

Clay County Schools

Clay Charter Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 21 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Clay Charter Academy

1417 RED APPLE RD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://claycharter.org/>

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.

To provide a safe and nurturing K-8 community where students develop integrity and accountability to reach their fullest potential. Students will foster a love of learning through rigorous and engaging curriculum within a school culture that promotes diversity and inclusion, celebrates family, allows them to become college and career ready and grow into productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Reaching new heights with every flight. Eagles soar together.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Gifford, Brian | Principal | Clay Charter Academy has a leadership team consisting of the principal, assistant principal, 2 CRTs, and the dean that work collaboratively to make school based decisions based on data. The principal oversees all school operations and completes instructional evaluation and feedback along with PD based on strategic goals and schoolwide needs identified by the leadership team. |
| Caldwell, Heather | Assistant Principal | Clay Charter Academy has a leadership team consisting of the principal, assistant principal, 2 CRTs, and the dean that work collaboratively to make school based decisions based on data. The assistant principal oversees scheduling, state testing, special populations and also completes regular instructional evaluation and feedback along with PD trainings based on strategic goals and schoolwide needs identified by the leadership team. |

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.

School leadership team including Principal, assistant principal, 2 CRTs, Dean along with CSUSA area 5 deputy director and area 5 curriculum specialist met with the Clay county district team due to being identified as a ATSI school. The areas identified included two subgroups based on data from the 21-22 school year. The two identified subgroups below 41 percentile were students with disabilities at 26 and English language learners at 38. Students with disabilities fell below 41 3 years and below 32 1 year. English language learners fell below 41 1 year. These subgroups will be the focus of our SIP this year.

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))

SIP will be monitored quarterly through assessment data review, walkthroughs and weekly grade level PLCs.

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) | Combination School KG-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 67% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 7% |
| Charter School | Yes |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| 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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A |
| 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 | 21 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 17 | 3 | 3 | 103 |
| One or more suspensions | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 35 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 8 | 16 | 14 | 57 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 15 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 22 | 5 | 58 |

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 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 9 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 75 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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 |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Absent 10% or more school days | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | | |
| Course failure in Math | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year | | |
| Students retained two or more times | | |

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 school days | 22 | 22 | 13 | 8 | 21 | 11 | 33 | 9 | 0 | 139 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 21 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 4 | 12 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 42 | |
| Course failure in Math | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 30 | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 13 | 22 | 18 | 19 | 96 | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 15 | 32 | 25 | 15 | 22 | 128 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 13 | 22 | 18 | 19 | 96 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 19 | 9 | 13 | 58 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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* | 56 | 52 | 53 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 56 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 50 | | | 48 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 31 | | | 38 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 51 | 56 | 55 | 49 | 34 | 42 | 55 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 45 | | | 40 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45 | | | 32 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 54 | 61 | 52 | 46 | 55 | 54 | 35 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 75 | 74 | 68 | 75 | 50 | 59 | 79 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 79 | 69 | 70 | 76 | 41 | 51 | 47 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | 70 | 74 | | 56 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 38 | 53 | | 68 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 33 | 39 | 55 | | 64 | 70 | | | |

* 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) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 410 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 52 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 469 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| 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 | 27 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| ELL | 42 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | | | |
| HSP | 60 | | | |
| MUL | 51 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | | | |
| FRL | 53 | | | |

| 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 | 26 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| ELL | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | | | |
| HSP | 53 | | | |

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 | 55 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | | | |
| FRL | | | | |

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 | 56 | | | 51 | | | 54 | 75 | 79 | | | 33 |
| SWD | 22 | | | 26 | | | 20 | 40 | | | 5 | |
| ELL | 50 | | | 44 | | | | | | | 3 | 33 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | | | 40 | | | 33 | 73 | 54 | | 6 | |
| HSP | 55 | | | 54 | | | 62 | 68 | 90 | | 7 | 26 |
| MUL | 65 | | | 52 | | | 36 | | | | 3 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | | | 55 | | | 70 | 75 | 81 | | 6 | |
| FRL | 46 | | | 48 | | | 50 | 67 | | | 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 | 52 | 50 | 31 | 49 | 45 | 45 | 46 | 75 | 76 | | | |
| SWD | 20 | 33 | 20 | 19 | 35 | 32 | 15 | 36 | | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 50 | 36 | 32 | 47 | 45 | 29 | | | | | |
| 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 | 43 | 45 | 21 | 41 | 39 | 38 | 35 | 61 | 60 | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 51 | 43 | 47 | 53 | 40 | 44 | 79 | 71 | | | |
| MUL | 56 | | | 53 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 54 | 33 | 56 | 43 | 57 | 52 | 79 | 83 | | | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | 56 | 48 | 38 | 55 | 40 | 32 | 35 | 79 | 47 | | | |
| SWD | 26 | 24 | 23 | 30 | 26 | 27 | 0 | 46 | | | | |
| ELL | 26 | 45 | | 32 | 36 | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | 45 | 34 | 46 | 39 | 38 | 24 | 65 | 38 | | | |
| HSP | 55 | 46 | 33 | 50 | 34 | 21 | 26 | 67 | 53 | | | |
| MUL | 50 | 43 | | 63 | 36 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | 52 | 57 | 65 | 46 | 36 | 61 | 100 | 40 | | | |
| FRL | 50 | 31 | | 57 | 36 | | | | | | | |

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 | 43% | 55% | -12% | 54% | -11% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 52% | -3% | 47% | 2% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 59% | 51% | 8% | 47% | 12% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 52% | 61% | -9% | 58% | -6% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 53% | 61% | -8% | 47% | 6% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 59% | 59% | 0% | 50% | 9% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 75% | -28% | 54% | -7% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 59% | 50% | 9% | 48% | 11% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 62% | -11% | 59% | -8% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 59% | 67% | -8% | 61% | -2% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 37% | 70% | -33% | 55% | -18% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 37% | 59% | -22% | 55% | -18% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 59% | -13% | 44% | 2% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 63% | -23% | 51% | -11% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 93% | 68% | 25% | 50% | 43% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 69% | 53% | 16% | 48% | 21% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 83% | 73% | 10% | 63% | 20% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 73% | 79% | -6% | 66% | 7% |

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.

From the 21-22 school year data, the students with disabilities subgroup performed the lowest; specifically in Science achievement 15%, Math achievement 19% and ELA achievement 20%. Our ELL subgroup performed the lowest in ELA achievement 29% and Science achievement 29%. One explanation for the poor performance with these subgroups could be the ESE teachers not having consistent, research based resources to more effectively assist students with identified learning gaps. Other possible explanations include high teacher turnover and a leadership change within the school.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year from the SWD subgroup includes; SWD ELA Achievement dropped from 26% to 20%, SWD Math Achievement dropped from 30% to 19%, SWD SS Achievement dropped from 46% to 36%. For the ELL subgroup, all recorded scores increased from the prior school year. One explanation for the poor performance with these subgroups could be the ESE teachers not having consistent, research based resources to more effectively assist students with identified learning gaps. Other possible explanations include high teacher turnover and a leadership change within the school.

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.

20% of SWD Lowest 25% made learning gains in ELA as compared with the state average of 33.8% (13.8% gap). One explanation for the poor performance with these subgroups could be the ESE teachers not having consistent, research based resources to more effectively assist students with identified learning gaps. Other possible explanations include high teacher turnover and a leadership change within the school.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement included SWD ELA learning gains which improved 9 points from 24 to 33 and SWD Math learning gains which also improved 9 points from 26 to 35. The ELL subgroup improved in all areas with the biggest gain being an 11 point increase in math learning gains from 36 to 45. This can be contributed to a strong tier 1 instructional program which allowed students to show growth even though their overall achievement was low.

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

Attendance was a big issue across the board which can greatly affect student outcomes. 103 students missed 10% or more school days last year. Also, 35 students were suspended last year and missing school for discipline purposes affects learning as well.

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

1. Increase ELA academic achievement of our students with disabilities subgroup.
2. Increase ELA achievement for our English language learners subgroup.
3. Implement effective PBIS program to decrease suspensions
4. Implement effective attendance team to monitor and address attendance concerns consistently

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Increasing ELA achievement for students with disabilities. Increasing reading proficiency will positively impact all subject areas for students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with disabilities will increase ELA achievement to 32% from 20% by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Students with disabilities data will be reviewed regularly in weekly PLC meetings along with quarterly leadership data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Caldwell (hcaldwell@claycharter.org)

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.)

ESE teachers will use research based interventions that align with their students' identified learning gaps. Students will be regularly assessed and interventions adjusted based on performance data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research based interventions will be more effective at assisting students with bridging identified gaps. More consistent monitoring will ensure specific needs and adjustments are made in a timely manner.

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.

Research based interventions available will be reviewed and additional materials purchased based on need.

Person Responsible: Heather Caldwell (hcaldwell@claycharter.org)

By When: September 15, 2023

ESE teachers will meet in regular weekly PLCs to review data from interventions and make changes accordingly.

Person Responsible: Heather Caldwell (hcaldwell@claycharter.org)

By When: Each month through April, starting September 5, 2023.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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.

Increase ELA achievement for english language learners. If we can increase overall reading achievement, those skills will also positively impact performance in all subject areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

English language learners will increase ELA achievement to 35% from 29% by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

English language learners achievement data will be reviewed in weekly PLC meetings as well as quarterly leadership data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Caldwell (hcaldwell@claycharter.org)

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.)

ELL coordinator will work with teachers regularly to ensure that resources and supports are working effectively for their students and adjust supports if needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In the past, ELL plans and accommodations were just given to teachers with no assessment of effectiveness. With closer monitoring and adjusting, students will be ensured to get the level of support that they need.

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.

Review subgroup data (NWEA & FAST PM1) as leadership team by September 18, 2023. Make suggestions to guide ELL plans and supports based on data.

Person Responsible: Heather Caldwell (hcaldwell@claycharter.org)

By When: by September 18, 2023

Meet with grade level teams in weekly PLCs with at least once a month reviews of subgroup data to guide any needed changes to ELL supports

Person Responsible: Heather Caldwell (hcaldwell@claycharter.org)

By When: Each month through April, beginning October 2, 2023.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

Decrease student suspensions by implementing an effective PBIS program.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Implement effective PBIS program to consistently recognize and reward behavior expectations and decrease student suspensions from 35 to 20 or less by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Established PBIS committee will meet monthly to discuss trends and review behavioral data. They will problem solve and plan recognition and reward activities to increase positive school culture for students and staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Gifford (bgifford@claycharter.org)

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.)

Unified classroom behavior support was purchased by the school to allow each teacher to actively recognize students exhibiting schoolwide behavior expectations and to document any behavior incidents so that trends can be identified and acted upon. Character Counts was also purchased to provide weekly character lessons to develop character values in all students as well as to recognize students in displaying the 6 pillars of character that align with the schoolwide SOAR expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increasing a positive school culture and recognizing and rewarding students for exhibiting behavior expectations will reduce the amount of off task and disruptive behaviors thereby reducing suspensions and time out of school.

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.

Implement and roll out training to teachers on the new PBIS systems

Person Responsible: Brian Gifford (bgifford@claycharter.org)

By When: by October 15, 2023.

Meet with grade level teams (Admin, Student Support Coordinator and Dean) monthly to review behavior trends and share resources and ideas related to recognizing students and problem solving issues.

Person Responsible: Brian Gifford (bgifford@claycharter.org)

By When: Monthly beginning in September through April 2024.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Clay Charter Academy will use title IV funds to purchase Unified Classroom Behavior Support and the Character Counts program as well as student rewards to support our PBIS school goals this school year.

CCA will also use ESSER 3 funds to purchase any additional tier 2 and tier 3 research based interventions that our students with disabilities or English language learners may need in accordance with our ATSI SIP goals.