



---

## 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>8</b>  |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>13</b> |

## Merriam Cherry Street Elementary

1125 CHERRY ST, Panama City, FL 32401

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2017-18 Title I School</b> | <b>2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                               | Yes                           | 100%  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | <b>Charter School</b>         | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                                  | No                            | 49%   |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A       | B       | F       | D*      |

### School Board Approval

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

### 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.

Cherry Street inspires and equips all students to be a community of leaders and lifelong learners.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student at Merriam Cherry Street Elementary will achieve personal success and will become a responsible and productive citizen.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name              | Title               |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| Carpenter, Blythe | Principal           |
| Hicks , Barbara   | Other               |
| Eckles, Stacie    | Assistant Principal |
| Young, Lori       | Teacher, K-12       |
| Higgins, Lynn     | Teacher, K-12       |
| Rogers, Tracy     | Instructional Coach |
| Brown, Kristina   | Teacher, ESE        |

#### Duties

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

The Principal and Assistant Principal serve as the instructional leaders. Interventionist (Hicks) is our reading/SRA on-site expert, she also serves as grade chair, and PLC consultant for multiple grade levels. Young, Higgins, and Brown serve as peer leaders on campus. They collaborate with multiple grade levels, streamlining school initiatives and supporting classroom teachers with the implementation of the ELA school wide goal. Rogers serves as our literacy coach, she consults, advises, and collaborates with teachers K-5 to ensure best instructional practices.

### 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          | 17 | 15 | 11 | 9  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 82    |
| One or more suspensions         | 3           | 1  | 2  | 1  | 2  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 8  | 7  | 5  | 6  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 12 | 17 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |

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 | 0           | 4 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |

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     | 9           | 13 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 5           | 4  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 7/18/2018

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     | 19          | 13 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 79    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 7  | 4  | 4  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 3  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 7  | 23 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66    |

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 | 0           | 3 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |

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     | 19          | 13 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 79    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 7  | 4  | 4  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 3  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 7  | 23 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66    |

**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 | 0           | 3 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |

## 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?

One of our lower data components is ELA achievement at 56%. This has been a trend for Cherry Street, and although we are on the rise in this area, it will continue to be an area of focus.

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

We did not have an area of decline from the prior year.

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

Science was the only area in which the state outperformed Cherry Street. Our science proficiency was at 49% compared to the state at 55%.

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

The area that showed the most improvement is math achievement. We moved from 37% in 2017 to 62% in 2018. The improvement is a trend; however, the amount of the increase is unprecedented for Cherry Street.

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

We believe that the new math curriculum, Eureka Math, our overall focus on literacy, and our focus on building teacher capacity contributed to this significant improvement.

### 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      | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 56%    | 50%      | 56%   | 37%    | 48%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 70%    | 49%      | 55%   | 31%    | 47%      | 52%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 70%    | 45%      | 48%   | 10%    | 43%      | 46%   |
| Math Achievement            | 62%    | 57%      | 62%   | 32%    | 53%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 78%    | 57%      | 59%   | 32%    | 53%      | 58%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 76%    | 46%      | 47%   | 23%    | 43%      | 46%   |
| Science Achievement         | 49%    | 50%      | 55%   | 28%    | 44%      | 51%   |

**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 (19)                           | 17 (13) | 15 (11) | 11 (11) | 9 (11)  | 14 (14) | 82 (79) |
| One or more suspensions         | 3 (0)                             | 1 (1)   | 2 (7)   | 1 (4)   | 2 (4)   | 2 (6)   | 11 (22) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 (0)                             | 8 (3)   | 7 (0)   | 5 (1)   | 6 (0)   | 5 (4)   | 31 (8)  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 12 (7)  | 17 (23) | 12 (36) | 41 (66) |

**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 | 49%    | 57%      | -8%                        | 57%   | -8%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 46%    | 59%      | -13%                       | 58%   | -12%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 56%    | 51%      | 5%                         | 56%   | 0%                      |
|                       | 2017 | 40%    | 52%      | -12%                       | 56%   | -16%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 16%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 10%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 60%    | 50%      | 10%                        | 55%   | 5%                      |
|                       | 2017 | 38%    | 49%      | -11%                       | 53%   | -15%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 22%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 20%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2018 | 61%    | 63%      | -2%                        | 62%   | -1%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 39%    | 56%      | -17%                       | 62%   | -23%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 22%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 04                    | 2018 | 65%    | 59%      | 6%                         | 62%   | 3%                      |
|                       | 2017 | 45%    | 62%      | -17%                       | 64%   | -19%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 20%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 26%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 57%    | 57%      | 0%                         | 61%   | -4%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 33%    | 52%      | -19%                       | 57%   | -24%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 24%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 12%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2018 | 49%    | 54%      | -5%                        | 55%   | -6%                     |
|                   | 2017 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### 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 |
| SWD                                       | 42       | 58     | 69          | 49        | 78      | 77           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 35       | 61     | 64          | 51        | 76      | 67           | 6        |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 85       |        |             | 69        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 46       |        |             | 62        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 68       | 78     |             | 67        | 76      | 80           | 76       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 54       | 70     | 70          | 62        | 78      | 73           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |

  

| 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 |
| SWD                                       | 13       | 58     | 55          | 13        | 68      | 67           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 18       | 59     | 75          | 19        | 57      | 71           | 19       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 53       | 60     |             | 51        | 70      | 80           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 34       | 56     | 67          | 30        | 59      | 71           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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** ELA Achievement

**Rationale** Aside from science achievement, ELA achievement is still our area of focus because proficiency remains below 60%.

**Intended Outcome** By focusing on ELA achievement, we will increase our proficiency by 5%.

**Point Person** Barbara Hicks (hicksbb@bay.k12.fl.us)

**Action Step**

**Description** We will utilize a multi-step approach to meet our stated goals by focusing on building proficient readers and utilizing on grade level complex text to meet the rigor of the standards. We will build proficiency through the use of SRA curriculum, utilizing our district literacy coach as well as inclusion facilitators in K-2 & 3-5, the use of intervention programs (Connect to Comprehension, Voyager Passport, and Great Leaps). Additionally, we will utilize our school interventionist to work in small groups with our MTSS students for designated extra ELA time. Our students will work with complex text through the use of the Wonders Curriculum, school-wide writing plan, and the use of the resources on the Bay Literacy Cafe. Bay District Schools ELA Pacing Guides will be used by all teachers in every grade level, and PLCs will focus their attention and instruction on ELA benchmarks and standards.

**Person Responsible** Blythe Carpenter (carpeba@bay.k12.fl.us)

**Plan to Monitor Effectiveness**

**Description** Merriam Cherry Street will utilize multiple progress monitoring devices to determine the effectiveness of our action steps. We will review SRA data notebooks (K-1 will review weekly, 2-5 will review monthly), RTI/MTSS progress monitoring will be conducted monthly, grade level common assessments (according to the district pacing guide), district common assessments (by unit), and MAP data (three times per school year). We also complete classroom walk-throughs, both formal and informal, as needed.

**Person Responsible** Blythe Carpenter (carpeba@bay.k12.fl.us)

## Activity #2

**Title** Behavior

**Rationale** By identifying and addressing the behavioral needs of our students, instructional momentum in our classrooms will increase and the number of students demonstrating proficiency and making learning gains in ELA will increase.

**Intended Outcome** Increased proficiency and learning gains in ELA, decrease in office discipline referrals by 5%.

**Point Person** Stacie Eckles (ecklesl@bay.k12.fl.us)

### Action Step

**Description** The PBIS team for this school year will meet monthly to support teachers with implementation of PBIS classroom plans, analyze discipline data, and organize school-wide events promoting positive behavior. The team will consist of members from each grade level.

**Person Responsible** Stacie Eckles (ecklesl@bay.k12.fl.us)

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description** The PBIS team will meet monthly to discuss discipline data, trends in referrals, and students who could be considered high-flyers. The team will make adjustments and suggestions based on these discussions and continue to progress monitor the data.

**Person Responsible** Stacie Eckles (ecklesl@bay.k12.fl.us)

## 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, Â§ 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.**

We will continue to foster positive relationships with parents and families through our family nights, Donuts with Dad, Morning with Mom and other designated events scheduled throughout the school year. Our partnership with ECF and FUMC will allow us to continue to meet the needs of our families by providing meals at family nights, Shoes for Souls program, Backpack Blessings, and community donations to our food pantry, school supplies, and clothes closet. By meeting the essential needs of our students, we can then focus on their academic needs pushing them to proficiency in all content areas.

#### **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.**

Our faculty and staff members participate in a mentoring program called "MCS Believes" in order to support students with social-emotional needs.

Our school has partnered with two local churches and Tyndall Air Force Base to provide mentoring services to our students on a weekly basis. Additionally, Bay District Schools has implemented a district-wide mentoring program, "Elevate Bay" to increase the number of mentors serving students. Cherry Street is one of five schools identified to receive these mentoring services.

As part of our PBIS program we provide character education lessons, bullying prevention lessons, and citizenship lessons.

We have a "Backpack Blessings" program in partnership with two local churches that serves approximately 100 students. We also have a "Shoes for Souls" partnership with a local church that serves our students two or more times a year.

We have a Benevolent Fund for extreme needs for our students and their families.

We have an established partnership with the local Kiwanis Club who supports our students and families.

Our Student Council provides multiple opportunities for student service projects which may include Stuff the Bus, Toys for Tots, the Humane Society, and Recycling. These projects are ways for our students to give back to the community and develop empathy and emotional connections to those in need.

Students with extreme needs are supported via the school nurse, the Title I Social Worker, a Parent Liaison, and various district resources.

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

FLCKRS, MAP, SRA Placement Test, and the Number Sense Screener Assessments and teacher-made assessments are administered within the first thirty days of school to all kindergarten students in order to ascertain individual and group needs and to assist in the development of robust instructional/intervention programs.

Data will be used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students and for groups of students or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Core Kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction includes daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice and independent practice of all academic and/or social emotional skills.

Ongoing assessments are used throughout the school year to determine student learning gains in order to determine the need for changes to the instructional/intervention programs.

Students enrolled in the Voluntary Pre-K Program will be provided with school newsletters throughout the year and they participate in a variety of school-wide functions. Pre-K implements use of school-wide curriculum including SRA, Eureka Math, and Achieve 3000 as appropriate.

We also hold end-of-year transition meetings for all students leaving our campus and enrolling at the local middle feeder school. Additionally, we offer a field trip to our feeder middle school for students transitioning to 6th grade.

**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 School Leadership Team collaborates to plan, develop and monitor the implementation of school-wide systems that have been established to best meet the needs of all students. Responsibilities and steps to this process include:

- Review/revise and finalize school goals, vision, and mission statements
- Completing a needs assessment to identify critical areas of support for students
- Creating a para-professional support schedule
- Developing and implementing reading (SRA blocks across grade levels)
- Analyzing student academic achievement data to support goals aimed toward student growth and proficiency
- Participating in and presenting relevant Professional Development Opportunities for faculty & staff
- Leading and Facilitating Professional Learning Community meetings (SMART Goals, Common Formative & Summative Assessments, instruction focused on student results, unpacking standards, making data driven decisions about instruction).
- Positive and Proactive grading procedures
- Consistent systems of communication with parents, guardians, and families (about student progress, achievement, behavior, citizenship and safety)
- Collaborating and communicating with all faculty staff including non-core teachers: VPK, Art, Music, and P.E.
- Establishing and participating in committees that ensure student safety and success: Safety Committee, SAC, PBIS Team, MTSS Committee, SIP Team, Math/Science Committee, ELA Committee, and regular and vertically aligned PLCs.
- PLC meetings are held weekly
- Committee Meetings are held (at least) monthly
- Establishing and maintaining community partnerships in order to support students, parents, and families
- Sponsoring extracurricular clubs/committees that meet after school: weekly & monthly
- Establishing and maintaining community partnerships in order to support students, parents, and families
- Collaborate with administration, SAC and parent liaison to make decisions about the spending of Title I Funds.

Title I Funds have been used to support students in the following ways:

- \*\*Title I Intervention teacher hired to assist with bottom quartile students
- \*Additional Staff (paraprofessionals to assist with SRA and ESE students)
- \*Professional Development for teachers/staff
- \*Supplemental Instructional materials
- \*Parent Involvement Activities

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

Our school partners with Bay High School to provide mentors and encourage students to set goals for successful post-secondary opportunities. STEM Club will be supported by Jill Hansen, Bay High science teacher, LeAnne Laird, BHS Anchor sponsor and Megan Todd, BHS SGA sponsor will provide mentors for MCS students, Nick Efstathiou, Band Director Bay High School, will bring the band for a mini-concert demonstration for our students, and Julia House, Choir Director at Bay High School, will bring choral students to perform a holiday musical for our student body.

Elizabeth Mapoles, Pre-AICE Coordinator for Jinks Middle School, will provide information about Jinks' curriculum and extra-curricular activities available for all middle school students.

**Part V: Budget**

|               |                     |
|---------------|---------------------|
| <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$250,228.00</b> |
|---------------|---------------------|