

Jackson County School Board

Cottondale Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Cottondale Elementary School

2766 LEVY ST, Cottondale, FL 32431

<http://ces.jcsb.org>

Demographics

Principal: Thomas Register

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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 10/20/2020.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Cottondale Elementary School

2766 LEVY ST, Cottondale, FL 32431

<http://ces.jcsb.org>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/20/2020.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/10/2016, Thomas Register

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	83	68	67	62	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	410
Attendance below 90 percent	5	6	6	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	25	22	20	25	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
Students retained two or more times	0	2	5	3	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/11/2020

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	
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

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
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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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	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%
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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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

ESSA Federal Index	
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	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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 25% ELA and Math. Possible contributing factors are a loss of instructional time and displacement of teachers and students from Hurricane Michael. A reverse inclusion model was utilized with our lowest 25%, 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 25% in ELA. Possible contributing factors are a loss of instructional time and displacement of teachers and students from Hurricane Michael. A reverse inclusion model was utilized with our lowest 25%, 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 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 25% in Math. Impact from Hurricane Michael, attendance, and reverse inclusion models may have been 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 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?

Attendance below 90% and 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 25% in ELA
2. Learning gains of the lowest 25% 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and 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. ELA learning gains are 4 percentage points below the district average. ELA learning gains of the lowest quartile are 17 percentage points below the state average and 13 percentage points below the district average.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA proficiency, and learning gains of every student to at or above the district average. Cottondale Elementary goals for ELA will be 63% for proficiency; 58% for learning gains of every student; and 49% for lowest 25% learning gains (10 percentage point increase from 2019) as measured by the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment.

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. Remedial instruction will be given to students with a focus on the lowest 25th percentile and students with disabilities receiving instruction as specified in IEP's.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Rigorous standards based instruction with additional remediation time as needed to increase ELA proficiency and learning gains on the FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards based tier one instruction with the Wonders and Open Court Reading Programs.
2. Differentiated, small group instruction driven by ongoing progress monitoring.
3. I-Ready Reading Program to supplement reading standards (Tier1 Instruction).
4. The Accelerated Reading Program will be used for individualized, independent reading.
5. Remediation is available for students needing reading support.
6. Use of FSA Reading Coach to further prepare students for the FSA (Tier1 Instruction).
7. Pull out remediation (Tier2) for the lowest quartile to remediate ELA skill deficits.
8. Access to Reading Resource Teacher for professional development, data analysis, and classroom modeling.
9. Tier 3 instruction in small groups and individually by the classroom teacher. Tier 3 instruction will also given by the resource teacher for students with disabilities.
10. Students with disabilities will be given additional instruction and support. Unique skill instruction and accommodations will be provided as outlined in the students' IEP's.

Person Responsible Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student proficiency in math is 1 percentage point below the district average. Math proficiency decreased 6 percentage points from the previous year. Math learning gains of all students are 5 percentage points below the district average. Math learning gains of the lowest quartile are 19 percentage points below the state average and 13 percentage points below the district average.

Measurable Outcome: Cottondale Elementary goals for Math will be 66% for proficiency; 58% for learning gains of every student (district averages); and 42% (10 percentage point increase from 2019) for lowest 25% learning gains as measured by the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment.

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. 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 IReady Diagnostic Assessments and prior FSA Math Scores.

Action Steps to Implement

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 (Tier1 Instruction).
4. Use of FSA Math Coach to further prepare students for the FSA (Tier1 Instruction).
5. Remediation is available for students needing additional math support.
6. Tier2 instruction as pull out remediation for the lowest quartile of students to remediate math skill deficits.
7. Students with disabilities will be given additional math instruction and support in the resource room. Unique skill instruction and accommodations will be provided as outlined in the students' IEP's.
8. Tier3 math instruction will be given in small groups and individually by the classroom teacher. Tier3 instruction will also given by the resource teacher for students with disabilities.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student proficiency in science was above the district and state averages. Science proficiency improved 2 percentage points from the previous year.

Measurable Outcome: 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 Steps to Implement

1. Standard 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 in Tier 1 instruction.
4. Additional science instruction during wheel time of the tested 4th grade science standards.

Person Responsible Jessica Larkin (jessica.larkin@jcsb.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our federal index for students with disabilities is 38%.

Measurable Outcome: Increase our federal index for students with disabilities to 41% or higher with a specific focus needed on the learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile in Math.

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 the learning gaps will also be provided for these students as indicated in the 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 Steps to Implement

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)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: CES had 64 students with attendance below 90% and more students who missed at least one period per day.

Measurable Outcome: Student attendance will be at 90% or higher 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 student attendance for students will encourage them to be present to learn. School attendance data will be continuously monitored to determine effectiveness of the incentives.

Action Steps to Implement

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, Principal Craven will select a reward for students achieving perfect attendance.
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)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

There are no additional schoolwide improvement priorities.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Improve school to parent communication as measured by Title I Parent Survey administered Spring 2021. 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, Video uploads) will be held periodically throughout the school year to promote relationships with all stakeholders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00