

Jackson County School Board

# Cottondale High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Cottondale High School

2680 LEVY ST, Cottondale, FL 32431

<http://chs.jcsb.org>

## Demographics

**Principal: Zanda Warren**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (51%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

## Cottondale High School

2680 LEVY ST, Cottondale, FL 32431

<http://chs.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)
High School 6-12	Yes	89%
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	B	B	C	B

### 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.

Cottondale High School is committed to providing a safe and challenging environment through a cooperative effort of school and community. This is conducive to the development of life-long learners who are capable of living productive lives in our ever-changing, complex world.

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

Together we learn. Forever we succeed.

### 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
Warren, Zanda	Principal	The duties and responsibilities of the principal is to facilitate the communication and collaboration of the school improvement team and to ensure the implementation of the school improvement and parent and family engagement plan.
Ellerbee, John	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in fulfilling the duties and responsibilities of the principal to facilitate the communication and collaboration of the school improvement team.
Speers, Liza	School Counselor	To provide assistance with school data, promotion and graduation requirements, as well as requirements requested by the state for students to receive credit for classes they have successfully completed
Dilmore, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	To represent the faculty of CHS in support of improving the school and giving input towards the plan of action in the school improvement plan
Wheatley, Samantha	Teacher, ESE	To act as the chair of the school improvement committee and facilitate communication and collaboration between all parties, as well as represent and give input from the students with disabilities perspective of CHS
Eagle, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Instruction High school Mathematics
Ohler, Billie	Other	Media Specialist

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Thursday 7/23/2020, Zanda Warren

**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.*

3

**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.*

4

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

32

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (51%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A



<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	70	74	83	70	60	50	465	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	6	9	7	11	15	62	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	2	2	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	2	0	1	15	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	18	10	9	9	0	0	56	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	16	18	12	0	0	0	56	

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	6	15	10	17	12	15	8	83	

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	0	0	0	0	0	14	19	19	20	22	15	10	119	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	5	10	2	3	34	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	26	23	19	31	34	37	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	14	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	36	43	22	24	23	23	186

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	26	23	19	31	34	37	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	14	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	36	43	22	24	23	23	186

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## 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	59%	56%	56%	55%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	49%	51%	57%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	41%	42%	47%	48%	41%
Math Achievement	46%	43%	51%	50%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	46%	39%	48%	54%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	33%	45%	49%	25%	39%
Science Achievement	43%	66%	68%	54%	61%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	63%	69%	73%	58%	66%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(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
06	2019	65%	55%	10%	54%	11%
	2018	60%	58%	2%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	52%	56%	-4%	52%	0%
	2018	44%	45%	-1%	51%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2019	54%	57%	-3%	56%	-2%
	2018	62%	59%	3%	58%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
09	2019	61%	59%	2%	55%	6%
	2018	57%	50%	7%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
10	2019	57%	49%	8%	53%	4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	65%	56%	9%	55%	10%
	2018	63%	52%	11%	52%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	55%	3%	54%	4%
	2018	40%	49%	-9%	54%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	16%	30%	-14%	46%	-30%
	2018	18%	45%	-27%	45%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	13%	28%	-15%	48%	-35%
	2018	28%	45%	-17%	50%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	61%	0%	67%	-6%
2018	91%	82%	9%	65%	26%
Compare		-30%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	71%	-18%	71%	-18%
2018	34%	57%	-23%	71%	-37%
Compare		19%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	65%	12%	70%	7%
2018	57%	66%	-9%	68%	-11%
Compare		20%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	46%	50%	-4%	61%	-15%
2018	45%	61%	-16%	62%	-17%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	44%	-3%	57%	-16%
2018	74%	57%	17%	56%	18%
Compare		-33%			

## 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	19	46	46	12	25	25		40			
BLK	27	43	46	21	35	38	10	48		92	
HSP	44	56		44	53						
MUL	64	71		68	48						
WHT	66	63	63	52	49	46	48	68	85	79	69
FRL	50	57	54	41	42	44	34	58	82	75	47
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	18	38	32	21	30	29					
BLK	23	35	35	17	38	37		21		80	17
HSP	42	50									
MUL	68	55		65	58			70			
WHT	61	59	41	54	52	40	56	48	67	81	38
FRL	48	54	40	41	51	39	47	42	56	79	13
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	35	45	31	25	56	55	20	50			
BLK	28	46	54	20	40	44	20	45		79	27
HSP	69	92		44	53						

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
MUL	52	50		46	71			36			
WHT	62	59	39	58	56	48	63	66	57	84	34
FRL	49	55	44	46	54	55	48	48	45	81	10

### 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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	645
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	63
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	63
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	53
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.**

Due to a district-wide shutdown there is no testing data for the 2019-2020 academic year. Therefore our data components will remain the same as submitted for the 2018-2019 academic year. Science achievement showed the lowest performance. There are more students tested and a greater student variety than the prior year. There was a decrease in teaching for students because of shutdown.

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

Science achievement showed the greatest decline. There are more students tested and a greater variance in sub-groups. There was a decrease in teaching time due to shutdown.

**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.**

8th grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The students who scored a level 3 or higher on the previous FSA test were accelerated into a higher math course than previous years.

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

Middle school acceleration and college and career acceleration were areas most improved.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

ELA statewide assessment scores for students with disabilities and math statewide assessment scores for African American students.

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

1. Achieving a higher passing percentage of math statewide assessments for African Americans.
2. Achieving a higher passing percentage of ELA statewide assessments for students with disabilities
3. Middle School acceleration
4. Attendance
5. Focus on lower 25% of students in achievement to ensure learning gains.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**



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

Cottondale High School's percentage of ELA students with disabilities passing the statewide assessment is considerably lower when compared to the district average.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Cottondale High School's percentage of students with disabilities who passed the statewide assessment with a level 3 or above was 14.3%. The district's percentage of students with disabilities was 28.7%. Cottondale High School would like to increase the percentage of students with disabilities, passing the statewide assessment at level 3 or above to at least 20%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ciara Baggett (ciara.baggett@jcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

STAR, i-Ready, Learning Strategies, Intensive Reading

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

These programs provide the identified sub-group of students with extra support in ELA. Additionally these courses are staffed with a certified teacher as well as a paraprofessional in an effort to provide a smaller teacher to student ratio which supports individualized instruction. STAR and i-ready provide teachers with data on student progress and student level-based curriculum programs to increase achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Students will receive individualized instruction, based on the needs identified through progress monitoring programs.

**Person**

**Responsible** Ciara Baggett (ciara.baggett@jcsb.org)

2. To monitor progress for the identified sub-group, basic teachers and resource teachers will meet once a month to discuss areas in need of improvement and ways in which needs can be met.

**Person**

**Responsible** Ciara Baggett (ciara.baggett@jcsb.org)

3. Intervention strategies, such as SIM, will be implemented within the learning strategies courses through the resource class.

**Person**

**Responsible** Ciara Baggett (ciara.baggett@jcsb.org)

4. The ELA teacher(s) will attend IEP meetings as the student's basic teacher representative, in an effort to provide relevant and current information on student progress in an inclusive setting.

**Person**

**Responsible** Ciara Baggett (ciara.baggett@jcsb.org)

5. The resource teacher will attend at least one ELA department meeting per month to discuss current data, progress, and interventions with basic ed. teachers for the identified sub-group.

**Person**

**Responsible** Ciara Baggett (ciara.baggett@jcsb.org)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Cottondale High School's percentage of African American students scoring level 3 or above on the statewide assessments is significantly lower than the district average percentage.

**Measurable Outcome:** Cottondale High School's percentage of African American students who passed the statewide assessment with a level 3 or above was 24.3%. This compares to the district's percentage of 42%. Cottondale High School would like to increase the pass rate on math statewide assessments for African American students to at least 31%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Casey Herndon (casey.herndon@jcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Imagine Math, iReady, Brainchild, RTI, Intensive Math, Math Nation

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** These programs provide additional support in the area of mathematics outside of a regular math course.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. The lowest performing students from the last testing period in Algebra I EOC, 8th grade FSA, 7th grade FSA will be scheduled for Intensive Math courses for 2020-2021 academic year. Due to no state testing in the 2019-2020 school year, math teachers will also be consulted about placement of students.

**Person Responsible:** Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)

2. The RTI Resource Teacher will help with remediation data, scheduling for pull-out sessions for students, and communicating with regular education teacher to ensure target areas are covered in remediation sessions. The RTI teacher will also regularly communicate with parents concerning progress and participate in parent-teacher-student conferences.

**Person Responsible:** Casey Herndon (casey.herndon@jcsb.org)

3. The math department will meet twice a month to review data, lesson plans, and classroom assessments. New personnel in the math department will be assigned mentors from the math department to ensure lesson plans meet students' needs, classroom is effectively managed, and data collection/analysis is used to drive instruction. For the purpose of meeting the above goal, the math department will specifically analyze sub-group's progress monitoring scores/data to ensure gains are realized.

**Person Responsible:** Rebecca Dilmore (rebecca.dilmore@jcsb.org)

4. Online math programs/curriculum will be used to help students develop essential skills needed to improve overall understanding of mathematics as well as provide feedback to student, teacher, and parent.

**Person Responsible:** Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)

5. Attendance is a key factor in student achievement levels therefore incentives will be given as a part of the Positive Behavior System each nine weeks. This will include virtual learners enrolled in iJackson.

**Person Responsible** Billie Ohler (billie.ohler@jcsb.org)

6. After school tutoring will be provided to students for grades 6-9 upon lift of Covid-19 mandates.

**Person Responsible** Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Cottondale High School's percentage of students scoring level 3 or above on science statewide assessment is considerably lower than the district's achievement level for science.

**Measurable Outcome:** Cottondale High School's achievement level for science ( level 3 or above) is at 43% while the district's achievement level is at 66% pass rate. Cottondale High School would like to see at least a 10% increase in this area; greater than or equal to 53%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** resource room, after-school tutoring, purchase of online textbooks and FLVS curriculum

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** To support students in achieving a level 3 or above on statewide assessments and improve overall understanding of topic covered in 6-12 science classes.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Science department will meet at least once a month to analyze data from classroom assessments, and additional progress monitoring programs. Additionally, to ensure that lessons plans are meeting state identified standards and goals.

**Person Responsible** Paul Newton (paul.newton@jcsb.org)

2. Research data collections tools/remediation programs for the subject of science for all courses covered 6-12. Report these findings to administration by December 2020.

**Person Responsible** Paul Newton (paul.newton@jcsb.org)

3. Department chair will report students who are struggling in science to RTI resource teacher at progress report time and end of nine weeks, so that those students can receive additional support in this area.

**Person Responsible** Paul Newton (paul.newton@jcsb.org)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Cottondale High School's achievement rate for social studies is lower than the district achievement rate.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Cottondale High School's achievement rate for social studies is 63% while the district's is at 69%. Cottondale High School would like to see an increase from 63% to 70%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Tara Addison (tara.addison@jcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Khan Academy, resource room, RTI resource teacher, online textbooks with progress monitoring programs, FLVS curriculum through Canvas
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	To increase student achievement scores. To provide teachers with programs that will help to analyze data in an effort to identify strengths and weaknesses.
<b>Action Steps to Implement</b>	
1. The social studies department will meet at least once a month to analyze course data and align lesson planning.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Tara Addison (tara.addison@jcsb.org)
2. The social studies department will report to admin how they will progress monitor and which programs are being used, as well as which programs are most effective.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Tara Addison (tara.addison@jcsb.org)
3. The social studies department will report twice a month to the RTI resource teacher with any students that are struggling in this area. The RTI resource teacher will assist in providing additional support to the identified students.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Casey Herndon (casey.herndon@jcsb.org)

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Cottondale High School graduation rate is lower than state average. High school acceleration is below 90%.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	The 2021 Graduation rate will be 92% and the 2021 High School Acceleration rate will be 90%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Certification programs, Algebra I Honors course for 8th grade, dual enrollment courses, vocational training, intensive courses for those still needing to meet graduation requirements for math and English.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	To present students with various ways to accomplish individual goals before graduating high school; to ensure college and career readiness; to ensure graduation rate is increased.
<b>Action Steps to Implement</b>	
Certification programs will continue in the area of Agriculture and Computer Science.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)
Dual enrollment courses will be offered on and off campus for students who qualify.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Liza Speers (liza.speers@jcsb.org)
Algebra I Honors course will be offered to incoming 8th grade students who meet requirements for accelerated programs.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Liza Speers (liza.speers@jcsb.org)
Vocational programs will be offered to 12th grade students who are interested and meet minimum requirements.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Liza Speers (liza.speers@jcsb.org)
Students who have not met math or English graduation requirement (Level 3 or above on Algebra I EOC, Level 3 or above on English II FSA or concordant score) will be staffed into Intensive Math and/or Intensive Reading.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Liza Speers (liza.speers@jcsb.org)

**#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Student achievement in ELA is below the state average. Additional supports will be implemented to improve performance.

**Measurable Outcome:** As a result of taking the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment- 60%% will be proficient; 60% will make learning gains; and 59% of lowest 25% of students will make learning gains

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Clay Dilmore (clay.dilmore@jcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** i-ready, Intensive Reading, STAR, Learning Strategies

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** To provide additional support to students who are struggling in the area of ELA; to provide teachers with progress monitoring data in an effort to identify and address areas of weaknesses and strengths.

**Action Steps to Implement**

The ELA department will meet once a week to discuss lesson planning, data, and curriculum.

**Person Responsible** Clay Dilmore (clay.dilmore@jcsb.org)

The ELA department will work with RTI resource teacher in identifying struggling students as well as specific needs. The RTI teacher will work to pull these students for one-to-one or small group instruction.

**Person Responsible** Casey Herndon (casey.herndon@jcsb.org)

After school tutoring will be provided for grades 6-10 upon approval from Administration.

**Person Responsible** Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)

Intensive Reading instructor will communicate data progress monitoring from i-Ready for grades 9-10 to RTI resource teacher and basic teacher. Basic teachers in grades 6-8 will monitor i-Ready scores to ensure progress is being made.

**Person Responsible** Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)

**#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** Increase overall mathematics proficiency rates from 46% to 56%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

As a result of taking the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment- 56% will be proficient; 60% will make learning gains; 60% of lowest 25% of students will make learning gains; and 98% will be proficient for middle school acceleration.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Brainchild, iReady, Math Nation, RTI program, Imagine Math

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

To provide additional support to students who struggle in the area of math. To provide teachers with progress monitoring data in an effort to identify areas of weaknesses and strengths.

**Action Steps to Implement**

RTI resource teacher will work with math department in identifying those at risk and pull students for one-to-one or small group instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Casey Herndon (casey.herndon@jcsb.org)

The math department will meet twice a month to review data, lesson plans, and plans for struggling students.

**Person Responsible**

Rebecca Dilmore (rebecca.dilmore@jcsb.org)

After school tutoring will be provided Monday- Thursday for grades 6-9 upon approval from Administration.

**Person Responsible**

Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)

Algebra I teacher will work with RTI resource teacher in providing a specific list of skills that need to be addressed for identified students.

**Person Responsible**

Amanda Eagle (amanda.eagle@jcsb.org)

Intensive math instructors will meet once a month to review curriculum, needs, upcoming testing dates, and any other current data.

**Person Responsible**

Amanda Eagle (amanda.eagle@jcsb.org)

The math department will utilize Imagine Math supplemental program to improve student performance.

**Person Responsible**

Amanda Eagle (amanda.eagle@jcsb.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**



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

**The school leadership team will be monitoring student attendance and implementing district policy and procedures for students that are identified as truant. Furthermore, the leadership team will work towards developing more incentives for students who remain non-truant.**

## 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.

The faculty and staff at Cottondale High School understand that building positive, meaningful relationships with the families of our students is vital in ensuring success. The leadership team and administration are always developing new ideas in which to increase parent and community involvement.

A key factor in increasing and maintaining parent involvement is communication. Moreover, the communication needs to be continuous, user friendly, and meet the needs of parents. Means of communication include, but are not limited to, school and/or district publications, progress reports, report cards, marquee announcements, phone contacts, conferences, school and/or district website, email, Focus Messenger, Canvas Inbox, social media school page (Facebook).

The schools SIS, Focus, also allows for school faculty and administration to record notes/comments about students that are visible to both student and parent. School atmosphere surveys are periodically published and used for the purpose of collecting data as it relates to parent input.

### 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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00



5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00