



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# W E Cherry Elementary School

420 EDSON DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://wec.oneclay.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Angie Whiddon**

Start Date for this Principal: 2/22/2000

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: A (63%) 2014-15: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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](http://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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# W E Cherry Elementary School

420 EDSON DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://wec.oneclay.net>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">99%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">53%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	A	B	B	A

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.**

(\* The Title I Schoolwide Plan/SIP/PFEP are available in any language upon request.)

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and individual responsibility.

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

The School District of Clay County exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

### 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
Whiddon, Angie	Principal	<p>The duties of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is to analyze school-wide data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction for all students. Data to be analyzed includes K-6 iReady Math and Reading diagnostics, 4-6 Achieve 300 data, and formal assessments such as FSA. The principal leads the meetings and provides a common vision for members in order to make data informed decisions. Instructional coaches facilitate and support: best practices in the classroom, data collection, MTSS, and implementation of curriculum. General education teachers provide information about core instructional practices and curriculum, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction, collaborate with staff to provide Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/ instruction with Tier 2/3 supports.</p>
Lee, Kristie	Teacher, K-12	
Cummings, Katheryn	Teacher, K-12	
Gillander, Brenda	Teacher, K-12	
Eason, Jarrod	Assistant Principal	
Phelps, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	
Perea, Marlene	Teacher, K-12	
Brady, Christina	Teacher, K-12	
Kinion, Sara	Teacher, K-12	
Minzenmayer, Emily	Teacher, PreK	
Watson, Kristine	Teacher, K-12	
Gerra, Renessa	Teacher, K-12	
Strickland, Holly	Teacher, K-12	

**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	108	91	102	94	104	92	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	695
Attendance below 90 percent	27	21	17	10	21	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	3	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	28	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

**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	3	2	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

**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	
Students retained two or more times	0	7	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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

30

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/12/2019

**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	13	14	13	15	12	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	2	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	17	3	4	4	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	35	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

**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	1	0	0	2	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

**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	13	14	13	15	12	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	2	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	17	3	4	4	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	35	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	1	0	0	2	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

## 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	62%	65%	57%	61%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	62%	58%	58%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	54%	53%	52%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	70%	63%	69%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	66%	62%	65%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	56%	51%	44%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	65%	53%	47%	55%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	108 (0)	91 (0)	102 (0)	94 (0)	104 (0)	92 (0)	104 (0)	695 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	27 (13)	21 (14)	17 (13)	10 (15)	21 (12)	17 (16)	13 (14)	126 (97)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	2 (0)	0 (1)	2 (0)	3 (2)	1 (13)	8 (8)	16 (25)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (17)	2 (3)	4 (4)	0 (4)	0 (2)	2 (5)	8 (35)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (12)	28 (35)	18 (18)	17 (0)	71 (65)

### 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
03	2019	64%	68%	-4%	58%	6%
	2018	71%	68%	3%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	64%	-9%	58%	-3%
	2018	49%	62%	-13%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	63%	62%	1%	56%	7%
	2018	61%	59%	2%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
06	2019	54%	64%	-10%	54%	0%
	2018	62%	63%	-1%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	71%	3%	62%	12%
	2018	67%	70%	-3%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	69%	-21%	64%	-16%
	2018	58%	66%	-8%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2019	67%	64%	3%	60%	7%
	2018	61%	65%	-4%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
06	2019	71%	70%	1%	55%	16%
	2018	75%	68%	7%	52%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	63%	63%	0%	53%	10%
	2018	62%	64%	-2%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

## 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	48	44	48	59	59	57	62				
ELL	27	53	50	48	67						
ASN	75	64		94	100						
BLK	46	52	50	49	58	54	41				
HSP	45	46	42	60	61		69				
MUL	57	44		75	75						
WHT	75	68	68	77	71	65	77				
FRL	61	60	56	65	69	62	66				
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	63	62	46	56	68	47	57				
ELL	35	71		60	64						
ASN	60	50		87	80						
BLK	49	64	67	49	54	32	33				
HSP	55	64	65	73	67	53	57				
MUL	52	42		52	63						
WHT	73	68	50	75	64	65	79				
FRL	57	64	54	65	63	49	58				
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	39	52	46	45	45	35	28				
ELL	50			60							
ASN	67			83							
BLK	46	58	40	56	62	47	25				
HSP	60	54	58	69	76		40				
MUL	63	53		71	72						
WHT	68	57	70	72	61	42	53				
FRL	56	53	52	65	63	45	42				

## 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	500
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## 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.**

6th grade ELA performed the lowest compared to all other data components. This has not been a recent trend. The contributing factors were having a veteran teacher retire and another teacher resign during the school year. This led to the 6th grade students having three ELA teachers in one school year.

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

The greatest decline was 4th grade Math Lowest 25th Percentile. Only 8% (3 out of 24) of students in this component were proficient. The contributing factor was that our student numbers warranted an additional ESE teacher and Reg. Ed. teacher however we did not receive either so some classes were too large for effective instruction.

**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.**

All categories except for ELA Lowest 25th Percentile performed at or better than the state average. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile at WEC was 51% and the state average was 53%. This shows a 2% gap. This has been a recent trend. The contributing factor was not having an additional ESE teacher and a regular education classroom teacher for which our student population warranted.

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

Math Lowest 25% showed the most improvement. This component improved 10% compared to the previous year. Using two Master Math Teachers to push in to grades three through six math classes and model is what contributed to this improvement.

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

The greatest area of concern is the number of students scoring a Level 1 on the statewide assessment for ELA or Math. In 2017-2018 only 65 students scored a Level 1 whereas in 2018-2019 71 students scored a Level 1. Another concern is the number of students with Attendance below 90%. In 2017-2018 97 students missed more than 18 days of school whereas in 2018-2019 126 students missed more than 18 days of school.

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

1. ELA and Math Lowest 25th Percentile
2. Increase ELA Proficiency
3. Attendance

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Lowest 25% gains in ELA
<b>Rationale</b>	There was a significant decline in learning gains of the Lowest 25% in ELA. These students are often more than one grade level behind and often require more support within the classroom. 2018-2019 lowest quartile gains in ELA was 51%. This was a decline of 4% from the previous year.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By identifying and monitoring students in the lowest 25% for remediation and targeted instruction based on data, then students in the lowest 25% will increase achievement.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jarrold Eason (jarrod.eason@myoneclay.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Student achievement increases when teachers systematically and routinely use data to guide instructional decisions and meet students' learning needs.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Evidenced based ELA instruction indicates that intentional small group instruction based on data provides the highest level of proficiency in ELA. Evidence is based on research from Curriculum Associates, Pearson and Fountas & Pinnell.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will meet with administrators and instructional coaches for an initial data meeting to plan for instruction.</li> <li>2. Teachers will work with instructional coaches, grade level and subject area teams to plan high quality instruction.</li> <li>3. Teachers will receive professional development opportunities to increase teacher capacity in specific areas identified by school-wide data.</li> <li>4. Teachers will provide small group instruction using Ready LAFS material, Fountas &amp; Pinnell LLI and iReady Teacher Toolkit materials.</li> <li>5. Title I staff and assistance will provide support for small group instruction and classroom support.</li> <li>6. Teachers will have students utilize Chromebooks in the classrooms to complete iReady Reading and Math lessons. Classrooms without Chromebooks will use the computer lab.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jarrold Eason (jarrod.eason@myoneclay.net)



<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Attendance
<b>Rationale</b>	During the 2018-2019 school year 126 students were absent from school more than 10% (17 days) of the school days. Current graduation requirements determine that students must attend a minimum of 90% of school days. Missing 10% or more days within a school year can negatively effect student learning, and is an early warning indicator for drop out.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Student achievement will increase if the attendance rate of the identified students is at or above 90%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jarrold Eason (jarrod.eason@myoneclay.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Providing personalized early outreach, monitoring attendance data and practice, and recognizing good and improved attendance are strategies that will decrease absenteeism.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students who attend school regularly have been shown to achieve at higher levels than students who do not have regular attendance. Research shows that attendance is an important factor in student achievement. ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) requires states to report chronic absence data and allows federal spending on training to reduce absenteeism. Also, ESSA allows states to choose student attendance as an indicator to measure school quality or student success.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students missing more than 10% of school days will be referred to the social worker to initiate home visits, phone calls and/or letter home.</li> <li>2. Students missing more than 10% of school days will be referred to Right Path program and Sednet program.</li> <li>3. Students missing more than 10% of school days will be placed in the mentorship program.</li> <li>4. Students with perfect attendance receive an award quarterly.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jarrold Eason (jarrod.eason@myoneclay.net)

<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	ELA Learning Gains
<b>Rationale</b>	ELA learning gains fell below the district average of 62% and had a decline of 6% from the previous school year. 2018-2019 ELA Learning Gains was 58%.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	ELA Learning Gains will increase to 60%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jarrold Eason (jarrod.eason@myoneclay.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Title I teachers and assistants provide intentional small group remediation targeting those "Bubble Students" who most likely will make ELA learning gains.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Evidenced based ELA instruction indicates that intentional small group instruction based on data provides the highest level of proficiency in ELA. Evidence is based on research from Curriculum Associates, Pearson and Fountas & Pinnell.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will meet with administrators and instructional coaches for an initial data meeting to plan for instruction.</li> <li>2. Teachers will work with instructional coaches, grade level and subject area teams to plan high quality instruction.</li> <li>3. Teachers will receive professional development opportunities to increase teacher capacity in specific areas identified by school-wide data.</li> <li>4. Teachers will provide small group instruction using Ready LAFS material, Fountas &amp; Pinnell LLI and iReady Teacher Toolkit materials.</li> <li>5. Title I staff and assistance will provide support for small group instruction and classroom support.</li> <li>6. Teachers will have students utilize Chromebooks in the classrooms to complete iReady Reading and Math lessons. Classrooms without Chromebooks will use the computer lab.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]

**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).**

**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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.**

The school plans to build relationships with parents, families and community stakeholders through the following activities. Open house/orientation allows parents to tour the campus, meet the teachers and find support services provided by the community. Chick-Fil-A for Champions, and Panera for Parents to promote the book fair and provide parents with reading and math strategies to help their students. Spring Carnival provides parents with educational opportunities and the community partners the opportunity to interact with parents and share their products and services. Relay for Life allows parents, teachers and the community to connect and fundraise for the America Cancer Society. Girls on Run this community organization provides students with SEL services through fitness and goal setting. School Dance and Information Nights provide parents and students with free reading materials and at home strategies to improve students academic performance. SAC provides parents and stakeholders opportunities to participate in school improvement planning.

### **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 classrooms are based on the collaborative model where social and emotional components are used. The SIPPS and LLI programs also include these components. There is a Positive Behavioral Support System in place. School council focuses on improving the school in various ways. The guidance counselor, the school social worker and the school psychologist are available to all students upon request. Guidance will also be providing classroom lessons from Child Safety matters. Right Path will be providing one-on-one and group counseling. The Youth Crisis Center demonstrates SNAP (Stop Now and Plan) strategies to selected third and fourth grade classrooms. Attendance is tracked in FOCUS by teachers and administration and if a student misses more than 10% of school days they are referred to the social worker, Right Path program and our mentorship program.

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

Each kindergarten teacher is responsible for ensuring each child successfully transitions to our elementary school program. To provide a smooth transition to school, W.E. Cherry offers Pre-kindergarten education as well as staggered enrollment for kindergarten students. Orientation to school begins prior to the start of the school year. When registering their child, parents are given a copy of the grade level expectations and initial kindergarten readiness skills to work on at home. Parents and students have the opportunity to attend a kindergarten orientation the week before school begins. Additionally, an Open House is held within the first 30 days of school to further inform parents how to best help their child during the transitional period.

At the beginning of the school year, kindergarten teachers screen each child to determine the students' acquisition of specific skills and knowledge. Students with low reading readiness are given supplemental intensive reading instruction using SIPPS, and/or other research based programs. The STAR Early Literacy assessment (formerly FLKRS) and SIPPS diagnostic is used during the first 30 days of school to determine school readiness and the child's ability to form meaningful relationships.

Programs currently in place to assist preschoolers with low readiness rates include Head Start and the State of Florida Voluntary Pre-kindergarten (VPK) and an ESE Pre-K program for students identified as developmentally delayed. All feeder preschools are invited to utilize the Parent Resource Room and materials provided by Title I funds. The effectiveness of our preschool transition design is determined by data collected from the initial assessment and the FLKRS.

Our outgoing 6th grade students are acclimated to their new junior high school environment by

information given to them by the junior high staff who visit our school and explain the course schedules, electives and extra-curricular activities available to them.

**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-based leadership teams will meet after each assessment period to review student data. Quality of Tier 1 instruction will be analyzed within these meetings. Coaches are in place at each school and will focus upon supporting quality Tier 1 instruction in all content areas. Administrators will meet monthly with all grade level/content area teams. At these monthly meetings, administrators and teachers will look at specific student data and will initiate Tier 2 or Tier 3 plans for those students who are struggling to meet grade level/course expectations. These monthly meetings will focus on student achievement and the provision of appropriate, effective interventions. District and school resources will be allocated based upon individual student needs.

Available resources are as follows:

- Enrichment/after school tutoring provided by Title I
- Substitute money provided by State and local funds for common planning and professional development
- Title I teachers and Assistants for small groups in the classrooms
- Parent Involvement Nights to inform Parents about Curriculum and Reading
- SIPPS program purchased through Title I to assist K-2 with phonics
- LLI purchased for tier 2 & 3 reading interventions
- FSA Annual Testing
- FSA Alternative Assessment
- Performance Matters in 5th grade Science
- iReady Diagnostics
- Achieve 3000
- FLKRS
- Diagnostic Reading Assessments (DRA)

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

Our outgoing 6th grade students are acclimated to their new junior high school environment by information given to them by the junior high staff who visit our school and explain the course schedules, electives and extra-curricular activities available to them.

## Part V: Budget

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest 25% gains in ELA				\$40,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5200	120-Classroom Teachers	0241 - W E Cherry Elementary School	General Fund	1.0	\$40,000.00
			<i>Notes: ESE Teacher was allocated due to increase number of ESE students.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Attendance				\$0.00

<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains</b>				<b>\$5,451.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	510-Supplies	0241 - W E Cherry Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$5,451.00
			<i>Notes: Scholastic News, Scope and Let's Find Out Magazines</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$45,451.00</b>