W E Cherry Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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 (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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

W E Cherry Elementary School

420 EDSON DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://wec.oneclay.net

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-6	Yes	97%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

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 can be made 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Whiddon, Angie	Principal	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 3000 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.
Eason, Jarrod	Assistant Principal	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 3000 data, and formal assessments such as FSA. The assistant principal co-leads the meetings and provides a common vision for members in order to make data informed decisions.
Roach, Celestina	Teacher, K-12	The Chair of the SAC committee shall assist the principal in leading the committee to develop the SIP, PFEP, and school's annual budget. 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.
Henderson, Lindsay	Instructional Coach	Instructional coaches facilitate and support: best practices in the classroom, data collection, MTSS, and implementation of curriculum.
Lee, Kristie	Teacher, K-12	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.
Cummings, Katheryn	Teacher, K-12	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.
Sutton, Emmalee	Teacher, K-12	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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 2/22/2000, Angie Whiddon

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
28

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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 (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
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	75	97	88	70	95	89	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	614
Attendance below 90 percent	5	6	3	2	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	3	9	12	2	5	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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

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

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	5	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/3/2020

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	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

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	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

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	
	(0)	(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	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						

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
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
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%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
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%	0

English Language Learners	
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%	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	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
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	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	72
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	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

The lowest performance was 6th grade (based on their 4th grade data) FSA Math. Only 48% were proficient (a 10% drop from the prior year). 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 showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

ELA learning gains dropped from 64% to 58% (compared to the Statewide ELA learning gains of 58%). Inexperienced teachers in the testing grades ELA settings contributed to the decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The largest gap was 6th grade (based on their 4th grade data) FSA Math. WEC proficiency was 48% while the state average was 64% (-16%). 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. Additionally, WEC did not transition to Eureka and Go Math was no longer supported by the county for professional development.

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

FSA 3rd grade math proficiency jumped from 67% to 74% (compared to the state staying at 62%). Actions: Go Math, small group instruction, Title 1 assistance, data meetings with explicit intention to drive small group instruction and use of Title 1 team to push in with SIPPS, LLI, iReady toolbox lesson, etc.

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

5% (20) of students had attendance below 90%

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

1. Improvement in ELA learning gains and improvement in 5th grade ELA, Math and science bq performance
2. Improvement in FSA Math proficiency
3. Decrease in absences (Attendance)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With a drop in ELA learning gains from 64% to 58%, WEC will utilize supplemental personnel for small group ELA instruction, hold monthly data meetings to drive instruction, and initiate a self-contained ESE classroom in the 5th grade setting.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA learning gains will improve from 58% to 59%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angie Whiddon (angela.whiddon@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Self contained ESE classroom, Title I assistance with small group instruction, differentiated instruction within ELA and Math classrooms, departmentalized team, ESE inclusion teacher, adopted curriculum,and support within the virtual classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Best practice research indicates a higher level of learning when the teacher to student ratio is smaller, utilizing the Title I team and the ESE teacher will lower the ratio and therefore increase learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet with administrators and instructional coaches for an initial data meeting to plan for instruction.
2. Teachers will work with instructional coaches, grade level and subject area teams to plan high quality instruction.
3. Teachers will receive professional development opportunities to increase teacher capacity in specific areas identified by school-wide data.
4. Teachers will provide small group instruction using Ready LAFS and MAFS, Fountas & Pinnell LLI, Achieve 3000 and iReady Teacher Toolkit materials.
5. Title I staff and assistance will provide support for small group instruction and classroom support.
6. Teachers will have students utilize Chromebooks in the classrooms to complete iReady diagnostics and Math lessons and Achieve 3000 diagnostics and ELA lessons.
7.Implement a self-contained ESE classroom with inclusion support.
8. Supplemental materials will be provided to teachers (Scholastic News, Science Spin, Scope, Let's Find Out, My Big World, etc.)

Person Responsible	Angie Whiddon (angela.whiddon@myoneclay.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2019 school year 29 students (5%) were absent from school more than 10% 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 affect student learning, and is an early warning indicator for dropping out.
Measurable Outcome:	Due to the Covid 19 attendance policies, the real data for 20-21 will be much higher than 5%, but our measurable outcome for this goal would have been to lower it to 4%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jarrod Eason (jarrod.eason@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing personalized early outreach, monitoring attendance data and practice, and recognizing good and improved attendance are strategies that will decrease absenteeism.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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.

Action Steps to Implement

Both virtual and brick and mortar:
1. Students who are absent for 3 days are called by the teacher and recorded in FOCUS.
2. Students who are absent 6 days without communication are mailed a certified letter and a social work referral is done.
3. Students with perfect attendance are rewarded each quarter.

Person Responsible	Jarrod Eason (jarrod.eason@myoneclay.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase 6th grade FSA Math proficiency, we will focus on standards-based iReady instruction. The Iready diagnostic performance impacts student learning as they follow a tailored path through the program in conjunction with the teacher using the toolbox for supplemental instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	FSA Math achievement will increase from 68% to 69%. The percentage of proficient students on diagnostic 2 K-6 in math will increase by 1% to 45%. The percentage of proficient students in grades K-3 in ELA will increase 1%-61%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lindsay Henderson (lindsay.henderson@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the diagnostic data teachers will utilize domain lessons, toolbox lessons, modified paths, meet minutes and utilize small group instruction based on domains to meet the needs of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale is that Iready helps teachers provide all students a path to proficiency and growth in reading and math.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will log on to iready 46 minutes a week for both reading (3-6) and math (K-6)
2.. Supplemental materials will be provided to teachers (Scholastic News, Science Spin, Scope, Let's Find Out, My Big World, etc.)
3. Teachers will meet with administrators and instructional coaches for an initial data meeting to plan for instruction.
4. Teachers will work with instructional coaches, grade level and subject area teams to plan high quality instruction.
5. Teachers will receive professional development opportunities to increase teacher capacity in specific areas identified by school-wide data.
6. Teachers will provide small group instruction using Ready LAFS and MAFS, Fountas & Pinnell LLI, Go Math, Achieve 3000 and iReady Teacher Toolkit materials.
7. . Title I staff and assistance will provide support for small group instruction and classroom support.
8. Teachers will have students utilize Chromebooks in the classrooms to complete iReady diagnostics and Math lessons and Achieve 3000 diagnostics and ELA lessons.

Person Responsible	Lindsay Henderson (lindsay.henderson@myoneclay.net)

1. Students will log on to iready 46 minutes a week for both reading and math
2. Teacher with utilize data to drive instruction and adjust paths

Person Responsible	Lindsay Henderson (lindsay.henderson@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will meet monthly to analyze data. Admin and the instructional coach will meet with each grade level monthly to disseminate data and plan instructional paths. Classroom walk throughs will determine accountability.

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.

In collaboration of the school leadership team, SAC members, and the stakeholders listed below, WEC will build relationships with parents, families and community stakeholders through the following activities during the 2020-2021 school year: Open house/orientation allows parents to tour the campus, meet the teachers and find support services provided by the community virtually and brick and mortar (August). 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 (monthly). Spring Carnival provides parents with educational opportunities and the community partners the opportunity to interact with parents and share their products and services (April). Relay for Life allows parents, teachers and the community to connect and fundraise for the America Cancer Society (April). Girls on Run this community organization provides students with SEL services through fitness and goal setting (all year). School Dance (February) and Information Nights (December, March) provide parents and students with free reading materials and at home strategies to improve students academic performance. SAC, our webpage, our facebook page, and our google classrooms provide parents and stakeholders opportunities to participate in school improvement planning, provide input to budget addressing barriers,contribute to necessary revisions, and provide feedback (monthly).

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.