Clay Hill Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Clay Hill Elementary School

6345 COUNTY ROAD 218, Jacksonville, FL 32234

http://che.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Adele Reed

Start Date for this Principal: 9/23/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (49%) 2014-15: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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

Clay Hill Elementary School

6345 COUNTY ROAD 218, Jacksonville, FL 32234

http://che.oneclay.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	92%

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

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	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 life-long 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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Reed, Adele	Principal	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.
Pittman, Meredith	Teacher, K-12	
Tichinel, Brandy	Teacher, K-12	
Stevens, Candice	Teacher, K-12	
Johnson, Sarah	Assistant Principal	
LeStrange, Paula	School Counselor	
Pitchford, Crista	Teacher, K-12	
Dechman, Janet	Teacher, ESE	
Neese, Shannon	Teacher, ESE	
Medina, Renee	Teacher, K-12	
Zangrilli, Allyson	Teacher, K-12	
Carroll, Victoria	Teacher, K-12	
Groover, Suzanne	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	75	52	57	44	46	55	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	5	1	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	7	9	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	1	1	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	11	5	6	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
23

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 9/23/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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 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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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 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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	60%	65%	57%	48%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	62%	58%	51%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	54%	53%	54%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	70%	63%	40%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	66%	62%	39%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	56%	51%	39%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	70%	65%	53%	44%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	75 (0)	52 (0)	57 (0)	44 (0)	46 (0)	55 (0)	80 (0)	409 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	11 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	7 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (9)	7 (16)	9 (18)	21 (0)	41 (43)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	68%	-8%	58%	2%
	2018	72%	68%	4%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	64%	-1%	58%	5%
	2018	48%	62%	-14%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	54%	62%	-8%	56%	-2%
	2018	59%	59%	0%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2019	64%	64%	0%	54%	10%
	2018	43%	63%	-20%	52%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	71%	-17%	62%	-8%
	2018	54%	70%	-16%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	69%	-7%	64%	-2%
	2018	64%	66%	-2%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	64%	64%	0%	60%	4%
	2018	41%	65%	-24%	61%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	58%	70%	-12%	55%	3%
	2018	49%	68%	-19%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	63%	1%	53%	11%
	2018	55%	64%	-9%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

					2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS						
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	41	46	42	42	53	38	60				
WHT	62	63	50	63	66	39	69				
FRL	59	63	55	55	63	39	64				

					2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS						
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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				
HSP	40										
WHT	49	49	50	41	39	40	43				
FRL	43	44	57	31	33	28	37				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	59
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

The lowest performing data component for 2019 was "Math Lowest 25th Percentile". This does not appear to be a trend as our lowest performing component for 2018 was "ELA Lowest 25th Percentile". Although "Math Lowest 25th Percentile" was our lowest performing data component this year, "ELA Lowest 25th Percentile" also remains stagnant, not showing any schoolwide gains from the previous year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was "Math Lowest 25th Percentile", dropping 26 percentage points.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was "Math Lowest 25th Percentile", showing a difference of 10 percentage points.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was "Science Achievement", showing a gain of 11 percentage points.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

CHE has a significant number of students with current year retentions, although the majority of these are in the primary grades. In addition, absences are of notable concern.

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

1. FSA Achievement
2. Attendance
3. Discipline

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	If all teachers implement on-level curriculum and instruction aligned to Florida State Standards, then student proficiency rates will improve in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science.
Rationale	Instructional interventionists, ESE teachers, and general education teachers are all intentionally and thoughtfully trained and specialize in high-impact classroom strategies that focus on accelerating learning for students whose performance is subordinate to that of their peers. Academically tested and proven, research-based curricular materials are effective if implemented with fidelity. Our 2019 proficiency rate in ELA was 60%, followed by 62% in Math and 70% in Science.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase CHE's overall proficiency rates in ELA to 61%, in Math to 63%, and in Science to 71%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	All ELA, math, and science classrooms will utilize research-based programs and strategies to support student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If research-based programs and strategies are implemented with fidelity, then student proficiency rates should improve.

Action Step	
Description	Instructional interventionists, ESE teachers, and general education teachers will collaborate to plan and refine instructional strategies and best practices implemented for adopted curriculum, focusing on all learners based upon student data. All instructional staff will participate in regular job embedded professional learning communities which are self-directed, cooperative, relevant, and integrated. All instructional staff will participate in curriculum specific trainings (to include i-Ready, Achieve 3000, Eureka Math, Lucy Calkins, LLI, SIPPS, Being a Writer, Making Meaning, DBQ, LAFS, MAFS, etc.) throughout the school year. In addition, teachers will have the opportunity to participate in off-site model classroom observations and other job-specific training. Title I purchases to support this initiative will include: additional computers and Chromebooks, through which we will expand teacher and student access to digital learning tools/resources; Studies Weekly materials to better integrate ELA strategies in the Social Studies content area; professional development materials (Social/Emotional Learning and PBIS strategies); LAFS books for Kindergarten and First Grade; Leveled Readers and Take-Home Books; Top Score Writing materials for second grade; interventionists in both ELA and Math, and additional classroom assistants to reduce the teacher-to-student ratio

and increase opportunities for teacher feedback and small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)

#2	
Title	If all teachers provide strong, differentiated small group instruction aligned to student need, then all students will make learning gains in ELA and Mathematics.
Rationale	Small group instruction must be aligned to individual student need and ability. Planning for small group instruction should be intentionally targeted on areas of academic deficiency. Strategically differentiating small group instruction in this manner will comprehensively improve scholastic achievement in all students, more specifically that of bottom quartile students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase CHE's overall proficiency rates to 61% in ELA, and to 63% in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will provide differentiated instruction for all students via small-group instruction using research-based instructional programs and strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Reducing the teacher-to-student ratio and targeting students at their individual proficiency levels (via small group instruction) will enable teachers to better move student achievement toward proficiency.

Action Step	
Description	Instructional staff will utilize iReady Instructional Profiles, BAS, SIPPS, Achieve 3000 Levelset, pre-writing assessments, as well as other baseline assessment data to identify individual student need. This data will then be used to formulate and align small group instruction in an intentional, needs-based approach.
	Title I purchases to support this initiative will include: additional computers and Chromebooks, through which we will expand teacher and student access to digital learning tools/resources and enable students to work independently while others receive teacher-led instruction; interventionists in both ELA and Math, and additional classroom assistants to reduce the teacher-to-student ratio and increase opportunities for teacher feedback and small group instruction.
Person Responsible	Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)

#3	
Title	If all teachers implement the adopted 7 Mindsets curriculum and PBIS strategies with fidelity, then student disciplinary action will decrease and student instructional time will increase.
Rationale	Inadequate student awareness and knowledge of behavioral expectations results in increased disciplinary actions of scholars, contributing to a lack of self-determination and self-motivation. An increase in disciplinary action, in-turn, leads to a substantial decrease in total instructional time for affected students. If students know, practice, and are recognized for appropriate behaviors, then inappropriate behaviors will be reduced overall. This reduction will lead to more student/teacher contact time, increasing student confidence and engagement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to reduce our overall referral rate by 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sarah Johnson (sarah.johnson@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	CHE teachers will use the 7 Mindsets resources and instructional strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The implementation of research-based programs, with fidelity, should result in an increase in positive behaviors among students, a reduction in disciplinary action, and more time on task for students.

Action Step	
Description	Administration and staff will explicitly teach students about PBIS through the use of the Pride Paw Program. In addition, administration will review the Code of Conduct with every student while all staff members expressly model behavioral expectations for all students across campus. CHE's Guidance Counselor will conduct monthly classroom lessons centered on the 7 Mindsets and PBIS. As a part of the Title I Compact, parents are communicated with about the behavioral expectations and schoolwide norms. Both parents and students are required to sign the Title I Compact as an understanding and agreement of these expectations. Title I purchases to support this initiative will include professional development materials (Social/Emotional Learning and PBIS strategies - "The 7 Mindsets," and "Transforming the Difficult Child") and purchased resources from 7 Mindsets to promote classroom instruction and environmental supports.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.).

The School Advisory Council will meet quarterly. At the Quarter 1 meeting, the council will gain parent input into the development and finalization of the SIP, PFEP, and overall Title I program at CHE. Parents will receive overviews of school academic achievement, Panorama, and discipline data with which they will make informed decisions about how best to utilize Title I resources to support these elements.

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.

Early Warning System Data is reviewed monthly, during Student Success Team meetings. The EWS data is used to identify which students need to be considered for inclusion on the next SST meeting day, and what other interventions may be in order.

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 kindergartners 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.