

Clay County Schools

W E Cherry Elementary School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

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: 2/14/2002

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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.

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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hogmire, Joshua	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 coleads the meetings and provides a common vision for members in order to make data informed decisions.
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.
Lee, Kristie	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.
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

Thursday 2/14/2002, 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

54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

685

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

4

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

4

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	80	98	84	96	74	85	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	6	14	9	12	11	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	20	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	19	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	17	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	7	15	8	10	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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

Tuesday 9/21/2021

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	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	

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	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	7	15	8	10	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	7	15	8	10	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	7	15	8	10	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				62%	65%	57%	62%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	62%	58%	64%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	54%	53%	55%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				68%	70%	63%	68%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	66%	62%	63%	68%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	56%	51%	51%	56%	47%
Science Achievement				65%	65%	53%	62%	66%	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	64%	68%	-4%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	64%	-9%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	62%	1%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
06	2021					
	2019	54%	64%	-10%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	71%	3%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	69%	-21%	64%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	64%	3%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
06	2021					
	2019	71%	70%	1%	55%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	63%	63%	0%	53%	10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

K-6 iReady Math, K-3 iReady Reading, 4th-6th Achieve Reading, 5th PM Science (*due to loss of Unify, we do not have subgroup data)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	37	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	37	68
	Students With Disabilities	5	11	56
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	33	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	33	53
	Students With Disabilities	5	26	38
	English Language Learners	9	0	100
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	48	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	48	64
	Students With Disabilities	5	21	30
	English Language Learners	67	33	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12	18	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	18	43
	Students With Disabilities	0	5	21
	English Language Learners	33	33	33

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	74	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	74	77
	Students With Disabilities	5	35	50
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	31	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	31	55
	Students With Disabilities	0	12	30
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	39	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	39	37
	Students With Disabilities	17	21	17
	English Language Learners	25	0	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	33	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	33	49
	Students With Disabilities	4	8	22
	English Language Learners	0	0	50

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29	45	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	45	48
	Students With Disabilities	4	11	24
	English Language Learners	0	25	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27	49	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	49	59
	Students With Disabilities	15	30	26
	English Language Learners	25	50	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	12	63	na
	Economically Disadvantaged	*note above		
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29	35	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	35	40
	Students With Disabilities	5	5	10
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28	51	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	51	61
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	10
	English Language Learners	50	0	100

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	40	37	31	46	55	31	43				
ELL	26	42		56	73						
ASN	77			100							
BLK	42	55	50	42	60	39	31				
HSP	48	42	33	52	65	62	42				
MUL	63	60		65	56		75				
WHT	65	53	80	66	69	40	64				
FRL	56	52	35	54	63	40	56				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	48	44	48	59	59	57	62				
ELL	27	53	50	48	67						
ASN	75	64		94	100						
BLK	46	52	50	49	58	54	41				
HSP	45	46	42	60	61		69				
MUL	57	44		75	75						
WHT	75	68	68	77	71	65	77				
FRL	61	60	56	65	69	62	66				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	63	62	46	56	68	47	57				
ELL	35	71		60	64						
ASN	60	50		87	80						
BLK	49	64	67	49	54	32	33				
HSP	55	64	65	73	67	53	57				
MUL	52	42		52	63						
WHT	73	68	50	75	64	65	79				
FRL	57	64	54	65	63	49	58				

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	381
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	89
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
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	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

The average PM learning gain for students with disabilities in ELA was relatively the same as math (ELA=24%, math=21%)

ELL students showed significantly larger PM gains in math (38%) than ELA (19%)

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

The learning gains of the bottom quartile (BQ) among 5th graders (current 6th graders) demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. Their scores went from 61% making learning gains to 16%.

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

The greatest contributing factor was having a majority of our BQ participating in online learning. All students now are brick and mortar.

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

While we showed no improvement school wide, our proficiency percentages in ELA and Math equaled or surpassed the district and state percentages in all grade levels.

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

Self contained ESE classrooms, Title I interventionists, and extended day tutoring were the contributing factors to this improvement. We utilized county specialist support in classrooms for ELA and Science.

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

Implementing and providing PD for our newly adopted ELA curriculum, continuing Title I support, improving parent involvement events, targeting students for tutoring, and including Penda during resource time.

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.

Based on teacher PD feedback, opportunities will include in-person and virtual including (but not limited to) SAVVAS, Lexia, Synergy, small group instruction, data analysis, iReady, Achieve and Penda.

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

Implementation of newly adopted ELA curriculum, providing PD for any area needed, and utilizing county specialist when warranted.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: There was a significant decline in learning gains in our bottom quartile (BQ) in 5th grade (current 6th graders). It went from 61% to 16%.

Measurable Outcome: By identifying and monitoring current 6th grade BQ students via remediation and targeted instruction, learning gains will increase from 16% to 40% on FSA Math.

Monitoring: The school leadership team and Math teachers will meet quarterly to analyze iReady Math, Envisions, and Go Math data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lindsay Henderson (lindsay.henderson@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Student achievement increases when teachers systematically and routinely use data to guide instructional decisions and meet students' learning needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence-based Math instruction indicates that intentional small group instruction based on data provides the highest increase learning gains in Math. Evidence is based on research from Curriculum Associates and Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet with school leaders to analyze data and plan high quality instruction.
2. Teachers will receive professional development opportunities to increase teacher capacity in specific areas identified by data.
3. Teachers will provide small group instruction and iReady toolkit materials.
4. Title I staff will provide support for classroom instruction.
5. Students will utilize Chromebooks in the classroom to complete iReady Math activities.

Person Responsible Joshua Hogmire (joshua.hogmire@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our 5th grade science proficiency dropped 8 points from 65% proficient to 57% proficient. This means 43% of our 5th graders scored a 1 or 2 on FSA Science.
Measurable Outcome:	Our current 5th graders will raise Science proficiency percentages from 57% to 60%.
Monitoring:	Quarterly data chats, PENDA data chats, small group Title I instruction, PENDA work done during Health resource, beginning, middle, and end-of-year progress monitoring Science assessments through Synergy.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lindsay Henderson (lindsay.henderson@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HMH Science curriculum 2. Small group instruction based on PENDA domains 3. PENDA online instruction 4. Departmentalization in 5th grade (1 teacher has 75% of the science students)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Required county adopted curriculum 2. PENDA is FSA aligned and automatically generates small groups based on strengths and weaknesses 3. Required county adopted supplement to HMH 4. BEST practices show that teachers in specialist positions (ie: science) perform better

Action Steps to Implement

Quarterly data chats with science teachers to review data and chart the course of instruction.

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

PENDA to be done during Health resource to free up 30 minutes of instructional time during science.

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

Documentation of BEST standards during the year to ensure all standards are covered.

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

Small group instruction based on data.

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Research indicates that by developing social and emotional qualities in the classroom, students can become more productive, self-aware, and socially-aware citizens outside of the classroom in the years ahead.

Measurable Outcome: WEC will initiate SEL by following the district's character traits calendar/ 7 Mindsets program in every classroom.

Monitoring: Each classroom will have a character trait representative who will be recognized school-wide. Additionally, teacher's will follow the monthly SEL calendar and will submit lesson plans and pictures of their SEL activity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Angie Whiddon (angela.whiddon@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The 7 Mindsets is a research-based program educating the mind and the heart. It promotes decision making, self awareness, self management, social awareness, and relationship skills.

Students who experience a) a firm belief in their potential, b) an optimistic vision for the future, and c) a strong sense of personal authenticity, perform better academically and forge more substantial relationships in life.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Several independent studies have been performed which validate the 7 Mindsets impact. What separates the 7 Mindsets from all other social-emotional learning programs is a measured set of lasting, tangible improvements upon the mindsets of both students and educators. By positively changing the way individuals think about themselves and their future, the 7 Mindsets empower them to live lives of passion, purpose, and meaning.

Action Steps to Implement

Follow the district's character traits calendar and emphasize the trait for the month. Choose a student exemplifying that trait for special recognition.

Person Responsible Joshua Hogmire (joshua.hogmire@myoneclay.net)

Implement the 7 mindset program school-wide, including all the pieces of the program (Mindset, SEL connection, character education, linked lessons). Lesson plans will be checked, walk-throughs will be done during 7 Mindset lessons.

Person Responsible Joshua Hogmire (joshua.hogmire@myoneclay.net)

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 are a non-reporting school, and therefore do not have the data report.

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.

W. E. Cherry promotes a positive school culture and environment by practicing the 7 Mindset character traits, promoting a positive school wide theme of "I am Enough", recognize student achievements and high attendance rates, offering various extra curricular activities such as Dance team, Girls on the Run, Cherry Pickers, kick off each day with thought provoking morning announcements and painted rocks spreading good cheer throughout the campus.

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

In collaboration of the school leadership team, SAC members, and the stakeholders, WEC builds relationships with parents, families and community stakeholders in the following ways: Open house/ orientation allows parents to tour the campus, meet the teachers and find support services provided by the community. Girls on the Run, a community organization, provides students with Social Emotional Learning (SEL) services through fitness and goal setting. The Spring Carnival provides parents with educational opportunities and the community partners the opportunity to interact with parents and share their products and services. Additionally Chick-Fil-A for Champions and Panera for Parents promote the book fair.. Relay for Life allows parents, teachers and the community to connect and fundraise for the American Cancer Society. School Dances and Information Nights 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.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00