Clay High School

2021-22 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: 7/1/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	33%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Halter, Jen	Principal	Educational leader of the school who oversees all areas of Clay High School. Assigned to oversee science and all new teachers.
King, Bonnie	Assistant Principal	Provide instructional leadership to the English/Language Arts, Intensive Reading, and World Language departments as well as manage the day-to-day operations of the school.
Coburn, Laurie	Assistant Principal	Provide instructional leadership to the math and Social Studies departments as well as manages cllimate and culture throughout the school.
Lewis, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Oversees career and technical education programs, manages the day-to-day operations of the school, works with students to improve classroom behavior.
Hull, Tonya	Teacher, ESE	ESE department head and Intervention Team Facilitator. Helps with coordinating accommodation information and academic planning for ESE students. Helps teachers identify students in need of interventions and plan/monitor intervention plans. Helps analyze school wide and teacher specific assessment data.
Horn, Susan	School Counselor	Guidance department head. Works with guidance team and others to support students academic success. Primary person responsible for coordinating social emotional learning activities during the school day.
Dillon, Theresa	SAC Member	Represents SAC. Math teacher responsible for providing instructional support to students in math.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, 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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
85

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,694

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
14

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
19

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	426	440	370	412	1648
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	23	22	30	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	60	62	9	232
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	6	36	4	163
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	15	16	2	58

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	37	40	5	148

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

Tuesday 8/31/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	101	60	62	9	232
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	6	36	4	163

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	3	2	3	0	8

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				58%	60%	56%	53%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	52%	51%	56%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	39%	42%	46%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				50%	55%	51%	50%	55%	51%
Math Learning Gains				42%	46%	48%	40%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	38%	45%	28%	36%	45%
Science Achievement				71%	73%	68%	94%	92%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				77%	81%	73%	80%	79%	71%

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2021					
	2019	59%	61%	-2%	55%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

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
2021					
2019	72%	72%	0%	67%	5%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	76%	80%	-4%	70%	6%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	38%	65%	-27%	61%	-23%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	64%	-6%	57%	1%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was compiled for reading using English/Language Arts Florida Standards Assessment data.
Data was compiled for math using Algebra 1, Geometry, and Algebra 2 Florida Standards Assessment data.
Data was compiled for Biology using end-of-course Biology exam data.
Data was compiled for U.S. History using end-of-course U.S. History exam data.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			48
	Economically Disadvantaged			39
	Students With Disabilities			17
	English Language Learners			0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			39
	Economically Disadvantaged			27
	Students With Disabilities			19
	English Language Learners			12
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			91
	Economically Disadvantaged			58
	Students With Disabilities			35
	English Language Learners			10
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			57
	Economically Disadvantaged			39
	Students With Disabilities			17
	English Language Learners			0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			63
	Economically Disadvantaged			38
	Students With Disabilities			19
	English Language Learners			44
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			59
	Economically Disadvantaged			58
	Students With Disabilities			35
	English Language Learners			10
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			82
	Economically Disadvantaged			100
	Students With Disabilities			100
	English Language Learners			100

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			33
	Economically Disadvantaged			40
	Students With Disabilities			21
	English Language Learners			0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			75
	Economically Disadvantaged			66
	Students With Disabilities			52
	English Language Learners			0

Grade 12					
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students				
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities				
	English Language Learners				
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students				
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities				
	English Language Learners				
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students				
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities				
	English Language Learners				
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students				
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities				
	English Language Learners				

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	20	40	41	19	27	33	31	56		89	27
ELL		20	23	19	29					61	27
BLK	33	45	40	18	28	35	53	54		91	31
HSP	40	44	39	31	18	18	51	75		89	38
MUL	64	63		45	35			73			

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
WHT	58	49	32	40	26	33	76	78		94	52
FRL	40	45	36	29	22	30	60	65		88	38
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
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	571
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Learning gains earned on state assessment tests are dropping in ELA and Algebra 1. ELL students are underperforming in both learning achievement and learning gains.

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

Achievement level and learning gains in Algebra 1. In 2021, Algebra 1 students had 36% math achievement, 26% learning gains, and 31% of the lowest 25% had learning gains.

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

During the pandemic, learning loss in math was significant. Action taken to address this includes focused small group remediation in Algebra 1 classes as well as a focus on item specifications and standards.

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

10th grade ELA and US History. In 2021, 10th grade ELA achievement was 53%, learning gains were 48% and learning gains of the lowest 25% was 34%. US History overall achievement increased from 2019.

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

Focused PLCs on best practices in ELA and US History instruction as well as time spent on learning test item specifications and standards/benchmarks.

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

Incorporating instructional technology and small group instruction. For our ELL population, we will utilize Universal Design for Learning strategies on a consistent basis.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

New learning via professional learning communities and targeted whole group professional development twice a month. New learning will be focused on using classroom data to drive instruction. Using classroom data, teachers will design small group instruction to help our struggling learners, including our ELL learners.

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

Ongoing professional development on how to implement school-wide PLCs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Proficiency in Algebra. CHS proficiency score in Algebra 1 is 26%. Incoming 9th-grade students begin the year below grade level expectations as evidenced by their 8th-grade math scores. Targeted improvement activities will focus on providing instruction and remediation within the classroom to close the achievement gap of these students.
Measurable Outcome:	Algebra proficiency rate will increase 5% from 26% to 31% in first-time test takers in Algebra 1.
Monitoring:	District benchmark assessments, as well as common assessments given in the classroom, will be used to monitor students' progress toward the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jen Halter (jennifer.halter@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Weekly common planning and PLCs to align lessons, curriculum, and assessments to best practice, grade-level work, and test item specifications.
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 assessments and tasks to ensure grade-level rigor, and support each other in meeting the needs of students.

Action Steps to Implement

Establish weekly meetings
Examine student work as part of the PLC process
Analyze common classroom assessments and district assessments to monitor progress and design future instruction and remediation opportunities.

Person Responsible	Jen Halter (jennifer.halter@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Learning gains in ELA have been stagnant over the past few years. Targeting students who did not receive a learning gain on the most recent state assessment will allow us to more closely monitor the students' progress and provide remediation and interventions in a timely manner. Additionally, when students struggle to understand grade-level text, it impacts them across all content areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will increase their Lexile level by an average of 50 points by the end of the school year.
Monitoring:	Achieve3000 will be used to monitor students' Lexile growth. We will check our students' Lexile growth at the end of every month.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bonnie King (bonnie.king@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The ELA and Intensive Reading departments will hold monthly data meetings to determine our students' progress toward Lexile gain. As a result of the data meeting, the teams of teachers will identify which students are not making progress and design instructional interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be more cognizant of the students' learning growth, their individual learning aging goals, and progress being made on a monthly basis.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development will be provided on how to analyze student Lexile growth.
Monthly data meetings will be held to analyze student data.
PLCs will be dedicated to identifying high-leverage strategies that will help promote student literacy growth.

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on student surveys, students indicated a need for Clay High to promote ways in which students could become more involved in the school as well as being acknowledged for doing good things.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on administrative walkthrough data and student survey data, students will increase their involvement in school-related activities by 5% and school staff will increase instances where they publicly acknowledge students' positive behavior by 10%
Monitoring:	Students will participate in the Blue Devil Cup Competition where we will monitor students' attendance, participate in activities, and other factors. This will be updated daily and the results will be shown to students every Friday.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laurie Coburn (laurie.coburn@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Clay High school will launch a school-wide competition between the 4 different classes that promote participating in school activities, attendance, GPA. This competition will encourage students to participate in school functions as well as provides public praise for students connecting with the school. We will also pass out Blue Devil tickets to students when they are caught doing something good. The tickets will be placed in a box for weekly and monthly drawings. We are also highlighting a student Blue Devil day maker every day on social media.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By promoting and publically praising students, we feel that this will encourage students to increase their participation in school events. It also increases attendance as they can't gain points if they don't come to school.

Action Steps to Implement

Regular meetings of the PBIS team.
Montior and input data for the Blue Devil Cup Competition
Prepare rewards for the Blue Devil ticket drawing

Person Responsible	Laurie Coburn (laurie.coburn@myoneclay.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although ELL students only make up 2% of the school's population, it was identified as an underachieving subgroup based on state assessment data.
Measurable Outcome:	On the Spring 2022 state assessment test, our ELL population will increase their overall achievement in math and ELA by 5%.
Monitoring:	Achievement will be monitored by quarterly district-wide assessments in reading and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bonnie King (bonnie.king@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will employ small group instruction based on student needs. Teachers will also employ Universal Design for Learning strategies consistently during instructional times.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through small group instruction and Universal Design for Learning strategies, teachers will be able to pinpoint the specific needs of ELL students in their classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

Review progress monitoring data and common formative assessment to identify the specific needs of the ELL population.

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

Design small group instruction lesson plans aimed at specific areas of need for the ELL population.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Drug/public order incidences were in the "high" category at Clay High School. We will increase the number of adults monitoring the hallways and bathrooms where these types of incidences typically occur.

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.

Clay High School builds a positive school culture and the environment by first holding Parent Nights to introduce parents and students to the school. Guidance, teachers, administrators attend and provide information regarding programs and courses as well as policies and procedures for scheduling, grades, and ways to communicate with the school. Clay High School continues to build relationships throughout the school year by promoting a sense of connectedness to the school. We accomplish this two ways. The first is by introducing the Blue Devil Cup Competition where the four different grades compete against each other in a variety of categories including participating in school events, attendance, GPA, and referrals. We also give "The Clay Way" tickets to students who are caught doing something above and beyond. The tickets go into a pot for weekly and monthly drawings.
We further promote a positive school culture and environment by publically acknowledging our students on social media through our daily #claydaymaker and showing our students on the weekly newsletter that goes out to faculty and parents. We have also added additional student organizations to the campus this year including a Student Advisory Council who will give us feedback on our new initiatives.

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

Jen Halter- Principal
Laurie Coburn - Assistant Principal
James Herrholtz - Dean of Students
Bonnie King - Assistant Principal
Matt Lewis - Vice Principal
PBIS Team - Ken Remsen (chair)

Part V: Budget

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

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

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00