

Bay District Schools

Merriam Cherry Street Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Merriam Cherry Street Elementary

1125 CHERRY ST, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Keri Weatherly

Start Date for this Principal: 7/4/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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*
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: F (28%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Merriam Cherry Street Elementary

1125 CHERRY ST, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Merriam Cherry Street Elementary celebrates academic excellence in a safe, friendly and nurturing environment. We value the emotional and educational well-being of each individual. We inspire and equip all students to be a community of leaders and lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Merriam Cherry Street Elementary strives to be a model of continued academic excellence. It is our vision that all students achieve personal success and will become responsible and productive citizens.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Long, Bryan	Principal	The Principal and Assistant Principal serve as the instructional leaders.
Thompson, Michelle	Assistant Principal	The Principal and Assistant Principal serve as the instructional leaders.
Young, Lori	Instructional Media	Young, Menhennett, Bellomy and King serve as peer leaders and mentors on campus. They collaborate with multiple grade levels, streamlining school initiatives and supporting classroom teachers with the implementation of school wide goals.
King, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	Young, Menhennett, Bellomy and King serve as peer leaders and mentors on campus. They collaborate with multiple grade levels, streamlining school initiatives and supporting classroom teachers with the implementation of school wide goals.
Hand, Kristin	Other	Interventionists (Hand) and ESE support teachers (Kyle) are our on site reading and math interventions subject matter experts.
Bellomy, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	Young, Menhennett, Bellomy and King serve as peer leaders and mentors on campus. They collaborate with multiple grade levels, streamlining school initiatives and supporting classroom teachers with the implementation of school wide goals.
Kyle, Tony	Teacher, ESE	Interventionists (Hand) and ESE support teachers (Kyle) are our on site reading and math interventions subject matter experts.
Menhennett, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Young, Menhennett, Bellomy and King serve as peer leaders and mentors on campus. They collaborate with multiple grade levels, streamlining school initiatives and supporting classroom teachers with the implementation of school wide goals.
Downs, Jenna	Attendance/ Social Work	Downs serves as our Social Worker and works with behavior, attendance and school wide initiatives.
Bunk, Malori	School Counselor	Bunk is our professional school counselor and supports the academic, behavioral and social/emotional of all students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/4/2019, Keri Weatherly

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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*
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: F (28%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	73	71	76	71	66	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	429
Attendance below 90 percent	6	13	12	21	21	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	1	11	13	20	25	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	3	4	9	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/4/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	80	76	77	77	70	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	17	27	13	26	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	3	2	1	12	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	8	11	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	2	10	8	16	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	11	10	5	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	
Number of students enrolled	80	76	77	77	70	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	17	27	13	26	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	3	2	1	12	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	8	11	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	2	10	8	16	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	11	10	5	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	66%	55%	57%	40%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	59%	58%	62%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	83%	57%	53%	67%	55%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	61%	56%	63%	37%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	54%	62%	66%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	42%	51%	74%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	68%	53%	53%	36%	44%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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	2019	73%	61%	12%	58%	15%
	2018	49%	57%	-8%	57%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	58%	-3%	58%	-3%
	2018	56%	51%	5%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	58%	56%	2%	56%	2%
	2018	60%	50%	10%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	62%	-11%	62%	-11%
	2018	61%	63%	-2%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	59%	3%	64%	-2%
	2018	65%	59%	6%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	60%	9%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	61%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	53%	5%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	40	57		62	70						
BLK	50	61		41	70	80	36				
MUL	50			40							
WHT	75	66		75	66		100				
FRL	65	67	83	60	63	65	67				
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				

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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
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	

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	45
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	67
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.

Third grade math showed the lowest performance at 51% for 2019. There were multiple factors that could have contributed to the 2019 lower performance, including Hurricane Michael (loss of instructional time), attendance, mobility rate, behavioral concerns, instructional pacing and practice, and teacher leave.

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

Third grade math showed the greatest decline, going from 61% in 2018 to 51% in 2019. There were many factors that could have contributed to the 2019 reduced performance, including Hurricane Michael (loss of instructional time), attendance, mobility rate, behavioral concerns, instructional pacing and practice, and teacher leave.

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.

Third grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Merriam Cherry Street Elementary scored 15% above the state average in this area. Factors that could have contributed to this success is the school wide focus on ELA and ELA specific interventions. This could be related to the poor performance in math for the same grade level.

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

Third grade ELA showed the most improvement with a gain of 24% from 2018 to 2019. We did not take new actions, but stayed the course with a school-wide focus on ELA and ELA specific interventions.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The primary concern is the lack of instruction the students have had for the previous six months (Distance Learning), coupled with the loss of instruction that took place after Hurricane Michael. A secondary concern is the amount of students that were promoted during distance learning without having mastered the grade level standards. Our new population data indicates a strong need to focus on ELA learning gains and Learning Gains of the lowest quartile in order to close learning gaps.

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

1. ELA Learning Gains
2. ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile
3. ELA Proficiency
4. Increase in School Culture resulting in a decrease in Discipline Referrals

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	ELA Achievement and Available Learning Gains.
Description and Rationale:	ELA Achievement, learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile continues to be our are of focus due to our new and increased population and their academic needs.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on ELA Achievement, Learning Gains and Learning Gains of the lowest quartile we will maintain our ELA Learning Gains of 64%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bryan Long (longbh@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>We will implement the districts ELA curriculum with fidelity.</p> <p>We will provide students with academic deficiencies the necessary interventions, every day, to help them close learning gaps utilizing SRA and Achieve3000.</p> <p>We will use John Hattie's research and embed instructional strategies with the largest effect size in order to engage all students in meaningful and relevant instruction.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The districts curriculum and curriculum resources provides us with a research based, guaranteed and viable curriculum with all of the necessary resources. SRA and Achieve3000 provides us with the necessary interventions to close academic learning gaps and ensure every student is getting what they need in order to be successful. Hattie's research on instructional strategies and their effect sizes provides us with a toolbox of strategies that are research based and proven to close learning gaps and ensure instruction is both meaningful and relevant.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize the Districts curriculum and curriculum guide to provide rigorous and rich learning experiences.
2. Provide students with academic interventions (EL, SRA, Achieve3000) daily in order to close learning gaps.
3. Utilize John Hattie's research and focus on instructional strategies with the largest effect size.
4. Monitor instruction, curriculum, interventions and instructional strategies with Classroom Walkthroughs and provide immediate feedback and coaching as needed.
5. Data analysis of summative assessments, quarterly MAP assessments and intervention logs through weekly PLC and bi-weekly data chats.

Person Responsible Bryan Long (longbh@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus	Behavior.
Description and 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 in turn increase.
Measurable Outcome:	Increased proficiency and learning gains in ELA while simultaneously decreasing the number of office discipline referrals by 15%, the number of in-school suspensions by 15% and the number of out-of-school suspensions by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Thompson (thomprm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The administrative and behavioral support teams will meet monthly to support teachers with classroom management, analyze data and organize school-wide incentive events. The team will consist of members from each grade level on campus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By reducing distractions and increasing instructional momentum we will be able to focus on the implementation of the districts curriculum and resources and securing learning gains and proficiency in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School wide implementation of House System.
2. School wide implementation of behavioral success plan.
3. Weekly problem solving meetings to ensure the needs of all students are met.
4. Monthly Behavioral Meetings to analyze data and make adjustments as necessary.

Person Responsible Bryan Long (longbh@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

All schoolwide improvement priorities identified in 2.E (Needs Assessment/Analysis) are identified above in the Areas of Focus.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Merriam Cherry Street Elementary addresses building a positive school culture and environment through the implementation of the House System and our PBIS system. We have chosen to implement the house system in order to build community on our campus, to promote positive relationships and mentoring for students, to promote positive relationships between all faculty/staff and all students and to instill a sense of Cheetah pride in every student. The end goal of the MCSE House System is to build school wide community, culture and pride as well as increase social/emotional learning and reduce the number of discipline referrals.

We will also utilize our #MCSBelieves mentoring program where every faculty and staff member is assigned a student to mentor throughout the school year as well as outside mentoring through community partners and our triad team.

We rely heavily on our community partners (First United Methodist Church, Emerald Coast Fellowship, City of Panama City and Hiland Park Baptist Church) to ensure all stakeholders are involved through frequent events and meetings.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00