# Clay Hill Elementary School



# 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Clay Hill Elementary School

6345 COUNTY ROAD 218, Jacksonville, FL 32234

http://che.oneclay.net

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2017-18 Title I School** | **2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-6 | Yes | 92% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 6% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | B | C | C | C* |

## 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.**

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education 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.

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

Clay Hill Elementary School exists to prepare lifelong learners for personal success in a global and technologically advanced society.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

| Name | Title |
|---|---|
| Reed, Adele | Principal |
| Pittman, Meredith | Teacher, K-12 |
| Holton, Lynette | Teacher, K-12 |
| Brown, Jenna | Teacher, K-12 |
| Tichinel, Brandy | Teacher, K-12 |
| Stevens, Candice | Teacher, K-12 |
| Johnson, Sarah | Assistant Principal |
| Barengo, Rachel | Teacher, K-12 |
| LeStrange, Paula | School Counselor |
| Pitchford, Crista | Teacher, K-12 |
| Pike, Paula | Teacher, K-12 |
| Dechman, Janet | Teacher, ESE |
| Neese, Shannon | Teacher, ESE |
| Zangrilli, Allyson | |

**Duties**

**Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.**

The function 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-2 Foundational Skills Assessment or alternative, 5th grade Performance Matters benchmark science assessments (and other locally-created common assessments), and formal assessments such as the FSA or SAT-10. The Principal is a participant of the meeting. The assistant principal will attend the meetings in a support role for the Principal. The reading committee chairperson may provide effective interventions for the Tier 1, 2 or 3 instructional needs, as does the math committee chairperson in

order to
make recommendations for math. The Intervention Team Facilitator is present to help ensure that the district's MTSS plan is followed. Lead teachers sometimes serve on the SBLT as a liaison to other teachers in their grade/content area grouping.

## Early Warning Systems

### Year 2017-18

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Date this data was collected**
Thursday 8/23/2018

### Year 2016-17 - As Reported

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**Year 2016-17 - Updated**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**Assessment & Analysis**
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

The lowest performing data component for 2018 was ELA Lowest 25th%, schoolwide. This does not appear to be a trend as our lowest performing component for 2017 was in the Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25th%, equally.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA Lowest 25th%.

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

The data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average was Math Achievement.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

The data component that showed the most improvement between 2017 and 2018 was Math Learning Gains. 2017 math LG was 50%, and in 2018, math LG improved to 72%.

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.**

The county adopted the new Eureka Math program. Grades 1-5 utilized this program, in addition to targeted, small group instruction in math, all grades.

**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 | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 54% | 63% | 56% | 49% | 58% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 52% | 59% | 55% | 54% | 55% | 52% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 49% | 50% | 48% | 47% | 47% | 46% |
| Math Achievement | 53% | 69% | 62% | 47% | 61% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 72% | 68% | 59% | 50% | 59% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 67% | 56% | 47% | 40% | 49% | 46% |
| Science Achievement | 59% | 66% | 55% | 58% | 56% | 51% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (5) | 0 (5) |
| One or more suspensions | 1 (1) | 0 (1) | 0 (1) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (5) | 0 (9) | 1 (18) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (5) | 1 (5) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 9 (1) | 16 (2) | 18 (5) | 0 (13) | 43 (21) |

**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 | 2018 | 72% | 68% | 4% | 57% | 15% |
| | 2017 | 59% | 70% | -11% | 58% | 1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 48% | 62% | -14% | 56% | -8% |
| | 2017 | 58% | 61% | -3% | 56% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 59% | 59% | 0% | 55% | 4% |
| | 2017 | 31% | 59% | -28% | 53% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 28% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 06 | 2018 | 43% | 63% | -20% | 52% | -9% |
| | 2017 | 41% | 61% | -20% | 52% | -11% |

| ELA | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 12% | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 54% | 70% | -16% | 62% | -8% |
| | 2017 | 52% | 67% | -15% | 62% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 64% | 66% | -2% | 62% | 2% |
| | 2017 | 44% | 65% | -21% | 64% | -20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 20% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 12% | | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 41% | 65% | -24% | 61% | -20% |
| | 2017 | 16% | 58% | -42% | 57% | -41% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 25% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | | |
| 06 | 2018 | 49% | 68% | -19% | 52% | -3% |
| | 2017 | 44% | 66% | -22% | 51% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 33% | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2018 | 55% | 64% | -9% | 55% | 0% |
| | 2017 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data

| 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 | 38 | 45 | 42 | 35 | 60 | 52 | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 53 | 51 | 54 | 72 | 68 | 60 | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 51 | 44 | 47 | 69 | 66 | 56 | | | | |
| **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 | 27 | 44 | 46 | 27 | 33 | 35 | 7 | | | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 40 | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | 49 | 50 | 41 | 39 | 40 | 43 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 44 | 57 | 31 | 33 | 28 | 37 | | | | |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

**Areas of Focus:**

| Activity #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | When teachers differentiate instruction though weekly small group instruction, aligned to student need, then all students will make learning gains in ELA and Math for all students. |
| **Rationale** | Instruction must be aligned to student needs and ability. Particuarly in the area of ELA, CHE declined in the percent of LQ students making gains (54% in 2017 to 49% in 2018). Targeting BQ students, based on individual needs and unique instructional levels, will improve overall achievement in BQ students making gains. |
| **Intended Outcome** | When teachers and administration review student achievement data from various assessment systems, learning gains will be evident. Our goal for ELA BQ students making gains is a minimum of 60%. |
| **Point Person** | Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net) |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | Teachers will utilize the iReady Instructional Profiles, BAS, SIPPS, Achieve 3000 Levelset, and pre-writing assessments to identify and align small group instruction based on specific student need.<br><br>0.5 Technology Teacher out of Title I (120)<br>-Integral with media tech integration<br>-Specific science instruction (fair game standards)<br>-Incentive work<br>-Systematic and explicit instruction<br>-Consistent program<br>-Studies Weekly |
| **Person Responsible** | Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| **Description** | Administration will conduct informal walkthroughs, formal observations of classroom instruction, and review of lesson plans. Formative student achievement data will also evidence increased achievement as a result of targeted, small group instruction. |
| **Person Responsible** | Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net) |

| Activity #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | If all teachers implement curriculum aligned to Florida standards, then student proficiency rates will improve on common, standards based assessments. |
| **Rationale** | Coaches, Interventionists, ESE teachers and General Education teachers specialize in high impact classroom strategies to accelerate learning for students whose performance is subordinate to their peers. Proven, research-based curricular materials are effective if implemented with fidelity. 2018 proficiency in ELA was 54%, with 53% proficient in math, and 59% proficient in science. |
| **Intended Outcome** | Our goal for ELA proficiency is 56%, math proficiency is 55%, and science proficiency is 60%. |
| **Point Person** | Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net) |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | Coaches, Interventionists, ESE teachers and General Education teachers will collaborate to plan and refine instruction and best practices for adopted curriculum for all learners based upon student data.<br><br>Teachers will participate in regular Job Embedded Professional Learning Communities which are self-directed, cooperative, relevant and integrated.<br><br>Teachers will participate in i-Ready, Achieve 3000, Eureka, Lucy Calkins, LLI, SIPPS, Being a Writer, Making Meaning, and DBQ training throughout the school year. Additionally, teachers have the opportunity to participate in off-site Model Classroom observations and other job-specific training.<br><br>-Continue to Pursue Establishing VPK program onsite.<br>-SIPPS in 1st and 2nd (including LLI)<br>-3rd grade targeted SIPPS |
| **Person Responsible** | Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net) |

| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | All teachers participate in monthly data meetings with administration and ensure lesson plans are written intentionally and differentiated based upon student needs. Evidence of increased student proficiency will be reflected in formative assessment data, including i-Ready and Achieve 3000. |
| **Person Responsible** | Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net) |

| Activity #3 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | If teachers implement PBIS with fidelity, then student disciplinary action will be reduced and will result in increased academic time for the student. |
| **Rationale** | Inadequate student knowledge of behavioral expectations results in increased disciplinary action and decreased recognition of positive behavior. If students know and are recognized for appropriate behaviors, then inappropriate behaviors will be reduced. 2017-2018 FOCUS discipline data reveals that 394 referrals were processed during the school year. |
| **Intended Outcome** | By including administration, guidance counselor, all staff, parents and students, students follow behavioral norms and are rewarded for their positive behavior choices which reduces the number of disciplinary actions and increases student instructional time. Our goal is to reduce referral rates by 50% to 197 or fewer. |
| **Point Person** | Sarah Johnson (sarah.johnson@myoneclay.net) |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | Administration explicitly teaches students about PBIS through the use of the Pride Paw Program. Additionally, administration reviews the Code of Conduct and all staff members model behavioral expectations for students. |
| | Guidance Counselor conducts monthly classroom lessons which focus on PBIS. |
| | As a part of the Title 1 Compact, parents are conferenced with about the behavioral expectations and schoolwide norms and both students and parents are required to sign the Compact as agreement with these expectations. |
| **Person Responsible** | Sarah Johnson (sarah.johnson@myoneclay.net) |

| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | Review rates of disciplinary actions and success of Pride Paw Program by monitoring number of students who meet their goal. |
| **Person Responsible** | Sarah Johnson (sarah.johnson@myoneclay.net) |

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

Increase parent involvement through parent conferences, volunteer opportunities, family events, and parent communication (Tuesday folders, email, phone calls, etc.).

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

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

Clay Hill Elementary fosters a positive atmosphere to meet the social and emotional needs of students through the implementation of our curriculum, Making Meaning and Being a Writer which enables students to work together in cooperative groups. They have the opportunity to discuss ideas which helps them to foster a community of respect among peers. Teachers can work with the counselor and school psychologist to develop Tier 2 or Tier 3 behavior plans as necessary. The guidance counselor also works with students to help give guidance or mentor students with social-emotional needs. Character education is also provided through the monthly PRIDE traits focused on school-wide.

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

Incoming:
At the end of each school year and during the summer, Clay Hill Elementary reaches out local a local feeder pre-kindergarten/daycare that feeds into our school for both family engagement and the delivery of instructional opportunities for emergent learners. In addition, CHE offers kindergarten early registration, at which time parents and prospective students can tour the school and become acclimated to the school environment. During pre-planning, Clay Hill Elementary has each incoming kindergartener go through an early literacy screening. Attendance is staggered for the first two days so only half of the kindgartners are in attendance.

Outgoing:
In the spring of the school year, Clay Hill Elementary sends all 6th graders to the junior high for a field trip allowing them to become familiar with campus and learn more about elective opportunities for the upcoming year. All 6th graders are offered a "Step-Up" program over the summer where they can spend a day at the junior high learning more about where things are located, how to work lockers, and study habits.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

All K-6 students take benchmark assessments throughout the school year. Grade level data meetings will be held in late fall and at the start of semester two (subsequent to baseline assessments), as well as monthly team/department meetings to review student data and analyze quality of Tier 1 instruction. These data are also brought to the SBLT team for analysis and recommendations for instructional response. Administrators meet with teachers during professional learning communities and quarterly data meetings to review student data. At these meetings, administrators, ESE teachers, the Intervention Team Facilitator, and classroom teachers look at specific student data and will initiate MTSS plans for those students who are struggling to meet grade level/course expectations. These meetings will focus on student achievement and the provision of appropriate, effective interventions. District and school resources will be allocated based upon individual student needs.

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

In the spring of the school year, Clay Hill Elementary sends all 6th graders to the junior high for a field trip allowing them to become familiar with campus and learn more about elective opportunities for the upcoming year. Many of these electives have college and career connections and these are emphasized when students tour the campus and classrooms in the spring. All 6th graders are offered a "Step-Up"

program over the summer where they can spend a day at the junior high learning more about where things are located, how to work lockers, and study habits.

## Part V: Budget

| Total: | $0.00 |
|---|---|