Clay High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Clay High School

2025 FL-16, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

http://chs.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Halter

Start Date for this Principal: 9/4/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 High School

2025 FL-16, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

http://chs.oneclay.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	34%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Clay High School, in conjunction with the School District of Clay County, is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a quality education and motivate students to develop and excel in academics, technology, and social interaction in a caring and safe environment that fosters responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the vision of Clay High School and the School District of Clay County to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dicks, Cary	Principal	Educational Leader of the school that oversees all areas of Clay High School- Assigned to the Science Dept for PLCs/Evaluations.
Garcia, Linda	Assistant Principal	Oversees math department for PLCs and Evaluations curriculum and professional development master scheduling
Hull, Tonya	Teacher, ESE	ESE department head and Intervention Team Facilitator- helps with coordinating accommodation information and academic planning for ESE students.ITF- helps teachers identify students in need of interventions and plan/monitor intervention plans. Helps analyze school wide and teacher specific assessment data.
Lewis, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Oversees Social Studies department for PLCs and evaluations, primary discipline administrator- works with teachers and others to help work with students to improve behaviors
Horn, Susan	School Counselor	Guidance dept head- works with guidance team and others to support students academic success. Primary person responsible for coordinating social emotional learning activities at school
King, Bonnie	Assistant Principal	Provide instructional leadership to the English/Language Arts and Reading department as well as help manage the day-to-day operations of the school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 9/4/2020, Jennifer Halter

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.*

5

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.*

23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

77

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419	377	414	343	1553
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	5	1	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/4/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	392	448	357	334	1531
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	90	93	83	335
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	12
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	128	120	84	404

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	392	448	357	334	1531
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	90	93	83	335
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	12
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	128	120	84	404

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	58%	60%	56%	52%	54%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	52%	51%	51%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	39%	42%	40%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	50%	55%	51%	59%	60%	49%
Math Learning Gains	42%	46%	48%	52%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	38%	45%	39%	37%	39%
Science Achievement	71%	73%	68%	61%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	81%	73%	78%	78%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
09	2019	59%	61%	-2%	55%	4%
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	55%	57%	-2%	53%	2%
	2018	56%	58%	-2%	53%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	72%	0%	67%	5%
2018	91%	90%	1%	65%	26%
Compare		-19%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	80%	-4%	70%	6%
2018	80%	78%	2%	68%	12%
Compare		-4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	38%	65%	-27%	61%	-23%
2018	40%	66%	-26%	62%	-22%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	64%	-6%	57%	1%
2018	57%	61%	-4%	56%	1%
Compare		1%			

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	27	41	41	21	35	37	43	48		90	34
ELL	25	40		13	15						
BLK	35	39	37	30	34	22	42	60		96	35
HSP	62	54	43	46	30	27	67	63		97	46

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
MUL	42	46		41	32		73	80			
WHT	61	48	41	54	44	41	76	81		94	68
FRL	46	43	41	40	36	29	62	77		88	47

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	20	36	29	22	25	20		46		76	34
ELL		50									
BLK	31	49	50	15	18	14		60		87	32
HSP	47	58	45	46	29	14	92	86		84	57
MUL	59	65		50	31			67		85	55
WHT	56	56	43	56	45	36	94	82		92	55
FRL	41	50	48	42	34	29	92	76		87	38

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	13	26	24	32	43	36	29	44		85	26
ELL				42	36						
BLK	27	43	36	33	30	9	30	60		100	33
HSP	48	37	31	48	45	27	57	61		87	50
MUL	59	63		45	41					90	
WHT	55	53	41	64	55	47	66	83		90	53
FRL	40	47	40	51	46	34	52	65		90	41

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	627
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

Math lowest 25% percentile was the lowest performance, 36% in 2019, 28% in 2018.
Increased 8% over last year.

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

The greatest decline was Science achievement which dropped 21%. 2018 data showed 92% and in 2019 was 71%. The factor that affected the scores decreasing was that we only had Honors students enrolled in Biology in 2018. Standard and Honors students took Biology in 2019.

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.

Math Lowest 25% had the biggest gap compared to the state average. 36% CHS and 45% State. The factor that contributed to this was that more students are coming to high school already taken Alg. 1 and Geometry. A larger percentage of students entering 9th grade are a level 1 or 2 in math.

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

ELA Achievement showed the most improvement. 58% in 2019 and 53% in 2018.
Increase the score by 5%. Use of Achieve 3000 reading program and increase in collaboration between English and Reading teachers.

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

Attendance is a concern but will be difficult to track for the 2020-2021 school year due to COVID-19 related absences.

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

1. ELL Students ELA Achievement and Math Achievement
2. Lower Quartile Literacy Learning gains
3. Proficiency in Algebra
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Support ELL students at Clay High. This subgroup fell below the Federal Index and is at 39%. Our ELL students struggle to meet grade-level achievement and to make gains in ELA and Math. By targeting this group, we will be able to provide more instructional support to this subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	ELL students will demonstrate improvement in ELA and Math by achieving: ELA achievement to 28% meeting grade level (Level 3). ELA learning gains to 45% meeting learning gains. Math achievement to 16% meeting grade level in Math (Level 3). Math learning gains to 20% meeting learning gains in math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cary Dicks (wesley.dicks@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through data tracking and responding to immediate needs, the ELL assistant will provide or will help connect students to academic and social-emotional support to help them meet learning gains goals and become more engaged in the school environment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tracking student data on a bi-weekly basis will help identify problems quickly and with the help of the ELL assistant interventions can be implemented to help. The language barrier the ELL students face in engaging in the learning activities present challenges to them accessing the standards and showing improvement. The ELL assistant is able to provide translation services. These students also experience social-emotional impacts and having the ELL assistant to talk to and connect will help with their attendance and engagement with school. The ELL assistant also helps connect with ELL parents by translating information.

Action Steps to Implement

ELL assistant will track ELL student grades and attendance bi-weekly
2. ELL assistant or counselor will contact parent if student has more than 2 absences a month
3. Progress monitoring for Achieve lexile and performance matters test and review of data monthly
4. ELL assistant will work with the ELA and Math teachers of ELL students to provide support (push in or pull out) to provide additional support as needed
5. ELL assistant will coordinate use of Rosetta stone or other language acquisition program and student progress in the program will be monitored weekly

Person Responsible	Cary Dicks (wesley.dicks@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lower Quartile Learning Gains ELA Our lower quartile students do not make expected learning gains at the same rate as the general population. Targeting this subgroup will allow us to more closely monitor the students' progress and provide remediation and interventions in a more timely manner. Additionally, this is an area for focus because of the impact that poor proficiency in reading and writing has across all disciplines. When students struggle to understand grade-level text, they struggle to access course materials in all subject areas. By targeting the lower quartile, we will be able to help close some of this learning impact on all subject areas caused by the literacy gap.
Measurable Outcome:	Lower quartile students will increase lexile levels by average of 50 points by June 2021 55% of Lower quartile students will make learning gains on FSA-ELA in May 2021
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bonnie King (bonnie.king@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monthly data dives in PLCs, facilitated by the ELA administrator, will allow teacher to identify students and develop interventions for those who need remediation to continue to meet learning gain goals. These students will be identified to receive more intensive and targeted literacy remediation through the use of intensive reading and Achieve 3000 in ELA and one other core class (9th grade science, 10th grade World History).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using monthly data discussion keeps the focus on those students who need the most support and allows for tracking growth and quickly identifying areas of concern as they emerge. Teachers will be more cognizant of the students, their individual learning gain goals, and progress being made on the monthly basis.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will complete baseline testing Achieve 3000 for lexile scores
2. Teachers will identify the score needed for each student to make a learning gain
3. PLC time each month will be dedicated to reviewing progress of each LQ student in each teachers class and planning interventions/remediation as needed to keep progress on goals
4. Administrator and district curriculum ELA coach will conduct weekly walkthroughs and lesson reviews with ELA teachers
5. Teacher led small group will be used in all Intensive reading and ELA 9-10 standard classes for remediation/interventions in literacy skills

Person Responsible   Bonnie King (bonnie.king@myoneclay.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Proficiency in Algebra Our proficiency scores in Algebra are 23% points below the state and 27% behind our district. We experienced another 2% point decline in 2019. More and more of our Algebra students start Algebra behind as evidenced by their 8th grade FSA-Math scores being Level 1 and 2. Targeting improvement activities in the area of Algebra will provide students the mathematical instruction and remediation needed to start to close this gap.
Measurable Outcome:	Algebra proficiency rate (passing rate) increase 5% from 38% to 42% in first time Algebra test takers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Linda Garcia (linda.garcia@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Weekly common planning to align lessons, curriculum, and assignments to best practice, grade level work, and test item specifications with district math coach and math administrator.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By working together, the Algebra teachers have opportunities to combine resources to identify best practices and strategies, analyze student data, regulate assignments and tasks to ensure grade level appropriateness, and support each other in meeting the needs of students. Working with the math specialist provides teachers job embedded professional development and coaching to quickly address student needs. Teachers will work on incorporating rotation models, collaboration, and embedded review with the help of the coach.

Action Steps to Implement

1. establish weekly common planning time (Thursdays)
2. schedule math curriculum specialist for weekly visit (Thursdays periods 4-6
or all day every other week)
3. math administrator and math specialist conduct weekly walkthroughs
together
4. teachers develop common assessments and use PLC time each Weds to
review data

Person Responsible	Linda Garcia (linda.garcia@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Social-emotional learning and wellness of students is another area targeted this year through weekly SEL lessons (every Weds led by guidance during 5th period) using the 7 Mindsets curriculum. Guidance counselors create a 15-20 minute lesson that is broadcast via the student television network, classroom teachers use the lesson plan and any materials provided by guidance to facilitate student discussion based on the lesson presented. Outcomes expected include fewer chronic absenteeism, fewer referrals, and fewer failing grades across all grade levels.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Clay High School begins building positive relationships with families during a Parent Night and Academy/Career Expo in February to introduce parents and students to the school offerings for the following school year. Guidance, teachers, administrators and organizations attend to provide information regarding programs and courses as well as policies and procedures for scheduling, grades and communication to and from school. Clay High School continues building this relationship through Open House and Orientation at the beginning of the year. Clay High School also maintains a website where information is provided for parents and community members regarding the mission, vision and contact information for school personnel. Additionally, the school uses an online grade book and student data system in which parents can sign up for access and are able to monitor student progress. An automated parent phone call system is used to send school-wide information to families and we maintain an active Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram account. Additionally, the school district has an app that helps connect parents to online resources and information about the district and the school. Parent surveys are used to get feedback to help the school improve its services and communication with families. Parents are invited to join the School Advisory Council and encouraged to volunteer at the school. Parents are also invited to join the Academy and Career Education Advisory Boards. Parents are also notified and included in the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support process to help struggling students. Finally, teachers and guidance counselors keep communication open with parents via phone calls, e-mails and conferences. Parents are encouraged to schedule conferences or contact teachers at any time there are concerns.

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