

Bay District Schools

# Merriam Cherry Street Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## 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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# 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: 7/15/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 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 (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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 9/28/2021.

## 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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Merriam Cherry Street Elementary

1125 CHERRY ST, Panama City, FL 32401

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

## School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 9/28/2021.

## 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Long, Bryan	Principal	The primary responsibility of the Principal is the creation of an instructional plan that meets the needs of students. Factors that must be included are academic growth, academic achievement and social/emotional development. It is more important now than ever to focus on the whole child, not just academics.
Thompson, Michelle	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal serves as an instructional leader and supports the mission and vision of the school.
Hand, Kristin	Other	Interventionists are our on site reading and math interventions subject matter experts and work to support academic growth and achievement.
Young, Lori	Instructional Media	Instructional Media teacher serves as a peer leader and mentor on campus. She collaborates with all grade levels, streamlining school initiatives and supporting classroom teachers with the implementation of school wide goals.
Kyle, Tony	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Support teacher is our on site ESE, Reading and Math subject matter experts and work to support academic growth and achievement.
Downs, Jenna	Attendance/Social Work	Our Social Worker works to support behavior, attendance and school wide initiatives that are focused on improving academic growth and achievement.
Bellomy, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a peer leader and mentor on campus. She collaborates with multiple grade levels, streamlining school initiatives and supporting classroom teachers with the implementation of school wide goals.
Menhennett, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a peer leader and mentor on campus. She collaborates with multiple grade levels, streamlining school initiatives and supporting classroom teachers with the implementation of school wide goals.
Stark, Pamela	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal serves as an instructional leader and supports the mission and vision of the school.
Smiley, Kathy	School Counselor	The School Counselor supports the academic, behavioral and social/emotional well being of all students.
Acevedo Rivera, Minelly	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Support teacher is our on site ESE, Reading and Math subject matter experts and work to support academic growth and achievement.

**Demographic Information**



**Principal start date**

Thursday 7/15/2021, 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**

30

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

474

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

12

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

12

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**2021-22**

**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	71	90	73	91	67	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	457
Attendance below 90 percent	42	37	32	37	30	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	1	6	3	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	7	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	38	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	44	54	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171

**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	4	11	26	21	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	8	4	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Thursday 8/19/2021

**2020-21 - 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	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

**2020-21 - 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	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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				66%	55%	57%	56%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	59%	58%	70%	49%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				83%	57%	53%	70%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				61%	56%	63%	62%	57%	62%
Math Learning Gains				64%	54%	62%	78%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	42%	51%	76%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				68%	53%	53%	49%	50%	55%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**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	2021					
	2019	73%	61%	12%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	58%	-3%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	56%	2%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	59%	3%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison						

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

NWEA Measures of Academic Performance (MAP) was taken three times a year, the data was compiled using MAP reports.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23.17%	25.60%	24.69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16.92%	18.75%	18.75%
	Students With Disabilities	8.30%	9.09%	7.69%
	English Language Learners	7.60%	10%	10%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23.17%	24.39%	24.69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16.92%	18.75%	20.31%
	Students With Disabilities	8.3%	9.09%	15.38%
	English Language Learners	15.38%	20%	20%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25.92%	26.66%	27.27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.88%	24.65%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	18.75%	16.66%	19.04%
	English Language Learners	16.66%	16.6%	16.66%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23.17%	23.33%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.05%	20.54%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	18.75%	22.22%	19.04%
	English Language Learners	16.66%	16.66%	14.28%

<b>Grade 3</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36.84%	35.06%	34.88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.22%	25.96%	26.47%
	Students With Disabilities	28.57%	25%	25%
	English Language Learners	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26.31%	25.97%	25.58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16.39%	17.46%	17.64%
	Students With Disabilities	28.57%	31.25%	31.25%
	English Language Learners	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Grade 4</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40%	38.46%	36.84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.33%	29.50%	27.11%
	Students With Disabilities	13.63%	12.50%	9.0%
	English Language Learners	0.0%	0.00%	0.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35.71%	33.33%	33.76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.77%	24.59%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	4.50%	0.0%	0.0%
	English Language Learners	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44.28%	43.75%	42.30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38.46%	37.93%	37.50%
	Students With Disabilities	17.64%	16.66%	16.66%
	English Language Learners	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24.28%	25.0%	24.35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.15%	22.41%	23.21%
	Students With Disabilities	11.76%	11.11%	11.11%
	English Language Learners	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

**Subgroup Data Review**

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	20	11	10	10	6						
ELL											
BLK	17	23		7	16		8				
HSP	33			30							
MUL	61			35							
WHT	60	39		34	23		39				
FRL	31	32	40	12	13	29	26				
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							

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
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				

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	30
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	31
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	236
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

**Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	10
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	



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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	14
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
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	39
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	26
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### **What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Based on progress monitoring data for the 2020-2021 school year proficiency across all grade levels and subjects ranges from 25-40%. ELL students seemed to score higher in proficiency in the lower grades than in higher grades. The number of economically disadvantaged proficiency was higher in older grades than in lower grades. Proficiency numbers in ELA are higher than in Math across all grade levels.

#### **What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile in mathematics and ELA.

#### **What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

There are multiple factors that could have contributed to the lower performance, including Hurricane Michael (loss of instructional time), COVID-19 (loss of instructional time), the closing and combining of multiple schools in the district, increased enrollment, attendance, mobility rate, behavioral concerns, instructional pacing and practice and teacher leave (COVID-19).

#### **What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Third grade ELA showed the most improvement with a gain of 24% from 2018 to 2019.

#### **What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

We did not take new actions, but stayed the course with a school-wide focus on ELA and ELA specific interventions.

#### **What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Focused and prescribed academic interventions will need to be implemented daily in order to close learning gaps. PLCs will need to collaborate regularly and closely monitor instruction/learning and make adjustments accordingly.

#### **Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Faculty will be provided ongoing professional development on the new ELA curriculum and iReady. Faculty will also be provided ongoing professional development on high-yield instructional strategies, Trauma Sensitive Classrooms and Social/Emotional learning.

#### **Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

Summer Learning, after school tutoring, extra curricular academic clubs, and prescribed academic interventions.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Merriam Cherry Street Elementary will have fully active and functioning PLCs that include participation, attendance and support from administration.

Professional Learning Communities are a priority at Merriam Cherry Street Elementary because they will help provide consistent, data-driven instruction in all classrooms in order to increase reading achievement and learning gains. A heavy emphasis will be placed on PLCs by administration with a plan to monitor for effectiveness with continuous communication between necessary stakeholders.

**Measurable Outcome:**

At Merriam Cherry Street Elementary we strive and expect 100% active participation in Professional Learning Communities. We also expect 100% of faculty and administration to regularly collaborate and openly communicate in order to meet the needs of every student.

**Monitoring:**

Administrators (Bryan Long, R. Michele Thompson and Pamela Stark) are assigned to specific grade level PLCs and will regularly attend PLC meetings. PLCs will also upload agendas and minutes to a shared drive for monitoring purposes.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Professional learning communities have been at the forefront of transforming schools to improve student achievement. Effective PLCs are founded on the shared vision and values of improving learning outcomes for all students. When staff have ongoing, consistent meeting times for PLCs such that they are able to respond to students' needs in a timely manner, those responses are shown to have a greater impact in ensuring all students have equitable opportunities to learn and grow academically.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

The four critical questions of a PLC, what do we want all students to know and be able to do, how will we know if they learn it, how will we respond when some students do not learn and how will we extend the learning for students who are already proficient is the rationale for selecting PLCs as a specific strategy.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Grade level PLCs will meet a minimum of once a week
2. Special PLCs (Vertical) will meet a minimum of once a month.
3. Administration will regularly attend PLCs and provide feedback as necessary.
4. Agendas will be provided 24 hours in advance for all PLCs.
5. Group Norms are pre-determined and expected to be followed school-wide.
6. Participants in PLCs will regularly change roles in order to maximize experiences.
7. Minutes of PLCs will be uploaded for documentation purposes.

**Person Responsible**

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

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus</b>	ELA Achievement and available learning gains.
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	ELA Achievement, learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile continues to be our area of focus due to our increased population and their specific academic needs in the subject of ELA.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By focusing on ELA Achievement, learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile we will increase our ELA learning gains to 55% from 34% and increase ELA learning gains of the lowest quartile to 65% from 40%.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Administrators (Bryan Long, R. Michele Thompson and Pamela Stark) will work closely with PLCs to ensure instruction is aligned to state standards and is meeting the needs of all students, specifically the lowest quartile. Administration will work closely and meet regularly with the interventions team (Kristin Hand and Brandy Schwinn) to ensure students are making consistent growth and being challenged so that growth in learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile is met.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Bryan Long (longbh@bay.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will implement the new ELA curriculum with fidelity, ensuring that instruction meets the needs of all students with whole and small group as well as prescribed academic interventions on a daily basis in order to close learning gaps. We will utilize John Hattie's research and embed instructional strategies with the largest effect size in order to engage all students in meaningful and relevant instruction.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The new ELA curriculum provides us with a research based, guaranteed and viable curriculum with all of the necessary resources. iReady provides us with the necessary interventions to close academic learning gaps and ensure every student is getting prescribed interventions 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.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Utilize the Districts ELA curriculum and curriculum guide to provide rigorous and rich learning experiences.
2. Provide students with academic interventions, every day 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, iReady diagnostics and intervention logs through weekly PLC and bi-weekly data chats.

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

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus</b>	<p>The Florida State Assessment measures students' ability to demonstrate mastery of state standards in ELA. Students scoring a Level 3 or above are considered to meet grade level mastery of state standards measured on the FSA.</p> <p>Based on the current released data 37.90% of the third grade students tested scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 25.80% percent of third grade students tested scored a Level 2 on 2021 FSA ELA. This represents a total of 63.7% of third grade students that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.</p>
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>Based on the released data 35.71% of tested fourth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 28.57% of tested fourth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 64.28% of fourth graders that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.</p> <p>Based on the released data 28.57% of tested fifth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 30.16% of tested fifth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 58.73% of tested fifth grade students scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>Students in grade 3 will demonstrate an increase of at least 3 percent increase in the percentage of proficient students on the 2022 FSA ELA. This will increase proficiency from 36.30% to 39.30%.</p> <p>Students in grade 4 will demonstrate an increase of at least 3 percent increase in the percentage of proficient students on the 2022 FSA ELA. This will increase proficiency from 35.71% to 38.71%.</p> <p>Students in grade 5 will demonstrate an increase of at least 3 percent increase in the percentage of proficient students on the 2022 FSA ELA. This will increase proficiency from 41.27% to 44.27%.</p>
<b>Monitoring:</b>	<p>Student progress will be monitored through teacher observation, formative and summative assessments, diagnostic assessments and progress monitoring probes. Teachers will meet weekly in PLCs to discuss and monitor student progress and classroom data. Student progress will also be monitored through iReady Diagnostic assessments three times per year and more frequently through Growth Monitoring Assessments.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>[no one identified]</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Bay District Schools has adopted a new state approved ELA Curriculum, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, which is correlated with the new Florida B.E.S.T. standards. This curriculum is designed to provide quality instruction on the new B.E.S.T. standards through a gradual release model starting with whole group lessons then allowing students to interact with the text and practice the skills in small group and individualized activities. In addition the curriculum includes table top lessons designed to differentiate instruction in small groups and enables grade level texts to be accessible to all learners. Additionally the curriculum includes table top lessons for ELL students allowing them to access and interact with grade level texts and skills as well.</p> <p>Along with the implementation of the HMH curriculum, students' progress will also be monitored through iReady. Students will participate in diagnostic assessments in Fall,</p>

Winter and Spring. This diagnostic data will be used to identify students that need additional support and interventions. In addition students will be assigned individualized lessons to address learning deficits. Students will participate in growth monitoring assessments more frequently in order to determine student progress and needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Houghton Mifflin Harcourt 'Into Reading' core adopted instructional materials for K-5 English Language Arts. The series was reviewed and approved by the FLDOE for inclusion on the State Adopted List at time of adoption and purchase. To improve instruction and learning, Bay District Schools teachers incorporate explicit, direct instruction (effect size of .60) and scaffolding (effect size of .82) based on John Hattie's research (Visible Learning: John Hattie 2017)

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers will participate in Houghton Mifflin Harcourt virtual training facilitated by both HMH Facilitators and district ELA Instructional Specialists. This series of training will guide teachers in the implementation of the curriculum. Follow-up training will be conducted both virtually and in person by the district's ELA Instructional Specialists.

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

Teachers will meet in PLCs to analyze formative and summative assessment data along with iReady diagnostic and growth monitoring data. Administrators will take part in these PLC meetings to ensure that the curriculum is being instructed with fidelity and that students are receiving necessary support and interventions.

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

For any student who has not responded to a specific reading intervention delivered with fidelity and with the initial intensity provided (time and group size), reading intervention instruction and/or materials may be changed based on student data. Diagnostic assessments will be required to identify specific needs (areas of strengths and weaknesses.) Further, schools are supported with district MTSS Staff Training Specialists and meet monthly to review student data, progress, and intervention materials. Additionally, schools follow the Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan and MTSS decision tree which indicates research based and evidence-based materials available for targeted interventions (Tier 2). If student data does not show progress at Tier 2 then adjustments will be made (teacher: student ration; time in intervention; intervention materials; instruction).

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

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**



Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**We will focus on reducing the number of discipline referrals by 25% and the number of out-of-school suspensions by 20%.**

**We will utilize the Kindness in the Classroom by Random Acts of Kindness as our Social and Emotional curriculum and purposefully embed morning meeting time into our master schedule for all grade levels. We will also partner with Yale University and SevinDipity and implement the Trauma Sensitive Classrooms project in order to arm our teachers with additional strategies for behavioral and classroom management. We will also partner with our TRIAD team on campus to aid in social/emotional/behavioral strategies for students and teachers alike.**

**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.**

**The administrative and behavioral support teams will meet monthly to support teachers with classroom management, analyze data and organize school-wide incentive events. The administration team will also meet regularly with PLCs in order to problem solve. Data will be monitored regularly by the administration team and shared with faculty/staff to highlight successes and problem solve areas of concern.**

#### **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.**

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 to reduce the number of discipline referrals.

We will also utilize our #MCSBelieves mentoring program in which every faculty and staff member is

assigned a student to mentor throughout the school year as well as outside mentoring through community partners (Elevate Bay) and our TRIAD team.

**Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

Administration team creates instructional and positive culture plan for school, provides professional development opportunities, monitors and shares data regularly and meets with leadership team to problem solve.

Faculty and staff implement Kindness in the Classroom lessons on a daily basis as part of our Social/ Emotional learning. The faculty and staff also actively participate in the Trauma Sensitive Classrooms project and are provided ongoing professional development.

TRIAD team, Social worker and school counselor support the mental well being of students and are provided ongoing professional development.

Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) supports the school and specifically the instructional staff.

Community partners (First United Methodist Church, Cove Baptist Church, Emerald Coast Fellowship, Hiland Park Baptist and City of Panama City) provide their time and resources to ensure all stakeholders are involved through frequent events and meetings.

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>