have the opportunity to observe highly effective intervention instruction.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school’s highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Description: Teachers will work collaboratively with administration and our assigned coach in PLCs to plan for daily instruction that is fully aligned to the Math benchmarks. This planning will include plans for small group instruction in 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 learning gains across subjects.

Rationale: Learning gains for our lowest 25% in both ELA and MATH showed the lowest performance, with only 50% of students in our L25 making learning gains in Math. Many of the students in our L25 are also students with disabilities. This suggests the need for better alignment of instruction between our ESE and Gen Ed teachers, which also will require the need for more collaborative planning time for our gen ed and ESE teachers to plan together.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Learning Gains

- We will increase whole school Learning Gains from 67% to 72% (+5%).
- We will increase L25 Learning Gains from 50% to 55% (+5%).

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

iReady weekly and diagnostic data, intervention data and FAST progress monitoring data will be monitored and analyzed by teachers with administration and coach. Additionally, students will take Math unit assessments throughout the year. Teachers, coach 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 populations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jessie Stein

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

* Benchmark-aligned district curriculum implementation for Math • Small group instruction- Targeted,

data-driven, and structured • Explicit instruction • Systematic instruction • Scaffolded Instruction • Twice per month Structured Planning in Math • i-Ready Toolbox for Math

Rationale:
The identified practices/programs show proven record of effective instruction for students. They meet Florida's definition of evidence-based, systematic and/or explicit instruction. Our data indicates a need for continued structured collaborative planning time 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:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Tier 1 Math Instruction

Person Monitoring:
Jessie Stein

By When/Frequency:
Starting in August and monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
1. Administrators will dedicate Collaborative Planning time for Math teachers, including Resource teachers, to plan benchmark - 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 delivering grade-level instruction using visual models, manipulatives, math talks, and scaffolded tasks to support conceptual understanding. Teachers will plan for and deliver small group instruction to all students. 2. Administrators and Coach will participate in PLCs to review individual student data from specific planned tasks 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. 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. Students will track their data and set goals for continued growth. 5. Administrators will conduct classroom walk-throughs and provide feedback on Tier 1 math instruction and small group instruction. Administrators will use the walk through tool. 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.

Action Step #2
Tier 2 and Tier 3 math instruction

Person Monitoring:
Jessie Stein

By When/Frequency:
August and monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
1. Teachers will be trained by our Assistant Principal and later our math coach to use all intervention materials needed for their intervention groups. 2. Teachers will use student data and the Decision Tree to determine the focus of their intervention groups. Changes will be made in intervention program or interventionist if students are not making adequate progress as indicated by their OPM data. 3. Administration will conduct walk-throughs and give feedback on Tier 2 and 3 instruction during designation intervention times. 4. Teachers will have the opportunity to observe highly effective intervention instruction.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Description: Teachers will be departmentalized in grades 4, 5 and 6 and in 5th grade, two teachers will be solely dedicated to teaching Science. These teachers will plan collaboratively with our STEM teacher and administration in PLCs to plan for daily instruction that is fully aligned to the Science benchmarks. This planning will include plans for systematic Science vocabulary instruction with application, which will contribute to all students experiencing greater proficiency in Science.

Rationale: Proficiency decreased in Science by 1 point last year from 58% to 57%. With more intentional planning time to incorporate explicit vocabulary instruction, we believe proficiency will increase in Science.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Science Proficiency

We will increase proficiency from 57% to 60% (+ 3%).

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Science Summative assessments will be used in grades 3-5 to monitor student learning each unit. In 5th grade specifically, PENDA Beginning of the Year and then Middle of the Year assessments will be

used to monitor student progress toward mastery of the 3rd, 4th and 5th grade Science standards prior to the end of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Sarah Barnett

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
*Benchmark-aligned district curriculum implementation for Science • Explicit instruction • Systematic instruction • Scaffolded Instruction • Weekly Structured Planning in Science • PENDA Science

Rationale:
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 • 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:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Science Action Steps

Person Monitoring:
Sarah Barnett

By When/Frequency:
August and Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
1. Administrators will dedicate common planning time for 4-6 grade Science teachers. An emphasis will be placed on increasing student discourse and focusing on Tier 3 Science vocabulary. Teachers will plan to embed reading comprehension strategies and explicit science vocabulary instruction to support students' understanding of complex texts and questions by providing opportunities for close reading of nonfiction texts (articles, labs, scientific texts). This planning time will be facilitated by a Teacher Leader and/or our Science teacher. In 5th grade, the Science teachers will plan with our STEM teacher weekly. 2. Teachers will teach and review Tier 3 science terms weekly and will

strengthen student learning through the use of required Science notebooks in grades 4-6. 3. Administration will designate required Science time for each grade level and monitor with admin walk-throughs, providing feedback to teachers. 4. Grades 3-6 will complete all District science summative assessments. Teachers will use the data to plan instruction during our collaborative planning times. Lowest 25% and SWD data will be monitored. Our dedicated Science teacher will use data to plan for intervention and reteach opportunities in the Science lab. 5. 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. 6. Focus on Vocabulary: STEM teacher will have a content word wall by unit and will support the implementation of similar word walls in our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade Science classrooms. Additionally, STEM teacher will support our school-wide focus on Science vocabulary by preparing vocabulary Focus words for our school announcements. Words will be introduced on the announcements and also on the TVs/ monitors throughout the day. STEM teacher will lead the Activity team in integrating focus Vocabulary words throughout their weekly lessons. 7. STEM teacher will monitor subgroup data and plan for targeted reteach opportunities for 5th grade students in our focus subgroups during a “Science Club” time during morning arrival in the Spring. 8. All students in grades 4-6 will participate in the Science Fair, focusing on the scientific method and real life Science learning. 9. 3rd and 4th grade standards will be spiraled in 5th grade 10. Academic Support Program for Science grade 5 - "Science Club"; participants determined by district assessments. Standards-aligned materials will be used in this program. 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. 11. 5th grade students will participate in standards-aligned Science rotations and Standards Bootcamp focusing on highest-need standards in March and April.

Area of Focus #4

Address the school’s highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Description: Subgroup data as an Area of Focus is a crucial need for Meadowlane Intermediate because there is a historic trend that our SWD subgroup has performed below the Federal Index of 41% or higher proficiency. Increased and consistent push-in services for the majority of the SWD students in addition to intentional collaborative planning times that include gen ed and ESE teachers will be implemented this year.

Rationale: Students with Disabilities Federal Index for the 21-22 school year was 38% and for the 22-23 school year was 36%. Although this index increased to 46% during the 23-24 school year, this subgroup declined to 39% during the 24-25 school year. We must continue to focus on this group so that proficiency and learning gains both increase until we see a consistent trend in increased proficiency and learning gains multiple years in a row. Additionally, Our BPIE indicated the need for

additional opportunities for Gen Ed and ESE teachers to collaborate to plan for the implementation of specific strategies that will support all SWDs in the class as well.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

We will increase our Federal Index for our Students with Disabilities from 39% to 42% (+3%), so that we will once again be above the Federal Index of 41%.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

After the iReady diagnostics 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 and/or learning gains. Individual students will be monitored to determine how many additional points would be needed to be considered proficient/make a learning gain. Subgroup data on District Assessments will also be analyzed at bi-weekly data meetings with teachers, administration and Literacy Coach for both ELA and Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Sarah Barnett

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

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:

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:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Clearly identify and track progress for students in each class that are in our SWD subgroup.

Person Monitoring:
Lisa Hirschy

By When/Frequency:
August and monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
1. Teachers will identify students in their classes during pre-planning that fall into this subgroup and/or our L25. 2. Teachers (including ESE teachers), counselors, and administration will track and monitor ESSA subgroup data for ongoing progress on intervention (Lexia) progress monitoring, i-Ready diagnostics, DORF, FAST progress monitoring and unit assessments.

Action Step #2
Planning for and delivering instruction that meets the needs of the students in our focus subgroups.

Person Monitoring:
Sarah Barnett

By When/Frequency:
August and monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
1. Resource schedule will be designed to allow for collaboration between the classroom and resource teachers and will allow for students to receive small group support during specific, designated times. (BPIE indicator 28) 2. Collaborative planning time will be provided for ESE and Gen Ed teachers to plan together to align instruction and consult to ensure that proper scaffolding and strategies are used with our SWD. Additionally, weekly team planning with coach/admin for ELA, Math, Science will include strategies including visuals, anchor charts and manipulatives, to support students in our underperforming subgroup. (BPIE indicator 28) 3. 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. 4. Teachers, Coach and Admin will ensure that benchmark-aligned curriculum is being used with all students, including SWD students. 5. Coaching on the Science of Reading multi-sensory strategies will include resource and VE teachers to address learning for SWD students. 6. Teachers will ensure that all students in these subgroups receive invitations to ASP for reading, math and science if needed. 7. Resource teachers will attend collaborative teaching training with their gen ed counterparts and also will attend Specially Designed Instruction training to ensure best practices are being used when planning for collaborative teaching and for small group instruction that will meet the needs of our SWD students. 8. Support Specialist and ESE Program Specialist will assist with data tracking and will participate in monthly walk-throughs with administration to provide feedback and support to teachers. 9. Administration, support specialist and literacy coach will work together to equip staff with training in differentiation, accommodations, and inclusive practices to better support SWD by ensuring opportunities to attend PD on IEP compliance, co-teaching models, and instructional strategies for SWD. Also, this group, including our ESE Program Specialist, will provide coaching and modeling for teachers implementing inclusive practices.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Multiple Early Warning Signs

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Description: A review of our data indicates that we have 107 students (approximately 14% of our student population) that meet the criteria of having multiple Early Warning Systems, most notably Level 1 on Math and/or ELA and absent 10% or more school days. We will focus on increasing students' attendance which we believe will directly impact increased learning, decreasing our number of Level 1s in both ELA and Math. In order to increase attendance, we will also focus on strengthening a positive school culture so that students want to come to school.

Rationale: We know that attendance plays a crucial role in student achievement; we need students here in school in order for them to learn and grow academically. Additionally, we need students here on time and for the whole day, so we will be focusing on decreasing tardies and early check-outs as well.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

We will decrease the number of Level 1s in both ELA and Math:

- In ELA we had 157 students who scored a Level 1 on ELA and we will decrease that by at least 5% to 149.
- In Math we had 145 students who scored a Level 1 on Math and we will decrease that by at least 5% to 138.

We will decrease the number of students who were absent 10% or more of the school year by at least 5%, moving from 137 to 130.

We will decrease the number of students who have two or more Early Warning indicators by at least 5%, moving from 107 to 101.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

We will monitor student achievement progress on iReady D1 and D2 as well as on FAST PM1 and PM2, specifically tracking the students that fall into the above categories. We will monitor attendance data weekly and then monthly to ensure that students that fall into both categories (Level 1 on PM3 ELA or math and low attendance) are increasing the number of days that are in school each month as

compared to last school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Dana Inghram

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
In addition to the reading and math interventions being used to address student learning in ELA and Math, these evidence-based interventions to improve attendance will be implemented: * Clear communication about attendance expectations to students and families * Recognition of good and improved attendance * Connection to a caring adult/mentor * Check-in/Check-out * small group and/or individual counseling with counselors or social worker

Rationale:
These interventions are evidence-based as referred to at Attendance Works and will be used during our MTSS process to support students who demonstrate need in this area.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Increasing Attendance

Person Monitoring:
Dana Inghram

By When/Frequency:
August and bi-weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
1. A list of students who had a high level of absences (greater than 10%) and also scored a Level 1 on ELA or Math will be compiled. Those students will be assigned a mentor/caring adult on campus that they will check-in/check-out with daily or weekly on campus. 2. These mentors will receive training during pre-planning on expectations and ways to encourage their student(s) to want to come to school through the lens of building relationships/relationship mapping. They will also have access to incentives to offer their mentees with increased attendance. 3. Progress towards increased learning/gains and proficiency and decreased Level 1s will be monitored for these students after iReady D1, D2 and FAST PM1 and PM2. Mentors will include goal setting and follow-up in their check-ins/outs. 4. Attendance will be monitored by teachers and phone calls will be made to families after 2 missed days in a row. Then, additional correspondence will be made by a member of the attendance team bi-weekly and follow-up phone calls will be made with families. 5. The entire team to include admin will meet monthly to problem solve and track improvements. 6. To increase attendance

school-wide, a drawing will be held each month to recognize students who had 2 or less absences that month. 7. "The Best Day Ever" will also be implemented on a random day each quarter to encourage students to come to school daily.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage where the school's Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other federal, state and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections

1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSIor CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

Needs Assessment:

During the summer, administration analyzed a range of data to create responsive plans aligned with student needs, including the unique needs of students with disabilities (SWD). The team conducted a comprehensive needs assessment to identify specific challenges faced by students, such as academic achievement gaps, attendance concerns, and access to appropriate supports and services. Special consideration was given to ensuring the voices and data related to SWD were meaningfully included in the assessment.

Resource Evaluation:

The leadership team reviewed the allocation and utilization of current resources—including teaching staff, technology, instructional materials, support services, specialized programs, and funding—with an intentional focus on equitable access for SWD. The evaluation included assessing whether these resources effectively support inclusive practices and individualized learning needs and whether they are aligned with both the school's goals and students' Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) or 504 Plans.

Gap Analysis:

The team conducted a gap analysis by comparing current resources and their impact on student outcomes—particularly for SWD—against the identified needs. They identified areas where supports were insufficient, inaccessible, or underutilized, including time and scheduling structures, availability of specialized staff or related service providers, and the adequacy of professional development for supporting inclusive and differentiated instruction.

Action Plan Development:

Based on multiple sources of data—including data disaggregated for SWD—administration identified strategic focus areas. The principal then selected appropriate, evidence-based interventions that support both universal and targeted student needs. Interventions were chosen to align with best practices in inclusive education and were designed to provide meaningful access, participation, and progress for SWD within the general education curriculum and school community.

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

Meadowlane Intermediate will implement the following plan (in timeline order) to support and improve

SWD subgroup performance:

- During pre-planning, the Support Specialist will identify all students performing below grade-level proficiency (Level 1 and 2) in math and reading using PM3 data from the 24-25 school year.
- Our Support Specialist will share these lists with teachers, coaches, counselors and admin so that these students can be progress monitored throughout the year. Additionally, instructions will be shared by the Support Specialist on how to identify these students' accommodation and how to document implementation of these students' respective IEPs.
- ESE Resource teachers will have schedules that allow them to attend the Collaborative Teaching PD with the classroom teachers with whom they work. Activity teachers will also be able to participate. (This addresses our BPIE Need Indicators 18 and 28.) They will also have the opportunity to attend Specially Designed Instruction Training in October with our ESE Program Specialist in order to improve instruction for our SWDs.
- Our Support Specialist and ESE Program Specialist will conduct monthly meetings during which they participate in classroom walk throughs with administration to monitor implementation of Specially Designed Instruction and push-in services and provide feedback and professional development as needed.
- Reviewed data will also be shared with teachers at PLCs each month.
- At our MTSS meetings and/or our monthly Attendance Team meetings, our SWD students who have been identified though the EWS report will be on the agenda so we can discuss interventions and supports.
- Mid-year PM2 data will be used to compare to PM1 and PM3 from 24-25 data to look for student growth or need for intervention and support.
- Teachers will ensure that all of our SWDs who scored Level 1 or Level 2 on PM2 during the 24-25 school year receive invitations to our ASP program.

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.	**No**

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					**0.00**