Clay County Schools

Clay Hill Elementary School

2020-21 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: 9/2/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	7%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
Stevens, Candice	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Teacher, Grade level chair person, Curriculum Council Rep.
Johnson, Sarah	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal, inventory, school behavior plan, teacher observations/ evaluations.
LeStrange, Paula	School Counselor	Guidance counselor, MTTS service, monitor meetings, 7 Mindsets Rep, FSA testing coordination.
Pitchford, Crista	Teacher, K-12	Media specialist, Title I Lead, Title I events organizer, compliance organizer, i-Ready Champion.
Neese, Shannon	Teacher, ESE	5th and 6th Grade ESE Team Leader, SAC Chair
Carroll, Victoria	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade, Grade level chair person, Curriculum Council Rep.
Groover, Suzanne	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade, Grade level chair person, Curriculum Council Rep.
Holton, Lynette	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten, Grade level chair person, Curriculum Council Rep.
Ristad, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade, Grade level chair person, Curriculum Council Rep.
Gomes, Hollie	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade, Grade level chair person, Curriculum Council Rep.
Fehrs, Amy	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade, Grade level chair person, Curriculum Council Rep.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/2/2020, Adele Reed

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.*

1

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	53	68	47	61	45	51	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	373
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	5	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	9	4	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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 10/9/2020

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	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

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	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

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%	0

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%	0

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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	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	59
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	57
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.

The data components that showed the lowest performance were ELA Lowest 25th Percentile (49%) and Math Lowest 25th Percentile (41%). These proficiencies reflect no change in ELA Lowest 25th Percentile over the prior year, and a decline of 26 percentage points in math.

This trend in math performance may be attributed to the loss of CHE's math interventionist during the second semester of the year, who specifically targeted lower quartile students. CHE also had new, departmentalized math teachers in both 4th and 5th grade during the 18-19 school year.

Stagnant performance in lower quartile ELA may be attributed to a lack of a consistent, schoolwide

writing program, as well as a continuing emphasis on foundational skills in the intermediate, FSA grades, with many students. A lack of decoding, fluency, and especially vocabulary skills continued to challenge our lower quartile students in both remediation and state assessments.

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

Math Lowest 25th Percentile proficiency rate showed the greatest decline from the prior year. This may be attributed to the aforementioned factors, as well as inconsistent student participation in extended day/Saturday tutoring opportunities. Some misalignment between Eureka math curriculum and small-group curriculum, driven by iReady Diagnostic data, may have also impacted student outcomes on state assessments.

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.

CHE's Math Lowest 25th Percentile proficiency rate was 10 percentage points lower than the state average, but our science proficiency was 17 percentage points higher than the state. Math proficiency rates are attributed to the aforementioned factors, while science performance is attributed to intensive focus on fair game standards in grades 3 and 4, as well as common planning and professional development among/between science vertical teams.

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

Science proficiency improved from 59% to 70%, This performance is attributed to intensive focus on fair game standards in grades 3 and 4, as well as common planning and professional development among/between science vertical teams.

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

Two potential areas of concern are how disciplinary issues may interfere with academic time and how target students (lower quartile) may not be engaging in extended-day academic opportunities.

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

1. Increase proficiency of lower quartile math students.
2. Increase proficiency of lower quartile reading students.
3. Reduce disciplinary action as a barrier to academic instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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. 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.
Measurable Outcome:	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. LAFS, SIPPS, LLI, Eureka, HMH Science, small group instruction, interventions implemented when needed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If research-based programs and strategies are implemented with fidelity, then student proficiency rates should improve.

Action Steps to Implement

All teachers will collaborate to plan instructional strategies and best practices implemented for adopted curriculum, focusing on all learners based upon student data. Teachers will participate in regular job embedded PLC's which are self-directed and integrated. Teachers will participate in curriculum specific trainings (to include i-Ready, Achieve 3000, Eureka Math, LLI, SIPPS, Top Score Writing, DBQ, Ready LAFS, Ready MAFS, etc.) throughout the year. Teachers will have the opportunity to participate in model classroom observations and job-specific training.

Title I purchases will include: additional devices to expand teacher and student access to digital learning resources; Studies Weekly materials to integrate ELA strategies in Social Studies; professional development materials (Social/Emotional Learning and PBIS strategies); LAFS books for Kindergarten and First Grade; Leveled Readers; Top Score Writing materials; interventionists in ELA and Math, and additional classroom assistants and teachers 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If all teachers provide strong, differentiated small group instruction aligned to student need, then all students will make learning gains in ELA and Mathematics. 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.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase CHE's overall learning gains rates to 63% in ELA, and to 68% in Math. Lower quartile reading gains increase to 50%, and lower quartile math gains will increase to 45%.
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 Steps to Implement

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 and teachers to reduce the teacher-to-student ratio and increase opportunities for teacher feedback and small group instruction. Various on-level and supplemental resources will support our differentiated instruction, including the Rewards program from Voyager-Sopris. This program will assist in students' ability to attack multisyllabic words and improve comprehension skills.

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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. Inadequate student awareness and knowledge of behavioral expectations result 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.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to reduce our overall referral rate by 50%. From August 2019 to March 13 of 2020, CHE students were issued 170 referrals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Johnson (sarah.johnson@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	CHE teachers will use the 7 Mindsets resources, PBIS Rewards, and instructional strategies for engagement to reduce disciplinary action and improve classroom climate and culture.
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 Steps to Implement

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.

Purchases to support this initiative will include the PBIS Rewards system of Tier 1 supports. Teachers will be trained in effective practices for promoting and reinforcing positive behaviors. They will deepen their understanding of PBIS and improve their skill in recognizing and reinforcing target behaviors while redirecting less-desired ones.

Person Responsible	Sarah Johnson (sarah.johnson@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

All stakeholders have trained in the 7 Mindsets curriculum annually. Parents are introduced to our PBIS systems, including our PRIDE Program through our Title I Annual Meeting in the fall, Monthly PVO meetings, Orientation, Open House (September/October), and monthly and quarterly student recognition programs. Positive school culture is facilitated through our ongoing staff Gratitude program, as well as our PBIS Rewards/PRIDE program through which students are immediately recognized for making positive choices that contribute to the well-being of themselves, their class, and their school community. PRIDE is an ongoing system, reinforced daily with monthly and quarterly recognition.

Annual stakeholder surveys are also used to glean feedback from stakeholders, and to uncover areas of opportunity for improvement.

PBIS data chats will be expanded in the 20-21 school year to include all instructional personnel, once per month, so that EWS students as well as candidates for SST will be more readily identified and receive the needed interventions in a more timely manner.

Multiple Parent and Family Engagement events are scheduled throughout the year to promote parent involvement in student progress and enhance systems of communication among stakeholders.

Stakeholders include community members, student parents/guardians, teachers, staff members, local business partners. Discussions/revisions will be revisited and completed quarterly, during SAC meetings. PFEP input is provided through SAC meetings as well. During SAC meetings, the budget items are included, any revisions to events or other funding is addressed, feedback is provided.
The school offers spring and summer outreach to local daycares (Kids World and Leaps and Bounds) to promote readiness skills and early registration. The school also completes a Kindergarten registration at the beginning of the school year, provides VPK (and extended day), and staggered Kindergarten attendance for first day of school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00