

The School District of Palm Beach County

# Meadow Park Elementary School



2018-19 School Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>13</b> |

# Meadow Park Elementary School

956 FLORIDA MANGO RD, West Palm Beach, FL 33406

<https://mdpe.palmbeachschools.org>

## School Demographics

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)<br><br>Elementary School<br>PK-5 | <b>2018-19 Title I School</b><br><br>Yes | <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)<br><br>79% |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)<br><br>K-12 General Education             | <b>Charter School</b><br><br>No          | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)<br><br>74%               |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2017-18</b> | <b>2016-17</b> | <b>2015-16</b> | <b>2014-15</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | A              | A              | B              | B*             |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 11/14/2018.

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement

Meadow Park Elementary is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

The Meadow Park Elementary School team envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name                      | Title               |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Zuloaga-Haines, Valerie   | Principal           |
| Brocard-Sobrino, Patricia | SAC Member          |
| Mahoney, Pamela           | Teacher, K-12       |
| Blessington, Valerie      | Teacher, K-12       |
| Allen, Vernetta           | Teacher, ESE        |
| MacCloud, Jill            | Teacher, K-12       |
| Mercado, Juliana          | Teacher, K-12       |
| Lozano, Judy              | Teacher, PreK       |
| Haag, Susan               | Other               |
| Liberia, Crystal          | Teacher, K-12       |
| Andrews, Melanie          | Teacher, K-12       |
| Ussin, Sylvia             | Guidance Counselor  |
| Kline, Andrew             | Assistant Principal |
| Schwertner, Eric          | Teacher, K-12       |

#### Duties

##### Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making

School administrators will monitor classroom core instruction in Tier 1. This will include but not be limited to lesson plan checks, iObservation observations and conferences as well as grade level specific data analysis. They also monitor the implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. The SSCC will co-facilitate PLCs with Team Leaders, help monitor student's progress, and will work with administration in building capacity for standards-based instruction. The school counselors, along with Administration and the SSCC, will facilitate efficient and effective MTSS using the School Based Team process, which includes developing intervention plans and assisting with data collection. They

will also monitor and support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions. The ESE contact/teacher helps to develop plans for interventions and assists with data collection. She will monitor and support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions. Team Leaders are responsible for co-facilitating PLCs, grade level meetings as well as distributing pertinent information to their teams. Teachers have shared decision-making responsibilities in PLCs and grade level meetings.

**Early Warning Systems**

**Year 2017-18**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |     |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 16          | 19 | 12 | 10 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 83  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 1  | 0  | 2  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 9   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 29          | 42 | 43 | 16 | 33 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 195 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 10 | 16 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 47  |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |    |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--|-------------|----|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|  | K           | 1  | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 6           | 11 | 3 | 10 | 16 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 67 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 13 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0           | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 23 |

**Date this data was collected**

Wednesday 8/15/2018

**Year 2016-17 - As Reported**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |     |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 22          | 15 | 13 | 20 | 15 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 97  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 0  | 1  | 3  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 7   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 40          | 51 | 41 | 42 | 52 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 269 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 24 | 25 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 76  |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |     |
|--|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 13          | 6 | 5 | 22 | 34 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 105 |

**Year 2016-17 - Updated**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |     |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 22          | 15 | 13 | 20 | 15 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 97  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 0  | 1  | 3  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 7   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 40          | 51 | 41 | 42 | 52 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 269 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 24 | 25 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 76  |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |     |
|--|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 13          | 6 | 5 | 22 | 34 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 105 |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**Assessment & Analysis**

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

When analyzing our data comparing multiple years, our ELA Lowest 25% showed the greatest decline in learning gains by 5% from 56% to 51%. Even though our Students With Disabilities significantly increased proficiency in ELA by 10% from 28% to 38% and significantly increased proficiency in Math by 9% from 32% to 41%, SWD has the largest achievement gap when compared to other subgroups.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest decline, 2017 at 56% and 2018 at 51% with a decrease of 5 percentage points. All other results stayed the same or increased.

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

All of our data components scored higher than the state average. The largest positive gap is our Math Achievement with 17 percentage points. School -79% State - 62%

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

The Math Achievement data component showed the most improvement with a 7 percentage point increase in 2018 as compared to the 2017 school year. 2017 -72% 2018 -79%

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area**

Accelerated Math Program, small group focused instruction, tutorials on computer based adaptive technology (iReady)

**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 68%    | 0%       | 0%    | 70%    | 57%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 65%    | 0%       | 0%    | 64%    | 61%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 47%    | 0%       | 0%    | 51%    | 56%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            | 76%    | 0%       | 0%    | 79%    | 65%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 65%    | 0%       | 0%    | 73%    | 63%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 51%    | 0%       | 0%    | 63%    | 53%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         | 60%    | 0%       | 0%    | 69%    | 56%      | 55%   |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         |         |         |         | Total     |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       |           |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 16 (22)                           | 19 (15) | 12 (13) | 10 (20) | 14 (15) | 12 (12) | 83 (97)   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 (0)                             | 1 (1)   | 1 (0)   | 0 (1)   | 2 (3)   | 5 (2)   | 9 (7)     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 29 (40)                           | 42 (51) | 43 (41) | 16 (42) | 33 (52) | 32 (43) | 195 (269) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 10 (24) | 16 (25) | 21 (27) | 47 (76)   |

**Grade Level Data**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2018 | 71%    | 56%      | 15%                        | 57%   | 14%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 69%    | 54%      | 15%                        | 58%   | 11%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 69%    | 58%      | 11%                        | 56%   | 13%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 58%    | 57%      | 1%                         | 56%   | 2%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 64%    | 59%      | 5%                         | 55%   | 9%                      |
|                       | 2017 | 60%    | 52%      | 8%                         | 53%   | 7%                      |

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2018 | 81%    | 63%      | 18%                        | 62%   | 19%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 66%    | 62%      | 4%                         | 62%   | 4%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 15%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 65%    | 63%      | 2%                         | 62%   | 3%                      |
|                       | 2017 | 66%    | 64%      | 2%                         | 64%   | 2%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 78%    | 66%      | 12%                        | 61%   | 17%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 75%    | 61%      | 14%                        | 57%   | 18%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 12%    |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| WHT                                       | 84       | 71     |             | 87        | 75      | 50           | 78       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 50       | 36     |             | 72        | 57      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 68       | 65     | 50          | 77        | 75      | 71           | 68       |         |           |                   |                     |
| SWD                                       | 38       | 47     | 47          | 41        | 60      | 50           | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 69       | 62     | 50          | 77        | 72      | 62           | 67       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 57       | 61     | 48          | 70        | 67      | 55           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| WHT                                       | 76       | 73     |             | 84        | 76      |              | 78       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 48       | 73     |             | 56        | 53      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 65       | 60     | 56          | 70        | 79      | 75           | 65       |         |           |                   |                     |
| SWD                                       | 29       | 50     | 43          | 33        | 44      | 35           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 63       | 65     | 57          | 69        | 76      | 65           | 65       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 58       | 59     | 54          | 63        | 78      | 81           | 51       |         |           |                   |                     |



### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

#### Areas of Focus:

##### Activity #1

**Title** To ensure progress towards student achievement within ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains in alignment with the District's Strategic Plan to support the expectations of LTO #1 and LTO #2: Increase reading proficiency by Grade 3 and Ensure High School Readiness.

**Rationale** By providing targeted and personalized instruction and resources, students will increase academic proficiency and growth.

**Intended Outcome** Students in the Lowest 25% in ELA will result in 80% gains.

**Point Person** Andrew Kline (andrew.kline@palmbeachschools.org)

##### Action Step

**Description** Pillars of Effective Instruction: Develop master schedule to allow additional ELA intervention and personalized support to L25% students. Continue collegial planning with the support of the Single School Culture Coordinator through PLC's and offer on -going professional development with the aim to continue to build the teachers' instructional delivery and effectiveness encompassing the full intent of standards, appreciation of multicultural diversity and infusion of content required by Florida Statute 1003.42 (2) and SB Policy 2.09 pertaining to Single School Culture. Data chats and goal setting with students, parents and teachers will be conducted throughout the year. Ongoing adjustments will be made according to the current status of student progress towards his/ her individual target.

**Person Responsible** Valerie Zuloaga-Haines (valerie.zuloaga-haines@palmbeachschools.org)

##### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description** Data from formative and summative assessments will be gathered and analyzed. These include, but are not limited to District FSQ's, Diagnostics, Literacy Assessment (RRR), iReady, Imagine Learning, and grade level team created assessments. Data trends and patterns will be discussed at PLCs and in Administrative data chats.

**Person Responsible** Susan Haag (susan.haag@palmbeachschools.org)

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Activity #2</b>                   |  |
| <b>Title</b>                         | To ensure progress towards student achievement within SWD within ELA, Math and Science in alignment with the District's Strategic Plan to support expectations of LTO #1 and LTO #2: Increase reading proficiency by Grade 3 and Ensure High School Readiness.   |
| <b>Rationale</b>                     | By providing targeted and personalized services and resources, students with disabilities will increase academic proficiency and growth.   |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>              | Students with disabilities will result in 80% gains for ELA and Math.  |
| <b>Point Person</b>                  | Andrew Kline (andrew.kline@palmbeachschools.org)   |
| <b>Action Step</b>                   |  |
| <b>Description</b>                   | Pillars of Effective Instruction: Develop master schedule to allow additional ELA intervention and personalized support for students with disabilities in all subject areas. Students will engage learning through small group instruction including extended learning opportunities that support individualized /differentiated instruction encompassing the full intent of standards, appreciation of multicultural diversity and infusion of content required by Florida Statute 1003.42 (2) and SB Policy 2.09 pertaining to Single School Culture. Data chats and goal setting with students, parents and teachers will be conducted throughout the year. Ongoing adjustments will be made according to the current status of student progress towards his/her individual target. |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>            | Valerie Zuloaga-Haines (valerie.zuloaga-haines@palmbeachschools.org)   |
| <b>Plan to Monitor Effectiveness</b> |  |
| <b>Description</b>                   | Data from formative and summative assessments will be gathered and analyzed. These include, but are not limited to District FSQ's, USAs, Diagnostics, Literacy Assessment (RRR), iReady, Imagine Learning, and grade level team created assessments. Data trends and patterns will be discussed at PLCs and in Administrative data chats. Adjustments to scheduling, instruction, and resources will be made throughout the year.  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>            | Susan Haag (susan.haag@palmbeachschools.org)   |

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

**Additional Title I Requirements**  
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students**

Meadow Park Elementary strives to form partnerships with parents in order to enhance support for students. There will be curriculum nights held as well as parent trainings that will assist with educating parents about Common Core State Standards, the grading system/report card, grade level expectations, and ways they can assist their children at home. Community language facilitators will be available at parent trainings and evening events in order to provide support in the home language. Activities to increase parent involvement include: STEM and Science Fair Night, Math Night, Muticultural Literacy

Night, Student-led Conference Night, Family Book Fair, Fall Festival, Movie Nights, Father/Daughter Dance, and Spaghetti Dinner.

### **PFEP Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

### **Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services**

Meadow Park school counselors support students in grades K-5 through a variety of methods. Counselors are available to students throughout the school day and offer guidance classes to grade levels weekly. We have an ESOL school counselor who is available to work with ELL students and parents. We also have a school counselor that serves the entire student population. Meadow Park has a Mentor Program to work with students both academically as well as socially. Mentors meet with students regularly to foster positive school relationships, to set academic goals, to increase attendance and motivation, and to proactively off-set negative behavior.

Other areas Meadow Park helps with the social-emotional needs of students includes:

- Operational school based team that meets weekly to discuss students with barriers to academic and social success;
- Check-in/Check-out, Check and Connect utilized with students in need of positive adult interactions and positive feedback throughout the school day.
- SEL Standards instruction and various campus activities that address social/emotional needs of students;
- Develop and implement a comprehensive school counseling program (Student Development Plan) with dedicated time to: (1) Assess the needs of the students and the barriers blocking their success (Data-Driven Decision Making), (2) Identify interventions that the research suggests works to remove the barrier to success (Evidence-Based Intervention), and (3) Evaluate your intervention and evolve (Evaluation).
- Engage with identified staff (i.e. school counselor, school-based team leader) to provide a differentiated delivery of services based on student/school need. Include core (classroom guidance, workshop, assembly), supplemental (solution focused small group counseling), and intensive supports (individual counseling/advisement, referral to community resources). Utilize data-based decision making to close academic, social-emotional and college-career equity gaps by connecting all students with the services they need.
- Implementation of school-wide SEL standards through Classroom Meetings and Social Contract

### **Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another**

As an early intervention to increase reading on grade level by third grade and to increase student readiness to enter kindergarten, Meadow Park offers a school year Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) program that is supplemented with enrichment hours. This VPK program is supported by the Department of Early Childhood Education and follows all statutes, rules and contractual mandates in the Florida VPK Statewide Provider Agreement, including the use of a developmentally appropriate curriculum that enhances the age-appropriate progress of children in attaining each of the performance standards adopted by the Florida DOE. Participating children are expected to transition to kindergarten ready to learn and be successful in school and later life.

At Meadow Park, all incoming Kindergarten students are assessed upon entry in order to ascertain individual needs and to assist in the development of rigorous instructional/intervention programs. All prospective students are assessed using the following diagnostic tools: Literacy Assessment System (LAS) and Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS). In addition, the LAS is used as an on-going tool to be collected and aggregated to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students. Kindergarten Round-Up is held in the Spring as an opportunity for parents to be trained on

expectations for their child upon entering Kindergarten. Kindergarten teachers and other staff are available at that time to assist parents. All kindergarten students follow a staggered start model for the first three days of school to ease the transition into kindergarten.

Students transitioning from the PreK ESE program go through assessments and reevaluations to determine needs for Kindergarten. New IEPs are developed to address these needs for the Kindergarten year. Fifth grade students are provided with informational meetings regarding the various middle schools. Families are invited to attend middle school open houses as well as transition meetings for ESE students.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact**

The MTSS/RTI Leadership Team will use the problem solving model to conduct all meetings. The team will identify students, based on data and discussion, who are in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support (supplemental or intensive). An intervention plan will be developed (PBCSD Form 2284) which identifies the students' specific areas of deficiencies and appropriate research based interventions to address these deficiencies. The team will ensure that the necessary resources are available and the interventions are implemented with fidelity. Each case will be assigned a case liaison to support the interventionist (example: teacher, RTI/Leadership Team, School Counselor and ESOL coordinator). These liaisons will report back on all data collected for further discussion at future meetings. Parents are included in every step of the MTSS/RTI process through conferences, letters, and phone calls. Copies of all paperwork are also provided to parents.

The Wellness Committee along with student clubs will promote a healthy lifestyle for the school community, foster agreement of norms to establish a safe learning environment, and develop an action plan on how to make Meadow Park a healthier place to learn, work, and play. There will be an opportunity for students to participate in a daily fitness program before school between 7:30 and 7:45 AM.

Title I Part A funds are used to support family involvement activities such as a parent liaison to facilitate parent training, supplies for the family resource room and activities and postage for parent mail outs. Title I funds are also used to hire a STEM/Math teacher that will provide supplemental programs and materials. PD activities are also funded by Title I.

The staff at Meadow Park will collaborate with the District's Multicultural and Migrant departments to meet the needs of our students. Additionally, we follow the McKinney-Vento act by working with District staff as needed to identify and to provide services for families who are homeless.

The administration and staff work closely with the community to meet the diverse needs of our students. Our business partners include, but are not limited to: ValuTeachers, The West Palm Beach Rotary Club, Kiwanis Club, Barnes and Nobles, South Florida Science Museum, and the Pew Foundation.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations**

STEM integration in all subjects. Partnerships with South Florida Science Museum, Okechee Nature Center and Kravis Center.

**Part V: Budget**

|               |               |
|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$0.00</b> |
|---------------|---------------|