

Clay County Schools

Clay Hill Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Clay Hill Elementary School

6345 COUNTY ROAD 218, Jacksonville, FL 32234

<http://che.oneclay.net>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Clay County School Board on 10/5/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position 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 in 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
Libretto, Lara	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will serve in a support role for the Principal.
Loper, Stephanie	Other	Provides input and guidance to promote student achievement by collaborating with teachers and parents regarding student intervention and progress monitoring data.
Medina, Renee	Teacher, K-12	As a grade level team leader, focus will be on improving student achievement by: modeling and supporting effective instructional practices; data analysis practices; parent communication; overseeing best practices among team members through the use of profession learning communities (PLCs).
Dupont, DeeAnn	Teacher, K-12	As a grade level team leader, focus will be on improving student achievement by: modeling and supporting effective instructional practices; data analysis practices; parent communication; overseeing best practices among team members through the use of profession learning communities (PLCs).
Pittman, Meredith		As a grade level team leader, focus will be on improving student achievement by: modeling and supporting effective instructional practices; data analysis practices; parent communication; overseeing best practices among team members through the use of profession learning communities (PLCs).
Ristad, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	As a grade level team leader, focus will be on improving student achievement by: modeling and supporting effective instructional practices; data analysis practices; parent communication; overseeing best practices among team members through the use of profession learning communities (PLCs).

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fehrs, Amy	Teacher, K-12	As a grade level team leader, focus will be on improving student achievement by: modeling and supporting effective instructional practices; data analysis practices; parent communication; overseeing best practices among team members through the use of profession learning communities (PLCs).
Dechman, Janet	Teacher, ESE	As a grade level team leader, focus will be on improving student achievement by: modeling and supporting effective instructional practices; data analysis practices; parent communication; overseeing best practices among team members through the use of profession learning communities (PLCs).
Stevens, Candice	Other	Offers support with data analysis and collegial learning, communication, and oversight. Provides reading instruction to challenged readers identified by Florida Standards Assessment Test (FAST) ELA scores.
Lowans, Allyson	Other	Improve student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice with technology and data systems (Synergy, iReady, Lexia, etc.), promote collegial learning and communication (FB, Instagram, etc.) with and among stakeholders. Improve student achievement in reading by ensuring that school practices, including professional development, instruction, curriculum, and assessment, align with state statute.
Caren, Lori	Teacher, K-12	
Byers, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders were involved in gathering input for the development of the 2023-2024 School Improvement Plan using the data and analysis from classroom walkthroughs, student performance on state-wide testing, student performance on district-wide progress monitoring, climate and culture surveys, attendance records, Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) reports for student discipline.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored, with shared results to stakeholders, quarterly. Information will be transmitted in the Principal's parent newsletter, SAC Committee, and shared with lead teachers to disseminate information among grade level teams. The Curriculum Council and School Leadership Team will meet quarterly as well to review achievement, analyze data, and revise the SIP is needed to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	9%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	5	5	2	7	3	14	0	0	36	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	1	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	15	6	12	0	0	34	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	17	9	11	0	0	38	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	13	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	17	16	13	19	9	13	9	0	0	96	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	3	7	7	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	8	13	4	0	0	29	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	3	8	8	0	0	23	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	17	16	13	19	9	13	9	0	0	96	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	3	7	7	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	8	13	4	0	0	29	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	3	8	8	0	0	23	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	57	59	53	61	63	56	51		
ELA Learning Gains				60			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				69			35		
Math Achievement*	52	64	59	61	51	50	56		
Math Learning Gains				63			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			50		
Science Achievement*	65	65	54	41	69	59	67		
Social Studies Achievement*					70	64			
Middle School Acceleration					61	52			
Graduation Rate					64	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		55	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	232
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	30	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	52			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	50			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	59			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	57			52			65					
SWD	26			23			28				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55			52			67				4	
FRL	51			48			61				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	61	60	69	61	63	58	41					
SWD	35	46	59	39	50	50	15					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK												
HSP	45			55								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61	58	70	62	62	55	39					
FRL	61	68	70	56	62	62	35					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	51	43	35	56	40	50	67					
SWD	37	35	38	46	33		53					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	52	43	33	56	38	47	67					
FRL	43	33	23	48	39	43	58					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	55%	-10%	54%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	61%	9%	58%	12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	57%	61%	-4%	47%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	59%	-2%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	72%	75%	-3%	54%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	37%	62%	-25%	59%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	67%	-8%	61%	-2%
05	2023 - Spring	59%	59%	0%	55%	4%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Overall math achievement showed the lowest performance based on 2023 Spring FAST data scoring 54% proficient rate. Contributing factors for this decline may include high teacher turnover rate to staff population throughout the course of the school year. The ripple effect of this was lack of qualified, certified Florida educators providing instruction.

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

Overall math achievement was also the area of greatest decline from the 2022 school year based on the Spring 2023 Spring FAST proficiency decreased from 61% down to 54% Contributing factors for this decline may include high teacher turnover rate to staff population throughout the course of the school year. The ripple effect of this was lack of qualified, certified Florida educators providing instruction. Long term substitute teachers who were placed in the abandoned posts also were not afforded the professional development opportunities that went along with the district wide adopted math curriculum aligned with the Florida Best Standards.

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.

Overall math achievement was also the area of greatest decline from the 2022 school year based on the Spring 2023 Spring FAST proficiency decreased from 61% down to 54% Contributing factors for this decline may include high teacher turnover rate to staff population throughout the course of the school year. The ripple effect of this was lack of qualified, certified Florida educators providing instruction. Long term substitute teachers who were placed in the abandoned posts also were not afforded the

professional development opportunities that went along with the district wide adopted math curriculum aligned with the Florida Best Standards.

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

Overall Science achievement had the most improvement when compared to the state average. Clay Hill Elementary proficiency rate was 64% compared to the state average of 51%. Contributing factors to the closing of this gap includes the use of high yield instructional strategies that focus on teaching the Florida BEST Standards. Clay Hill Elementary has also improved its systems of targeting student needs through the analysis of data, as well as more consistent progress monitoring to ensure that learning is accelerated. Teachers will utilized Learning Targets, Checks for Understanding, and Instruction Aligned to Assessment Results to improve teaching and learning. Rigorous/On-Level Content, explicit engagement strategies (i.e., Think-Pair-Share, CFU's, collaboration, etc.), and academic ownership (i.e., student data analysis, goal setting, & tracking, parent engagement in data monitoring and action steps) were employed to accelerate learning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Reflecting on the EWS data, two areas of concerns involve SWD. In the areas of mathematics and ELA, our SWD subgroup for fifth grade ELA was only 11%, and our SWD subgroup for third grade math was 37%.

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

Clay Hill Elementary School's top three highest priorities for the upcoming school year are: to increase proficiency in mathematical thinking and reasoning, to increase proficiency in reading comprehension, to focus on positive culture and environment.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on students Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Math 2022-2023 scores, proficiency in mathematical thinking and reasoning is a crucial area of focus. Clay Hill Elementary scores were 54%, lower than the state's 56% proficiency rate.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By using evidence based strategies we will increase our overall proficiency in mathematical thinking and reasoning from 54% to 60% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

All teachers will use data to identify student areas of need in math and develop and deliver daily differentiated small group as evidenced in lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, and student work analysis, and data chats/professional learning communities (PLCs). Substitutes will be provided for teachers during these meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The following evidence-based interventions will be implemented for this area of focus: small group math instruction; frequent student practice, visual representations with programs such as i-Ready Math, teaching modeling using interactive monitors, frequent progress monitoring assessments using Eureka Squared content to check for mastery levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers implement an on-level curriculum (Eureka Squared) and instruction aligned to Florida State Standards in conjunction with high impact learning strategies, learning acceleration may begin and learning gains will be made by all students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will be trained on new math curriculum. Small group instruction will be utilized in the classroom.

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

By When: End of 2023-2024 School Year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on students Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) ELA 2022-2023 scores, proficiency in reading comprehension is a crucial area of focus. While Clay Hill Elementary scored above the state's 50% proficiency rate at 56%, we still decreased in proficiency from the 2021-2022 school year down from 61% proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Through the practice of evidence based, direct explicit instruction, Clay Hill Elementary will increase our overall proficiency on the FAST ELA 2023-2024 from 56% to 61% by the end of the school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

All teachers will use data to identify student areas of need in the five components of reading and develop and deliver daily differentiated small group as evidenced in lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, and student work analysis, and data chats/professional learning communities (PLCs). Substitutes will be provided for teachers during these meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

All teachers will utilize the gradual release process to model, guide, and provide application opportunity in grade appropriate comprehension strategies as evidenced in lesson plans, classroom walk throughs and student work analysis, and professional learning communities (PLCs).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All teachers will implement an on-level curriculum and instruction aligned to Florida State Standards in conjunction with high impact learning strategies, learning acceleration and learning gains will be made by all students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Evidence-based strategies that will be employed to achieve our goals for improvement include:

Explicit vocabulary instruction,

Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction (Before, During, After) such as activating prior knowledge,

Generating questions,

Monitoring comprehension,
Identifying main idea,
Paraphrasing and summarizing,
Small-Group Instruction based on data to target specific needs of student groups

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

By When: End of 2023-2024 school year

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Clay Hill Elementary is focusing on fostering positive peer relationships.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

This area of focus was based on data from Clay Hill Elementary's school wide 2023 Annual School Climate and Culture Survey. By the 2024 Annual School Climate and Culture Survey, we will increase the percentage of students who report positive peer relations from 41.80% to 60%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Use the PBIS rewards program to enable us to monitor the distribution of PBIS points, and the specific life skills at which students are most and least proficient, better allowing us to target our PD focus with staff and students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The PBIS Team will develop and cross train on Mindsets lessons for implementation school wide. All staff will deepen knowledge of effective PBIS strategies to increase rates of acknowledgement and reinforcement of positive behaviors among students as evidenced by PBIS Rewards data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers implement the adopted 7 Mindsets curriculum and PBIS strategies with fidelity, an increase in positive behaviors among students should be seen, ensuring that all students feel respected and safe.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Train newly hired staff and faculty in the 7 Mindsets.
2. Provide PBIS school year kick off including new goal sets, student rewards, etc...

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

By When: End of the first quarter.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA proficiency for Students with Disabilities is 30%, which is down from 42%.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Through the practice of evidence based, direct explicit instruction, Clay Hill Elementary will increase our overall Federal Percent Index in 2023-2024 from 30% to 41% by the end of the school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

All teachers will use data to identify student areas of need in the five components of reading and develop and deliver daily differentiated small group as evidenced in lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, and student work analysis, and data chats/professional learning communities (PLCs). Substitutes will be provided for teachers during these meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

All teachers will utilize the gradual release process to model, guide, and provide application opportunity in grade appropriate comprehension strategies as evidenced in lesson plans, classroom walk throughs and student work analysis, and professional learning communities (PLCs) working in conjunction with ESE teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When providing evidence-based instruction with intentional planning between the general education teacher and inclusion special education provider, students with disabilities will show an increase in overall proficiency as a result of strategic instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Evidence-based strategies that will be employed to achieve our goals for improvement include:

Explicit vocabulary instruction,

Specialized designed instruction,

Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction (Before, During, After) such as activating prior knowledge,

Generating questions,

Monitoring comprehension,

Identifying main idea,
Paraphrasing and summarizing,
Small-Group Instruction based on data to target specific needs of student groups.
Recurrent scheduled planning between general education teacher and inclusion teacher that is data driven.

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

By When: End of the school year.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on PM3 STAR data from 2023, the percent of students in grades K-3 who were scoring below "At or Above Proficiency" (below 41st percentile) was:

Kindergarten: 25% (75% At/above proficient)

1st Grade: 26% (54% At/above proficient)

2nd Grade: 46% (54% At/above proficient)

Our practice to target improvement in ELA will be explicit, whole-group instruction at Tier 1 grounded in the science of reading, utilizing a structured ELA block with components for phonological skills development, phonics instruction, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

Furthermore, small group instruction, designed to remediate skills in all areas needed, and as appropriate, for target students, including oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. We will progress monitor student growth in these areas to ensure that students are making the targeted gains.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

The percent of students in each grade, 3-5, scoring below L3 in ELA on the spring 2023 FAST assessment was:

3rd: 43% (57% scored L3 or higher)

4th: 30% (70% scored L3 or higher)

5th: 55% (45% scored L3 or higher)

Our target group is our rising 5th grade (6th grade for 23-24), who had only 45% of students scoring proficient. Upon analysis of the group's performance in each reporting category, the area most in need of support is Reading Prose and Poetry, although only minimal difference in performance among L1/L2 students in Reading Informational Text and Reading Across Genres/Vocabulary was noted.

Lexia PowerUp baseline data has been utilized as a baseline resource for further identifying these students' greatest area of need, and Word Study (Word Analysis) (51% of students placing in intermediate or advanced levels) and Grammar (48% placing in intermediate or advanced) performance is significantly lower than comprehension (83% placing in intermediate or advanced levels).

Our primary instructional practice specifically relating to ELA is direct instruction in spelling, reading, interpreting, and applying morphemes. Research indicates that morphological skills are linked to literacy outcomes, including word reading, spelling and reading comprehension. Instruction on morphemes enables students to read and comprehend multisyllabic words and more complex vocabulary/text.

In addition, our instructional practice to target improvement in ELA will be small group instruction, designed to remediate skills in all areas needed, and as appropriate, for target students, including oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

We will progress monitor to ensure that students are making adequate gains.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Prior-year (spring 2023) STAR Early Literacy/STAR Reading data provided norm-referenced performance scores, including students considered At/Above Proficient by scoring at or above the 41st percentile and with a scale score of 749:

Kindergarten: 75% At/above proficient

1st Grade: 54% At/above proficient

2nd Grade: 54% At/above proficient

Baseline data for 2023-20234 on the STAR Early Literacy/STAR Reading assessment reveals the following cohort data:

Kindergarten: (Assessments not yet completed, as of 9/9) (No prior-year cohort comparison)

1st Grade: 54% At/above proficient

2nd Grade: 32% At/above proficient

2023 fall baseline placement in Lexia Core5/PowerUp reveals:

27% of CHE Kdg students placed in grade level material,

29% of CHE first-grade students placed in grade level material, and
17% of CHE second grade students placed in grade level material.

Our measurable outcome for kindergarten will be to meet or exceed 60% proficiency by FAST PM3.
Our measurable outcome for first grade will be to meet or exceed 64% proficiency by FAST PM3.
Our measurable outcome for second grade will be to meet or exceed 60% proficiency by FAST PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Prior-year (spring 2023) FAST PM3 data provided achievement level data and related proficiency percentages. FDOE reports reveal:

57% of CHE 3rd graders scored L3 or higher,
70% of CHE 4th graders scored L3 or higher,
45% of CHE 5th graders scored L3 or higher, and
57% of CHE 6th graders scored L3 or higher

2023 fall baseline PM3 data reveals:
(3rd grade assessments not yet taken, as of 9/9/23)
33% of CHE 4th graders scored L3 or higher,
49% of CHE 5th graders scored L3 or higher, and
48% of CHE 6th graders scored L3 or higher.

2023 fall baseline placement in Lexia Core5/PowerUp reveals:
21% of CHE 3rd grade students placed in grade level material,
24% of CHE 4th grade students placed in grade level material,
28% of CHE 5th grade students placed in grade level material, and
6th grade intermediate or advanced placement in PowerUp was
51% for Word Study
48% for Grammar, and
83% for Comprehension

Our measurable outcome for CHE 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th graders will be to meet or exceed 60% proficiency by FAST PM3.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Clay Hill Elementary School's area of focus, ELA, will be monitored ongoing throughout the school year using progress monitoring tools. Results will be based on FAST scores. Teachers will utilize Learning Targets, Checks for Understanding, and Instruction Aligned to Assessment Results to improve teaching and learning, Rigorous/On-Level Content, explicit engagement strategies (i.e., Think-Pair-Share, CFU's, collaboration, etc.), and academic ownership (i.e., student data analysis, goal setting, & tracking, parent engagement in data monitoring and action steps) to employ and to accelerate learning to teach the Florida Best Standards while monitoring the instructional trajectory of our area of focus.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Reed, Adele, aereed@oneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Weekly PLCs to create common formative assessments, analyze student data, and refine instructional practices are consistent and collaborative. Small group differentiated instruction based on individual student indicated needs closes gaps to leverage proficiency.

Small group instruction will be incorporated in all ELA classrooms through the provision of classroom assistants and/or ESE coteachers.

Explicit comprehension strategies will be incorporated into all ELA classrooms.

Evidence-based programs that address identified gaps, aligned with the science of reading/6 components of reading will be introduced via whole- and small-group instruction during the ELA block at all grades.

Direct instruction, via Corrective Reading and Spelling through Morphographs will be introduced to students exhibiting a substantial reading deficiency at the small-group level, and to whole-group, per demonstrated need as evidence by end of year data (grade 6).

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

PLCs improve instructional practices and leverage student achievement. Data reviews increase the effectiveness of small group and differentiation practices to individualize student learning based upon need. Small group instruction provides focused, intensive interventions for students at risk for reading deficiencies to close learning gaps and elevate proficiency levels.

EvidenceforESSA.org provides the following rating for evidence-based programs used to support the science of reading/6 components of reading:

Sound Partners - strong

Lexia Core5/PowerUp - strong

Raz-Plus - strong

Corrective Reading - strong

PALS - strong

The December 2007 study of Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades, published by the IES (Institute of Education Science) concluded:

- Small group instruction: STRONG level of evidence of effectiveness
- Direct instruction: STRONG level of evidence of effectiveness

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Professional Learning- Teachers are utilizing supports through monthly, administrative-led professional learning focusing on ELA strategies.	Reed, Adele, aereed@oneclay.net
The Literacy Leadership team meets monthly to review progress monitoring data and collaborate on best practices, evidenced by classroom walkthrough and student achievement data.	Reed, Adele, aereed@oneclay.net
The onsite Literacy Coach provides support through modeling, mentoring, data analysis and small group instruction.	Reed, Adele, aereed@oneclay.net
Coaching will occur via weekly administrator walkthroughs and subsequent feedback. In addition, formal observation data will provide teacher feedback on opportunities to improve practice.	Reed, Adele, adele.reed@myoneclay.net
Progress monitoring data will be reviewed no less than monthly and shared with literacy leadership and/or teachers to ensure that instructional adjustments are made, as appropriate.	Reed, Adele, adele.reed@myoneclay.net
Benchmark assessment data will be collected, followed by Data Meetings with each team to include the development of instructional action plans for long-range small group instruction.	Reed, Adele, adele.reed@myoneclay.net
Teachers will meet with PLCS, weekly, to enhance teaching and meet goals set for essential standards, with emphasis on ELA.	Reed, Adele, adele.reed@myoneclay.net
Admin and literacy leaders will participate in ongoing administrative professional learning (LETRS, Lexia Core5/PowerUp) to enhance the quality of feedback and implementation.	Reed, Adele, adele.reed@myoneclay.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be disseminated through multiple means, both face-to-face, and digital, including: quarterly School Advisory Council meetings, monthly Coffee & Conversation with the Principals meetings, weekly staff newsletters, and monthly Leadership Team and PBIS Team meetings. The SIP is also made publicly available in our lobby and at the school's website at <https://che.myoneclay.net>.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Positive relationships with parents, families, and community members are built through the execution of on-campus events, including Fall Festival, Spring Fling, parent/teacher conferences, and multiple Title I Parent and Family Engagement Events that focus expressly on engaging parents in school improvement targets in reading, math, and PBIS. The school's webpage is located at <https://che.myoneclay.net/>, where the Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Clay Hill Elementary will strengthen academics and increase the amount and quality of learning time while providing an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Title I Funds will be utilized to supplement core instruction through the provision of classroom assistants, supplementary instructional materials, and instructional materials. In the area of ELA and Mathematics this will be done by: shared weekly instructional planning time between exceptional education teachers general education teachers; data driven small group instructional practices; curriculum aligned with the Florida Best Standards; professional development opportunities for teachers using high yield writing program.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The resources and strategies incorporated in the CHE SIP were development in coordination with The Florida Inclusion Network.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

CHE provides school-based mental health services through the provision of our onsite Licensed Mental Health counselor. We also provide mentoring from our resource teachers who work with students referred by their teachers for extra life skills support.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

PBIS and discipline data is used to monitor students who may be in need of Tier 2 behavior support. These students are provided with individualized behavior plans, interventions, and explicit data monitoring, to address problem behavior and intervene.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Weekly professional development, including whole-group, Professional Learning Communities, and vertical teams, as well as book clubs focusing on effective strategies for teaching and learning, along with the provision of an onsite Instructional Coach all promote the development of teacher quality and retention.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Clay Hill Elementary school supports the transition of preschoolers to elementary programs via Childfind services, our onsite Pre-K ESE 3-5 program, and Voluntary Prekindergarten Program, as well as our partnership with our local prekindergarten provider, Kids World, with whom we collaborate to promote the effective transition of preschool students to Kindergarten.