# Cottondale Elementary School



## 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Cottondale Elementary School

## 2766 LEVY ST, Cottondale, FL 32431

### http://ces.jcsb.org

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2017-18 Title I School** | **2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5 | Yes | 98% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| K-12 General Education | No | 37% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| Grade | B | A | C | B* |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 9/18/2018.

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

At CES, Every Minute Matters! Every Child Counts!

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision of Cottondale Elementary School is to provide an educational program, in a safe environment, that contributes to the development of each student emotionally, physically, socially and cognitively. While using research-based curriculum and best practices, we strive to create a positive atmosphere that is conducive to learning, harmonious living and develops a sense of personal responsibility and accountability. Opportunities will be provided to develop decision-making skills so that each child will be prepared for their role in our continually changing diverse society.

### School Leadership Team

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

| Name | Title |
|---|---|
| Larkin, Jessica | Principal |
| Bailey, Judy | School Counselor |
| Ohler, Greg | Other |
| Russ, Alanna | Teacher, K-12 |
| Shouppe, Jessica | Instructional Media |

**Duties**

**Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.**

Specific SST Roles/functions (one person may sure more than one role):
• Instruction Leader – (Administrator) - Ensures fidelity of the process, sets regularly scheduled times for the SST to convene, makes decisions on how T2 and T3 services will be delivered
• Team Leader – Directs team activities, receives referrals for the SST, informs staff/parents, sets meeting times, ensures the proper documentation is maintained, and sets dates/times for follow-up meetings
• Data Mentor – Assists in collecting, organizing, visually displaying, analyzing and interpreting data
• Staff Liaison – Key communicator with staff, establishes procedures to gain staff input and collaboration with other school initiatives
• Content Specialist – Assists in making key decisions about instructional needs of struggling students, identifies evidenced-based interventions most likely to be effective in addressing the area of concern, and
provides training/consultation as needed
• Record Keeper – Documents/completes required paperwork in the meetings, serves as timekeeper, informs team when time is running short.
• Behavior Specialist – Assists in identifying function of problem behaviors and developing Behavior Intervention Plans, collaborates and provides training as needed
• Teacher – of the student whose needs are being addressed

• Parent/Guardian – of the student whose needs are being addressed
• Speech/Language Pathologist –as needed–assists in developing interventions for speech/language concerns-provides training as needed to interventionists

The SST collaborates with other school-based teams such as SAC, literacy leadership teams, grade group teams, the positive behavior support team, and other professional learning teams to analyze strengths and weaknesses in academic/behavioral domains, and to initiate instructional modifications needed to increase student achievement for all students, and to meet SIP goals.

## Early Warning Systems

### Year 2017-18

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 8 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 9 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |

**Date this data was collected**
Thursday 8/30/2018

### Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

**Year 2016-17 - Updated**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**Assessment & Analysis**
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

Learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile in ELA and Math. This is a trend.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

Learning gains in math of the lowest 25th percentile.

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

Learning gains in math of the lowest 25th percentile.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

ELA achievement. This is a trend.

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.**

Early intervention through the EWS and RtI processes to target reading deficits and offer remediation/ support. Implementation of the i-Ready program.

## School Data

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

| School Grade Component | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 69% | 67% | 56% | 52% | 58% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | 59% | 55% | 47% | 54% | 52% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 50% | 48% | 51% | 48% | 46% |
| Math Achievement | 71% | 70% | 62% | 56% | 63% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 56% | 58% | 59% | 42% | 52% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 30% | 40% | 47% | 36% | 41% | 46% |
| Science Achievement | 53% | 56% | 55% | 38% | 49% | 51% |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 (6) | 9 (8) | 6 (2) | 9 (5) | 7 (5) | 9 (10) | 46 (36) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (3) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 4 (3) | 4 (0) | 1 (2) | 1 (4) | 0 (1) | 10 (10) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 6 (3) | 8 (6) | 15 (9) |

## Grade Level Data

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 72% | 66% | 6% | 57% | 15% |
| | 2017 | 74% | 67% | 7% | 58% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 74% | 66% | 8% | 56% | 18% |
| | 2017 | 67% | 59% | 8% | 56% | 11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 58% | 54% | 4% | 55% | 3% |
| | 2017 | 59% | 61% | -2% | 53% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |

### MATH

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 03 | 2018 | 67% | 72% | -5% | 62% | 5% |
| | 2017 | 72% | 75% | -3% | 62% | 10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 80% | 72% | 8% | 62% | 18% |
| | 2017 | 78% | 73% | 5% | 64% | 14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 66% | 62% | 4% | 61% | 5% |
| | 2017 | 62% | 58% | 4% | 57% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |

### SCIENCE

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 05 | 2018 | 51% | 54% | -3% | 55% | -4% |
| | 2017 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data

#### 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWD | 54 | 42 | 27 | 50 | 32 | | 38 | | | | |
| BLK | 68 | 63 | | 68 | 46 | | 21 | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | | | 92 | 50 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 69 | 40 | | 63 | 40 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 59 | 41 | 71 | 61 | 33 | 64 | | | | |
| FRL | 66 | 49 | 46 | 66 | 54 | 35 | 41 | | | | |

#### 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWD | 38 | 46 | 25 | 47 | 65 | 43 | 29 | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | 53 | | 65 | 59 | 50 | | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 50 | | 75 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 58 | 58 | | 68 | 75 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 74 | 72 | 44 | 75 | 72 | 50 | 72 | | | | |
| FRL | 62 | 62 | 52 | 70 | 66 | 56 | 61 | | | | |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement
Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

**Areas of Focus:**

| Activity #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Math Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile |
| **Rationale** | Math learning gains of the lowest quartile at CES were 17 percentage points lower than the state average and 25 percentage points lower than the prior year at CES. |
| **Intended Outcome** | Increase learning gains of the lowest quartile of students in math to at or above the state average. |
| **Point Person** | Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org) |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Pull out remediation during wheel time for the lowest quartile of students to remediate math skill deficits. 2. Use of i-Ready math supplemental online curriculum and diagnostic assessments. 3. Access to Elementary Math Resource Teacher for professional development, data analysis, and classroom modeling. 4. Use of Coach supplemental math books. |
| **Person Responsible** | Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| **Description** | Progress monitoring with the i-Ready program and weekly/bi-weekly skill assessments |
| **Person Responsible** | Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org) |

| Activity #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Science Achievement |
| **Rationale** | Science achievement at CES was 2 percentage points lower than the state average and 15 percentage points lower than the prior year at CES. |
| **Intended Outcome** | Increase science achievement at CES to at or above the state average. |
| **Point Person** | Alanna Russ (alanna.russ@jcsb.org) |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Reteach 4th grade standards to 5th graders during wheel time.<br>2.Use the IXL science program to track science standards mastery. Implement more science labs into lesson planning.<br>3. Access to Technology Resource Teacher to integrate technology into the classroom instructional model. |
| **Person Responsible** | Jessica Shouppe (jessica.shouppe@jcsb.org) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| **Description** | Track standards mastery with IXL and unit assessments. |
| **Person Responsible** | Alanna Russ (alanna.russ@jcsb.org) |

| Activity #3 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Student Attendance |
| **Rationale** | CES had 13% of it's students with attendance below 90% and more students who missed at least one period per day. |
| **Intended Outcome** | Improve student attendance to 10% or less with a 90% attendance rate |
| **Point Person** | Alanna Russ (alanna.russ@jcsb.org) |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | Attendance incentives at the school-wide and grade level. |
| **Person Responsible** | Alanna Russ (alanna.russ@jcsb.org) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| **Description** | Ongoing monitoring and enforcement of student attendance |
| **Person Responsible** | Alanna Russ (alanna.russ@jcsb.org) |

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

**Additional Title I Requirements**
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

Improve school to parent communication as measured by the Title I Parent Survey administered Spring 2018.

**PFEP Link**

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

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

School personnel are trained in detecting signs that students may be emotionally distressed. Referrals for assisting a student with emotional needs are made to the guidance counselor, the on-site counseling services provider and to the district-contracted counselling services provider. The ALPHA program is an external counseling provider which is housed on the campus of CES. Referrals are made to these counselors who follow up with permission from parents/guardians of students to provide targeted individual, group and collateral counseling services. Signs of social isolation, misconduct and/or bullying are also taught to personnel who are trained to look for such evidence. There is a reporting process in place for substantiated or unsubstantiated bullying and/or harassment.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

Following are the transition procedures from Head Start to Kindergarten in Jackson County:
• Children and Family Comprehensive Services Specialist, Head Start staff, Kindergarten staff and parents will meet and plan transition activities.
• Children and Family Comprehensive Services Specialist will complete Transition Plan B (JC-403) and Transitioning from Early Head Start/Transitioning from Pre-Kindergarten to Kindergarten (JC-468).
• Head Start students and parents will visit Kindergarten classroom.
• Head Start students will participate in learning activities with the Kindergarten class.
• Kindergarten staff will conduct a parent orientation with Head Start parents and provide Kindergarten materials and information.
• Head Start staff will conduct end-of-year comprehensive conference with parents and discuss student's progress and readiness for Kindergarten.
• Head Start staff will complete Transition Data Form (Jc-373) on each student.
• Educational and health information will be transferred to Kindergarten site.
In addition, the school holds and open house prior to school beginning for any incoming Kindergarten students who may not have had formal transitioning opportunities.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

A school-based Student Support Team (SST) has been identified for the purpose of implementing a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for all students. Universal screening data at the grade level, classroom level and subgroup level is analyzed to evaluate the effectiveness and needs of core instruction. The SST meets regularly on students identified as needing supplemental instruction beyond core (T2), and those needing more intensive/ individualized (T3) instruction. The SST reviews multiple data sources and engages in a 4 step data-based problem solving method to design and evaluate intervention plans that are targeted to student needs. Resources and service delivery are allocated according to the level of student need.

Federal Funds include Title 1 funds which provide staffing for our school. These funds pay the salary of supplemental teachers at our school. Our school utilizes i-Ready for progress monitoring and this is federally funded also. State funds include textbook dollars from the state that provides instructional materials for our teachers and other resources such as library books and media. State funds include S.A.I. (Supplemental Academic Instruction) funds which allow our school to purchase enrichment resources such as Elements of Vocabulary and COACH workbooks to prepare our students for the rigor of EOC testing. Technology money from the state also helps fund our Accelerated Reader program. Local funds include PTO and the 1/2 cent sales tax which helps with technology resources.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

CES hosts a career fair for fifth grade students each year and partners with local business to share about opportunities and offer field trip experiences.

| Part V: Budget | |
|---|---|
| **Total:** | **$45,757.34** |