
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	22

Cottondale Elementary School

2766 LEVY ST, Cottondale, FL 32431

<http://ces.jcsb.org>

Demographics

Principal: Thomas Register

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: C (46%) 2014-15: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/15/2019.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	22

Cottondale Elementary School

2766 LEVY ST, Cottondale, FL 32431

<http://ces.jcsb.org>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	98%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	B	A	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/15/2019.

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Larkin, Jessica	Principal	Data Meetings and Data Chats
Bailey, Judy	School Counselor	MTSS/RTI
Ohler, Greg	Other	Discipline and Truancy
Stephens, Jessica	Instructional Media	SAC/SIP Chair and Data
McWaters, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Curriculum

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	67	75	77	49	60	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	381
Attendance below 90 percent	9	14	11	8	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	1	3	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	8	11	14	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	11	6	10	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	8	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	6	3	5	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

26

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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 with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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 with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	61%	63%	57%	67%	65%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	58%	58%	66%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	49%	53%	50%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	65%	66%	63%	73%	71%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	58%	62%	72%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	45%	51%	55%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	54%	53%	68%	61%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	67 (0)	75 (0)	77 (0)	49 (0)	60 (0)	53 (0)	381 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 (6)	14 (9)	11 (6)	8 (9)	9 (7)	13 (9)	64 (46)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	9 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	6 (0)	8 (4)	11 (4)	14 (1)	8 (1)	4 (0)	51 (10)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	9 (6)	15 (8)	25 (15)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	64%	58%	6%	58%	6%
	2018	72%	66%	6%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	62%	-5%	58%	-1%
	2018	74%	66%	8%	56%	18%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2019	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
	2018	58%	54%	4%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	70%	3%	62%	11%
	2018	67%	72%	-5%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	71%	5%	64%	12%
	2018	80%	72%	8%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	48%	58%	-10%	60%	-12%
	2018	66%	62%	4%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	52%	0%	53%	-1%
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	41	35		50	42	10	46				
BLK	46	44		68	56		27				
HSP	67			60							
MUL	48	53		52	60		67				
WHT	66	55	35	68	53	38	59				
FRL	60	55	43	59	50	24	51				

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				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	356
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile in ELA and Math. Possible contributing factors are a loss of instructional time and displacement of teachers and students due to Hurricane Michael. A reverse inclusion model was utilized with our lowest 25th percentile, which may have resulted in a lack of rigor. Attendance issues may also have contributed to this area. This is a trend.

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

Learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile in ELA. The previous stated contributing factors are also applicable to this data component.

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.

Learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile in Math. Again the impact of Hurricane Michael, attendance, and reverse inclusion models may have been a contributing factor. Yes, this is a trend for our school.

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

Science showed a 2% improvement from the prior school year. Our 4th grade science teacher increased the rigor of instruction to our students to prepare them for 5th grade science standards. The school's media specialist covered the tested 4th grade science standards with the 5th grade students during library class. All 5th grade students used the IXL Program to supplement classroom science instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance below 90%
Level one on state assessments

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

1. Learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile in ELA
2. Learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile in Math
3. Learning gains for students with disabilities

- 4. Student Attendance
- 5. Grade level proficiency in ELA and Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile
Rationale	ELA learning gains of the lowest quartile were 17 percentage points below the state average and 13 percentage points below the district average.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase learning gains of the lowest quartile of students in ELA to at or above the district average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated and remedial instruction will be given to these students in the basic classroom. Additional remediation to close learning gaps will also be provided for these students. Students in the lowest quartile who are also students with disabilities will be given additional support and accommodations as determined by the IEP Team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Rigorous standards based instruction with additional remediation time to increase ELA achievement.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pull out remediation (Tier 2) during wheel time for the lowest quartile of students to remediate ELA skill deficits. 2. Use of I-Ready Reading supplemental online curriculum and diagnostic assessments (Tier 1). 3. Tier 3 instruction will be given in small groups and individually by the classroom teacher. Tier 3 instruction will also given by the resource teacher for students with disabilities. 4. Access to Elementary Reading Resource Teacher for professional development, data analysis, and classroom modeling. 5. Students with disabilities will be given additional instruction and support in the resource room. Unique skill instruction will be provided as outlined in the students' IEP's. Accommodations specific to each of the learners' need will include extended time, alternate seating, and allowable questions and answers being read to the learner.
Person Responsible	Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Math Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile
Rationale	Math learning gains of the lowest quartile were 19 percentage points below the state average and 13 percentage points below the district average.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase learning gains of the lowest quartile of students in math to at or above the district average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Rigorous standards based instruction with additional remediation time to increase math achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Rigorous math instruction with the New Jersey and Go Math Programs, remedial math time based upon the individual learners' needs as determined by I-Ready Diagnostic Assessments and prior FSA Math Scores. Students in the lowest quartile who are also students with disabilities will be given additional support and accommodations as determined by the IEP Team.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tier 2 instruction as 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 (Tier 1). 3. Students with disabilities will be given additional math instruction and support in the resource room. Unique skill instruction will be provided as outlined in the students' IEP's. Accommodations specific to each of the learners' need will include extended time, alternate seating, and allowable questions and answers being read to the learner. 4. Tier 3 math instruction will be given in small groups and individually by the classroom teacher. Tier 3 instruction will also given by the resource teacher for students with disabilities. 4. Use of Coach supplemental math books.
Person Responsible	Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Our federal index for students with disabilities is 38%. A specific focus is needed on math learning gains of the lowest 25%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase our federal index for students with disabilities to 41% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated and remedial instruction will be given to these students in the basic classroom, additional remediation to close learning gaps will also be provided for these students as indicated in their IEP's.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Individualized standards based instruction with additional instructional and remedial time to meet the learners' need therefor increasing student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inclusion of students with disabilities into the mainstream classroom. 2. Additional Tier 3 instructional time with the ESE teacher to address individual learners' needs. 3. Use of I-Ready, IXL, Lexia, and other supplemental online instructional tools (Tier 1). 4. Unique skills class (Tier 3) during wheel time to offer additional learning support
Person Responsible	Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Student Attendance
Rationale	CES had 46 students with attendance below 90% and more students who missed at least one period per day.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student attendance will be at 90% or higher or for all students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Greg Ohler (greg.ohler@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Attendance incentives school-wide and at grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Providing attendance incentives for students will encourage them to be present to learn. School attendance data will be continuously monitored to determine the effectiveness of the incentives.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attendance will be taken and monitored daily by teachers. 2. Assistant Principal Greg Ohler will also monitor attendance daily and enforce county truancy policies. 3. Each 9 weeks, students with perfect attendance will be rewarded popcorn and drinks. 4. Homework passes will also be rewarded to students with perfect attendance at the principal's discretion. 5. Principal Craven will give shout outs to students with perfect attendance.
Person Responsible	Greg Ohler (greg.ohler@jcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Student Proficiency in ELA
Rationale	ELA student proficiency is 2 percentage points below the district average. ELA student proficiency decreased by 8 percentage points from the previous school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA student proficiency to at or above the district average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Rigorous whole group instruction, differentiated, small group instruction, and individualized online instruction provided to all learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Rigorous, differentiated, standards based instruction with additional remediation time as needed to increase ELA proficiency on the FSA.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Standards based tier one instruction provided to all learners with the Wonders and Open Court Reading Programs. 2. Differentiated, small group instruction driven by ongoing progress monitoring with I-Ready Reading. 3. I-Ready Reading Program to incorporate technology and further supplement reading standards (Tier 1 Instruction). 4. The Accelerated Reading Program will also be used for progress monitoring and individualized, independent reading. 5. Remedial time during the wheel is available for students needing additional reading support. 6. Use of FSA Reading Coach to further prepare students for the FSA (Tier 1 Instruction).
Person Responsible	Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Student Proficiency in Math
Rationale	Student proficiency in math was one percentage point below the district average. Math proficiency decreased 6 percentage points from the previous year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase math student proficiency to at or above the district average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Rigorous whole group instruction, differentiated, small group instruction, and individualized online instruction provided to all learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Rigorous, differentiated, standards based instruction with additional remediation time as needed to increase math proficiency on the FSA.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Standards based instruction provided to all learners with the Go Math, and New Jersey Math Programs. 2. Differentiated, small group instruction driven by ongoing progress monitoring with I-Ready Math. 3. I-Ready Math, and IXL Programs to incorporate technology and further supplement math standards (Tier One Instruction). 4. Use of FSA Math Coach to further prepare students for the FSA (Tier One Instruction). 5. Remedial time during the wheel is available for students needing additional math support.
Person Responsible	Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Student Proficiency in Science
Rationale	Student proficiency in science was above district and state averages. Science proficiency improved 2 percentage points from the previous year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student proficiency in science will continue to be above district and state averages.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Rigorous, standards based instruction, opportunities for inquiry based projects, and the use of technology to promote student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based instruction, science experiments, and technology support will continue to promote student achievement as determined by the state science assessment.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Standards based science instruction provided to all learners. 2. Inquiry based science experiments to enhance understanding of science standards. 3. Use of IXL Science Program to incorporate technology and further supplement science standards (Tier One Instruction). 4. Additional science instruction during wheel time of the tested 4th grade science standards.
Person Responsible	Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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 2019. Student planners were purchased for all students to encourage daily communication with families. Family and community events (Book Fairs, Family Nights, Vocabulary Parade, Field Days) will be held periodically throughout the school year to promote positive relationships with all stakeholders.

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 an 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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Attendance	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Proficiency in ELA	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Proficiency in Math	\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Proficiency in Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00