Cottondale Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cottondale Elementary School

2766 LEVY ST, Cottondale, FL 32431

http://ces.jcsb.org

Demographics

Principal: Thomas Register   Start Date for this Principal: 9/6/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 10/19/2021.

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

Cottondale Elementary School

2766 LEVY ST, Cottondale, FL 32431

http://ces.jcsb.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/19/2021.

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, we are the C.O.R.D.S.
Collaborating
Outstanding in all we do
Data-driven
Safety First

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Russ, Alanna	Instructional Media	Media Specialist for Cottondale Elementary School.
Gilmore, Kerry	Principal	Principal and leader of Cottondale Elementary School, handles curriculum, data, RTI, and any other school or staff related development.
Ohler, Greg	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Cottondale Elementary School, handles attendance, truancy, and discipline.
Stephens, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Cottondale Elementary School School Improvement Chair and a second grade classroom teacher.
Brockett, Reid	Teacher, K-12	Member and Parent on our School Improvement Team, also a 4th grade teacher at CES.
French, Erin	School Counselor	Guidance, enrollment, and ESE support for Cottondale Elementary School.
Newsome, Tammie	Instructional Technology	Technology support and training for Cottondale Elementary School.
King, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Instructional Reading Coach for Cottondale Elementary School.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 9/6/2021, 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.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
28

Total number of students enrolled at the school
391

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	73	62	70	56	68	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	391
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 9/6/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				61%	63%	57%	69%	67%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	58%	58%	56%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	49%	53%	44%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				65%	66%	63%	71%	70%	62%
Math Learning Gains				53%	58%	62%	56%	58%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	45%	51%	30%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				55%	54%	53%	53%	56%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	64%	58%	6%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	62%	-5%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	73%	70%	3%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	76%	71%	5%	64%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	58%	-10%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	52%	52%	0%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

IReady Progress Monitoring

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

				2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	61	73		52	55		70				
BLK	62			55							
MUL	53			59							
WHT	71	78		64	38		67				
FRL	62	66		49	28		55				

				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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	381
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	62
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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
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	59
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	64
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based upon progress monitoring data, vocabulary in ELA is below proficiency levels at all grade levels.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the 2019 state assessments, learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA showed a need for improvement. Math learning gains of the lowest 25% were also below district and state averages.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Possible contributing factors are a loss of instructional time and displacement of teachers and students from the COVID 19 Pandemic. This resulted in a lower attendance rate for teachers and students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science showed a 2% improvement from the prior school year based on the 2019 state assessments.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

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.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Individualized, small group Tier 1 Reading Instruction will be given to all students with Wonders, HMH, and/or Open Court Programs. Tier 2 and Tier 3 Reading instruction will be given in addition to

the 90 minute reading block to students demonstrating a reading deficit. Vocabulary enrichment will be provided on the wheel schedule for all students each week. Technology programs such as IReady and IXL will be used to further accelerate learning by closing learning gaps and providing enrichment to above level students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development with the new ELA curriculum will be provided for all ELA teachers.
The CES Literacy Team will do a book study with the book Reading Engagement: Motivating Readers Through Integrated Instruction by John T. Guthrie and Allan Wigfield.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services will include an after school program to provide additional reading and math instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA proficiency was at 68%. Learning Gains for ELA was at 70%. ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile was at 55%. Maintaining high proficiency and high learning gains while improving the learning gains of our lowest 25% students.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will be 68%, ELA Learning Gains will be 70%, and Increase the learning gains of the lowest quartile of students in ELA to at or above the district average of 48%.
Monitoring:	IReady Diagnostics will be administered in the fall, winter, and spring for progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kerry Gilmore (kerry.gilmore@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 to increase ELA achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards based tier one instruction- Wonders, Open Court and HMH 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 used for individualized, independent reading.
5. Remediation is available for students needing reading support.
6. FSA Reading Coach to further prepare students for FSA (Tier1 Instruction).
7. Pull out remediation (Tier2) for the lowest quartile
8. Reading Resource Teacher for professional development, data analysis, and classroom modeling.
9. Tier 3 instruction in small groups and individually by classroom teacher. Tier 3 instruction given by resource teacher for students with disabilities.
10. Students with disabilities given additional instruction and support. Unique skill instruction and accommodations provided as outlined in students' IEP's.
11. Flocabulary Online Program used to supplement vocabulary instruction.
12. Lexia in grades K-2 and ESE students for support in phonics and vocabulary instruction.

Person Responsible	Kerry Gilmore (kerry.gilmore@jcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math proficiency was 60%, Math Learning Gains was 33% Math learning gains of the lowest quartile was 27%
Measurable Outcome:	Math proficiency will be 62%, Math Learning Gains will be 35%, and increase the learning gains of the lowest quartile of students in math to at or above the district average of 35%.
Monitoring:	Math learning gains of the lowest quartile will be monitored with IReady Math Diagnostics in the fall, winter, and spring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kerry Gilmore (kerry.gilmore@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Rigorous standards based instruction with additional remediation time as specified in students' RTI Plans to increase math achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rigorous standards based 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, 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	Kerry Gilmore (kerry.gilmore@jcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student Proficiency in Science was 68%. Student proficiency in science was above the district and state averages. Science proficiency improved 13 percentage points from the previous year.
Measurable Outcome:	Student proficiency in science will continue to be at or above district and state averages at 68%.
Monitoring:	Science will be monitored with classrooms grades and with the IXL Science Program.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kerry Gilmore (kerry.gilmore@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. Standards based science instruction 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 instruction.
4. Additional science instruction during wheel time of the tested 4th grade science standards.

Person Responsible Kerry Gilmore (kerry.gilmore@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.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored with IReady Diagnostics in the fall, winter, and spring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kerry Gilmore (kerry.gilmore@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   Kerry Gilmore (kerry.gilmore@jcsb.org)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	CES had 147, or 37%, 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 80% of our students.
Monitoring:	Attendance will be monitored daily with FOCUS by administration.
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 Gilmore 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 Gilmore will give shout outs to students with perfect attendance.

Person Responsible	Kerry Gilmore (kerry.gilmore@jcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

With only 2 total incidents, 0.49 incidents per 100 students, CES is significantly below state and county averages. Our primary area of concern or focus will be to continue maintaining low incidents of school discipline. Our administration will continue to require discipline plans from every teacher. Classroom discipline support will be provided to all teachers thru the Positive Behavior Support Program. Positive behavior will be rewarded weekly in each classroom. Principal Gilmore will reward exemplary behavior each nine weeks. We believe our PBS Program will help our school culture of low discipline incidents continue to be a part of our environment. Discipline data will be monitored dally by CES Administration.

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.

CES will 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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our administrators, Principal Gilmore and Assistant Principal Ohler are actively involved in every aspect of our school. They believe that each child should be given the opportunity to learn in a safe environment. Our teachers also play a pivotal role in our school environment, because they are on the front lines providing a quality education to all the students. The staff at CES give the support that the school needs to carry out the daily schedules and learning opportunities. CES parents provide support for our students by helping their children with homework and providing donations for school activities. Our local community members and local businesses often provided monetary support for the school. Our school board member, Tony Pumphrey, is a constant voice of support for CES at the district office. All of these stakeholders working together help create the positive environment and learning culture that makes Cottondale Elementary School a special place to learn.

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