

Orange County Public Schools

Meadowbrook Middle



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Meadowbrook Middle

6000 NORTH LN, Orlando, FL 32808

<https://meadowbrookms.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: David Hardrick

Start Date for this Principal: 6/12/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: D 2014-15: D 2013-14: D
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hardrick, David	Principal	
Duroseau, Wendy	Instructional Coach	
Griffin-Simmons, Angela	Dean	
Hunter, Nikkie	Instructional Coach	
Nelson, Ronalda	Instructional Coach	
King, Leslie	Instructional Coach	
Washington, Ronald	Dean	
Williams, Andreaus	Dean	
Cain, Brandi	Assistant Principal	
Fitzgerald, Shantel	Assistant Principal	
Jackson, Desiree	Guidance Counselor	
Williams, Robin	Guidance Counselor	
Sharpe, Janet	Instructional Media	
Jordan, Larvarn	Teacher, ESE	
Martin, Lesa	Administrative Support	
Rainey, Sheila	Administrative Support	
Johnson, Sara	Administrative Support	
Codner, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	
Cooley, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Agbonkhese, Claudette	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	337	361	330	0	0	0	0	1028
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	71	92	0	0	0	0	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	10	44	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	199	61	0	0	0	0	348
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	210	184	0	0	0	0	561

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	178	135	0	0	0	0	444

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

55

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/8/2019

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	42	46	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	194	191	0	0	0	0	523

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	42	46	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	194	191	0	0	0	0	523

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	23%	52%	54%	24%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	35%	52%	54%	32%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	45%	47%	33%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	30%	55%	58%	33%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	40%	55%	57%	41%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	50%	51%	35%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	51%	51%	36%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	49%	67%	72%	47%	68%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	337 (0)	361 (0)	330 (0)	1028 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	46 (34)	71 (42)	92 (46)	209 (122)
One or more suspensions	19 (3)	10 (0)	44 (5)	73 (8)
Course failure in ELA or Math	88 (0)	199 (0)	61 (0)	348 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	167 (138)	210 (194)	184 (191)	561 (523)

Grade Level Data

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	23%	52%	-29%	54%	-31%
	2018	21%	48%	-27%	52%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	22%	48%	-26%	52%	-30%
	2018	18%	48%	-30%	51%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	22%	54%	-32%	56%	-34%
	2018	29%	55%	-26%	58%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	26%	43%	-17%	55%	-29%
	2018	18%	35%	-17%	52%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	21%	49%	-28%	54%	-33%
	2018	25%	51%	-26%	54%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	9%	36%	-27%	46%	-37%
	2018	17%	32%	-15%	45%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	29%	49%	-20%	48%	-19%
	2018	34%	49%	-15%	50%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	66%	-18%	71%	-23%
2018	46%	66%	-20%	71%	-25%
Compare		2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	63%	19%	61%	21%
2018	90%	61%	29%	62%	28%
Compare		-8%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	53%	29%	57%	25%
2018	85%	65%	20%	56%	29%
Compare		-3%			

Subgroup Data											
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	4	23	28	5	25	32	3	21			
ELL	16	33	32	21	41	49	20	44	86		
ASN	64	62		64	77						
BLK	22	34	31	29	39	44	27	48	84		
HSP	25	36	35	30	41	50	26	46	72		
WHT	17	41		35	31						
FRL	22	33	31	28	38	44	29	47	82		

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	4	29	29	3	19	22	10	10			
ELL	15	39	37	27	43	33	31	37	89		
ASN	67	54		58	54						
BLK	22	32	33	31	40	35	34	45	89		
HSP	27	37	31	43	52	30	45	48	91		
WHT	25	35		35	32						
FRL	23	31	31	33	41	35	36	47	90		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	426
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	67
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	31
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is English Language Arts proficiency. Of the nine English Language Arts teachers during 2018-2019, three positions experienced multiple transitions of instructional staff and or had an interim long-term substitute, which had an adverse effect on 33% of students tested.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline is Science proficiency. Of the three Grade 8 Science teachers during 2018-2029, two positions experienced multiple transitions of instructional staff and or had an interim long-term substitute, which had an adverse effect on 66% of students tested.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is English Language Arts proficiency with a 31% difference. Of the nine English Language Arts teachers during 2018-2019, three positions experienced multiple transitions of instructional staff and or had an interim long-term substitute, which had an adverse effect on 33% of students tested.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is Mathematics bottom 25%. During 2018-2019, the Intensive Mathematics classes focused on prerequisite skills through vertical alignment of standards working two grade levels below the grade-level standard to close gaps in skills. As the gaps closed, the instruction was modified to work towards grade level.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

After reflecting on the EWS data, the two areas of concern are the number of students scoring Level 1 and course failures in English Language Arts and Mathematics.

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

1. Building teacher capacity to create and maintain adequate learning conditions (Elements 1, 4, 18, 19, and 20)
2. Intense focus on ELA, if students can read with comprehension, they can perform better in SCI and CVC
3. Intense focus on ELA LG
4. Intense focus on ELA BTM 25%
5. Maintaining and improving MTH BTM 25% plan to increase LG and BTM 25%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title 1. Meadowbrook Middle School will increase student proficiency as a result of implementing high-quality, standards-based instruction in all grade-levels by the use of literacy strategies in all content areas.

Rationale This goal is most appropriate because increasing student achievement in Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies (Civics) will require Meadowbrook to increase English Language Arts skills. For the 2018-2019, Meadowbrook earned 23% for English Language Arts proficiency.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve By June 30, 2019, MMS will increase student English Language Arts proficiency from 23% to 36%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome David Hardrick (david.hardrick@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy The evidence-based strategy for increasing student proficiency is the use of differentiated instruction within the core English Language Arts courses, homogeneous grouping of students by performance levels into Tier 2 single-block Intensive Reading courses, and homogeneous grouping of students in the lowest ELA Level 1 subgroup into Tier 3 double-block Intensive Reading courses.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy A homogenous group can have a lesson plan tailored to the ability of the group as a whole, rather than having to address students with a variety of abilities and needs. Students may feel more comfortable in a group of their peers who are able to learn at about the same speed.

Action Step

- Description**
1. Schedule students appropriately into ELA core, single-block ITR, and double-block ITR
 2. Provide ongoing PD for teachers on effective differentiated instruction
 3. Lesson planning through PLCs with support of school-based coach, AP, and STO
 4. Provide actionable feedback
 5. Continuous monitoring

Person Responsible Shantel Fitzgerald (shantel.fitzgerald@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	2. Meadowbrook Middle School will increase teacher knowledge and implementation of highly-effective, research-based instructional strategies resulting in improved and accelerated student outcomes.
Rationale	Because of the novice level of the majority of teachers in providing the appropriate conditions for learning with fidelity and consistency, Meadowbrook needs to focus on teacher capacity in foundational skills and appropriate pedagogical practices, which are Marzano Elements 1, 4, 18, 19, and 20.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May 27, 2019, 51% of new and beginning teachers will demonstrate proficiency in Elements 1, 4, 18, 19, and 20 by earning a rating of applying.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	David Hardrick (david.hardrick@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>New and beginning teachers will participate in the Meadowbrook New and Beginning Teacher Induction Program. The induction program will focus on Marzano Elements 1, 4, 18, 19, and 20.</p> <p>Research increasingly documents the benefits of organized induction programs to new and beginning teachers. Studies show that strong induction programs significantly increase the retention rates of new teachers. New teachers involved in induction are twice as likely to stay in teaching than those not involved. Where induction assistance is most effective there is a 92% lower chance of beginning teachers leaving to go to another school or leaving the profession altogether. Also, some studies indicate that beginning teachers involved in induction programs had fewer discipline problems and engaged their students in more complex learning than did their peers who were not provided a comprehensive program.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assign a mentor for each new and beginning teacher 2. Host monthly training sessions 3. Biweekly meetings with teachers and mentors 4. Actionable feedback 5. Continuous monitoring via classroom walkthroughs and observations
Person Responsible	Wendy Duroseau (wendy.duroseau@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

The remaining schoolwide improvement priorities will be addressed through a distributive leadership model after building consensus among the leadership team, which is the guiding coalition.

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

Meadowbrook Middle School is working diligently to increase the number of opportunities parents have to participate in school-based activities in order to increase parental involvement. Meadowbrook Middle school is implementing more parent academic and social events on campus to include the SAC meetings, curriculum nights, band concerts, sporting events, and establishing a PTA. This will allow the parents a continuous opportunity to interact with teachers and create a true sense of "school community" at Meadowbrook. Working with community partners, Meadowbrook Middle School will participate in multiple community events, which will include holiday food drives, food pantry, clothing drives, and community clean up efforts.

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

The school ensures that the social-emotional needs of students are being met through the joint efforts of school-based guidance counselors, SAFE coordinator, restorative justice practices, and outside agencies: Big Bear, Elevate Orlando, and City Year. The guidance counselors facilitate social-skill groups and refer students with unique needs to the various support agencies. Deans host group sessions to help students develop the necessary skill-set to appropriately problem-solve and resolve conflict in a peaceful manner. Moreover, students with disabilities are supported through a learning strategies course. Students are referred to Big Bear if they exhibit emotional or psychological needs. Elevate Orlando is a civic, nonprofit organization dedicated to equipping and empowering under-served youth to graduate with a plan for the future. They serve students by establishing mentoring relationships and providing courses grounded in character education and leadership development. City Year provides mentoring services to students selected by the administrative team based on their at-risk status. Together, these agencies and individuals work with students to support their social-emotional needs.

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

Incoming Grade 6 students will meet their new guidance counselors at their respective feeder elementary schools. These students are provided with information that is vital to student success at the middle school level (including their course registration form). Incoming students, along with their parents, will visit the campus for an orientation.

Outgoing Grade 8 students will visit their feeder high schools to inform students of programs offered at their respective schools. This process is similar to the elementary and middle school transition.

Students who need course recovery opportunities will be scheduled with Edgenuity. Edgenuity is used to provide students with immediate opportunities to replace failing grades to ensure they remain on track for transition to high school.

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

School leadership identifies and aligns resources using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) supported by MTSS and RtI processes. Based on results from the 2018-2019 results from AdvancED survey, BPIE, WIDA, FSA, CFE, EOC, and year-end discipline data, the leadership team is coordinating local, state, and federal funds to accelerate and sustain student learning by focusing on building teacher capacity to implement rigorous, standards-based, data-driven instruction as well as building relationships with students.

The core curriculum (Tier 1) includes standards-based instruction in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies. Research-Based curriculum has been adopted by the district and progressions and curriculum resource materials (CRMs) are provided delineated by subject-area and grade-level. The School Transformation Office (STO) team members support core instruction by providing senior administrators, coaches, and a program specialist for each content area to support school-based coaches, professional development, and common planning.

Intensive Reading and Mathematics courses have been realigned to ensure Level 1 students are receiving Tier 2 instruction focusing on underlying deficits. The curriculum for the Intensive Reading and Mathematics courses has been reconfigured to eliminate duplicated exposure, so students receive targeted instruction. The Afterschool Tutoring Services (ATS) will target bubble students as well as provide support to acceleration students.

Peer Counseling and Critical-Thinking have been added as elective courses. Restorative justice continues to be a primary behavioral intervention.

A professional development calendar has been created to provide ongoing training to build teacher capacity. Training will focus on academic and behavioral instruction, teacher pedagogy, inclusion strategies (ESE and ESOL), and operational needs.

The above referenced activities and resources will be made possible through the coordination of school general funds, Title I, Title II, and the School Transformation Office.

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

Several initiatives and programs have been established to foster a college-bound culture and to support and assist administrators, teachers, students, and families as they work toward achieving college readiness for all students. These initiatives and programs include:

-AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) college and career readiness program which promotes student self-management and personal responsibility for academic success through an AVID elective course. AVID includes instruction in college readiness topics and strategies to ensure independent student success.

-The use of College Board's SpringBoard curriculum to increase rigor in English Language Arts (ELA) classes in middle schools is visible throughout all ELA classes at Meadowbrook Middle School.

-Guidance Services work with schools to inform and support students and parents about graduation and college readiness goals.

-Select 7th grade students participate in the Orange TIPS program that offer them the opportunity to receive tutoring that prepares them to take a special administration of the SAT. Those students are also afforded the opportunity to participate in a summer camp that will offer them additional exposure to a variety of college settings.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: 1. Meadowbrook Middle School will increase student proficiency as a result of implementing high-quality, standards-based instruction in all grade-levels by the use of literacy strategies in all content areas.				\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: 2. Meadowbrook Middle School will increase teacher knowledge and implementation of highly-effective, research-based instructional strategies resulting in improved and accelerated student outcomes.				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	100-Salaries	1241 - Meadowbrook Middle	General Fund	1.0	\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Supplement for teacher induction program coordinator.</i>			
					Total:	\$2,000.00