Jackson County School Board

Cottondale High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cottondale High School

2680 LEVY ST, Cottondale, FL 32431

http://chs.jcsb.org

Demographics

Principal: Zanda Warren

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	92%
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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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 High School

2680 LEVY ST, Cottondale, FL 32431

http://chs.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)
High School 6-12	Yes	87%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

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

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.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Warren, Zanda	Principal	The duties and responsibilities of the principal are to facilitate the communication and collaboration of the school improvement team and to ensure implementation of the school improvement plan along with the parent and family engagement plan.
Wheatley, Richard	Assistant Principal	To assist in implementing the SIP and the PFEP.
Eagle, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Work with admin to create, edit, and implement SIP and PFEP, schedule and run meetings with community members and additional support staff.
Dilmore, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	Assist in implementation, record minutes for all meetings.
Ohler, Billie	Instructional Media	Implementation, data analysis, support
Wilkes, Hannah	Teacher, K-12	Implementation, middle school data
Baggett, Ciara	Teacher, ESE	Implementation, subgroup data
Dilmore, Clay	Teacher, K-12	Implementation, ELA high school data, overall goals and improvement plan
Speers, Liza	School Counselor	Implementation, planning, student body demographic data
Herndon, Casey	Instructional Coach	Implementation, EWS data, retention data, tier data

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/1/2021, 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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

402

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.

2

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	50	62	71	64	49	51	403
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	24	29	30	40	27	34	203
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	6	5	1	4	33
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	3	3	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	18	10	9	9	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	16	18	12	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	19	23	18	20	25	119

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	14	19	20	33	18	14	12	130

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	3	3	6	6	6	2	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	5	4	5	2	27

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/28/2021

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	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

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	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

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				59%	56%	56%	55%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	49%	51%	55%	58%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	41%	42%	41%	58%	44%
Math Achievement				46%	43%	51%	49%	58%	51%
Math Learning Gains				46%	39%	48%	52%	53%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	33%	45%	38%	41%	45%
Science Achievement				43%	66%	68%	52%	96%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				63%	69%	73%	45%	73%	71%

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**
06	2021					
	2019	65%	55%	10%	54%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	52%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
08	2021					
	2019	54%	57%	-3%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
09	2021					
	2019	61%	59%	2%	55%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
10	2021					
	2019	57%	49%	8%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2021					
	2019	65%	56%	9%	55%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
08	2021					
	2019	16%	30%	-14%	46%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2021					
	2019	13%	28%	-15%	48%	-35%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	61%	61%	0%	67%	-6%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	53%	71%	-18%	71%	-18%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	77%	65%	12%	70%	7%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	46%	50%	-4%	61%	-15%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	41%	44%	-3%	57%	-16%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA for both middle and high school will use STAR.
Math for both middle and high school will use Imagine Math.
ELA remediation (Level 1 or 2) for both middle and high school will use LEXIA.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	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	30	46	36	30	45	42	33	41			
BLK	52	50	29	34	30	27	17	38		92	42
HSP	53	58		45	55						
MUL	70	63		65	48			46			
WHT	70	60	52	53	38	29	44	72	69	93	66

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
FRL	59	57	42	42	35	29	31	56	24	91	45

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

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	600
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	93%

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%	

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	41
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	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
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	59
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	46
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?

ELA Achievement levels in high school increased from 59% to 64%
ELA Achievement level in middle school increased from 57% to 66%
ELA Learning Gains CHS remained at 59%
ELA Learning Gains for L 25 dropped from 58% to 45%
Math Achievement levels in high school increased from 46% to 51%
Math Achievement levels in middle school increased from 46% to 47%
Math Learning Gains dropped from 46% to 39%
Math Learning Gains for L 25 dropped from 44% to 33%
We do not currently have subgroup data for 2021 but historically these groups will need interventions and do not score proficiently.

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

Learning gains for the Lowest 25% demonstrated the greatest need for improvement, both areas decreased from 2019 to 2021.
Learning Gains overall, stayed the same in ELA but decreased by 7% This data demonstrates a additional area in need of improvement.
ELA and Math Achievement for both SWD and Black/African American subgroups needs improvement.

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

Teacher turnover in math is a contributing factor in achievement levels in math. Additionally, students in this cohort missed nearly a half a year because of COVID-19 shutdown. Furthermore, the lack of district support and adopted math curriculum creates a hardship among math instructors. The district is working towards adopting new curriculum that align to state standards.

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

7th grade ELA increased student achievement on FSA from 52% to 66%

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

Teacher mentorship, grade level and subject area professional learning groups, collaboration, and data analysis.

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

Professional development in B. E.S.T standards, grade level and subject area collaboration in math, remediation courses for L25's, data team analyze progress monitoring results each quarter/semester

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.

District level PD offered to CHS teachers to increase understanding of the B.E.S.T standards, PAEC professional development opportunities offered to all instructional staff as needed for subject area and grade level

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

District leadership plans to adopt a comprehensive aligned math curriculum, science curriculum, and social studies within the next three years. Along with the implementation of the B. E.S. T standards and new curriculum for ELA that began in August of 2021. Additionally, the district has agreed to promote and find a curriculum coordinator/consultant for the areas of math, science and history.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math Proficiency was 66%. Learning gains in math decreased from 46% to 33%. Learning Gains of the lowest 25% was 33%. Middle School Acceleration (8th Grade Algebra 1) was 92%.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2022 70% will be proficient, at least 50% of students will demonstrate learning gains on the middle school math, Algebra I EOC and Geometry EOC, and 40% of the lowest 25% will make learning gains. Our middle school acceleration in 8th grade Algebra 1 EOC will be 95%.
Monitoring:	Administration will examine lesson plans, and progress monitoring reports. The math department will meet bi-weekly to collaborate with Intensive Math instructors to ensure areas of weaknesses are being addressed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	RTI program with RTI specialist, Imagine Math, Math Nation, Xtramath, Geometry Nation workbooks, after school program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By working in a collaborative group the math department will ensure that lesson plans, assessments, and progress monitoring align to not only the Florida standards but the needs of individual students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule bi-weekly meetings with math department including ESE, admin, and any additional personnel, such as RTI staff.
2. Collaborate by subject area and grade post progress monitoring to analyze data in an effort to meet needs of all students and to identify areas of weaknesses.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA proficiency was 66%, Learning gain in ELA did not increase, rather stayed the same at 59% and Learning gains of the lowest 25% was 45%.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will be 70%, ELA learning gains will increase to 65%, and learning gains of the lowest 25% will be 50% in 2022.
Monitoring:	ELA department will be meet bi-weekly to discuss learning strategies, BEST standards, lesson planning, and progress monitoring data. Admin as well as district staff will attend at least one of these meetings a month to ensure that instructors are covering standards and collaborating as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lexia, intensive reading classes for middle and high school, performance coach workbooks, RTI program and specialist, REWARDS program, and after school program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through collaboration, professional development support, and county resources instruction will provide opportunities for student growth in achievement levels.

Action Steps to Implement

Maintain learning community for ELA bi-weekly and include district staff, administration and any additional personnel support, such at RTI staff.
Teachers will collaborate in team and grade meetings to discuss data, pedagogical strategies, and progress monitoring.
Teachers will implement BEST standards.
Teachers will use LEXIA to remediate Level 1 and 2 students.
Teacher will use county's decision tree to make remedial decisions for struggling students.

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Cottondale High School's achievement rate for SWD is historically lower compared to district average in areas of math and ELA at XX%
Measurable Outcome:	At least 20% of students identified in the SWD subgroup will meet basic achievement levels on both math and ELA in 2022.
Monitoring:	LEXIA, STAR, Imagine Math, Intensive Math, Intensive Reading
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will work to improve skills in ELA and Math using one of the programs adopted by the district. Student will primarily work with these programs in their resource class, intensive reading course, and intensive math course.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who receive additional instruction in ELA and Math are more likely to close the achievement gap. The intensive classes provide and opportunity to work one-on-one, identify specific needs, and re-teach. Additionally, the adopted programs allow for a student driven course work, where they can move at their own pace.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify needs of students in subgroup. ESE department will work with regular education teachers to create opportunities for student achievement, analyze progress, re-teach in areas of weaknesses.

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

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the last several years Cottondale High School has experienced a significant turnover in mathematics teachers. There have been 10 different mathematics teachers in grades 6-9 with staffing allowance of 5 for grades 6-12. This turnover, based on exit interviews and admin-teacher conferences, is largely based on instructors education background. Many of these teachers were not education majors in their undergraduate studies.
Measurable Outcome:	To retain 100% of the current math department instructors for 2022-2023.
Monitoring:	Staffing will be monitored by administration and the department chair for mathematics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Assign mentors to new or beginning teachers. Mentors and administration will monitor progress in beginning teacher programs and work with district staff/PAEC staff to ensure all elements of the program are being mastered. Weekly meeting between new teachers and mentors will take place. Lesson plans, pedagogical strategies will be shared with new teachers. Classroom management strategies will be monitored closely by administration and the mentor.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	New teachers who have proper training and support are more likely to remain in the same school and in the teaching profession. Districts that provide state approved curriculum and support teachers with proper pacing guides, resources, and support are more likely to retain qualified instructor.

Action Steps to Implement

Assign mentors to new teachers, monitor progress, visit room of new teacher frequently (at least once per week), work with PAEC/district staff to ensure requirements are being met in a timely and effective manner.

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

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students in the Black/African American subgroup score below peers when taking the state math assessment at 51%.
Measurable Outcome:	49% of the subgroup Black/African American scored a level 3 or above in 2019. Cottondale high school would like this percentage to increase to 55% for 2022.
Monitoring:	Students will be monitored through Imagine Math progress monitoring three times a year as well as classroom assessments, which should be discussed in collaboration meetings held bi-weekly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Imagine Math, Intensive Math, RTI, and teacher-made assessments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	RTI, Imagine Math, and Intensive math provide extra time in the subject of math, data analysis, and a more student centered classroom experience, all proven methods to increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Administer Imagine Math three times a year
Add Imagine Math pathway for Intensive Math and/or RTI teacher to help with the reinforcement of fluency
Place all level 1 and low level 2 in Intensive Math courses
Identify students who qualify for the RTI program

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

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2020 Graduation rate was 93%
Measurable Outcome:	Increase graduation rate to 95% for 2022.
Monitoring:	1. District leadership will hire a district graduation resource teacher to assist guidance counselors with data tracking and student supports in meeting graduation goal. 2. Admin and school guidance counselors will have annual data chats with high school student beginning in the 9th grade year. 3. Admin and school guidance department will monitor closely EWS students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring, data tracking, counseling
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who receive multiple reports on progress and support from school leadership including the guidance department are more likely to graduate.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule annual student meetings where district resources will be used to track student progress
2. Bi-annual meetings between administration and guidance department to track EWS students and create interventions.
3. Project 10 Graduation data.

Person Responsible Liza Speers (liza.speers@jcsb.org)

#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students will be assessed using the B.E.S.T standards beginning in 2022-2023.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of math and ELA teachers will review the B.E.S.T standards prior to the end of the 2021-2022 school year and be ready to deliver instruction based on those standards in the 2022-2023.
Monitoring:	Teacher will collaborate during department/grade level meetings bi-weekly to discuss and unpack new standards and the most effective pedagogical strategies to implement new content.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Learning communities designed by grade level(s)/departments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research suggests that through collaboration among teachers of the same grade level/subject area increases student achievement levels.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule bi-weekly grade level/subject area collaborative meetings; administration will attend at least one meeting per month.

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

#8. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Cottondale High School's 2021 Science Proficiency was 35%.
Measurable Outcome:	Cottondale High School would like to see a 7% increase in 2022, to 42% proficiency.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring data collected by Science teachers Science department will meet monthly to discuss curriculum pacing, curriculum changes, data for progress monitoring, and general collaboration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Biology EOC practice booklets Brainchild
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reinforcing prior knowledge, effective pedagogical strategies, and regular progress monitoring are all ways to ensure student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement	
Teachers will seek out professional development opportunities to gain insight into the best and newest pedagogical strategies for the area of science.	
Person Responsible	Paul Newton (paul.newton@jcsb.org)
Teachers will ensure standards are being taught in an effective manner and match state guidelines.	
Person Responsible	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)
Teachers will progress monitor at least 3 times a year and report data to leadership team for analysis.	
Person Responsible	Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)

#9. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Cottondale High School's 2021 Social Science proficiency was 65%.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2022 Cottondale will increase proficiency in Social Science proficiency will be 75%. Specifically, an increase from 58% to 70% in Civics and an increase in US History from 70% to 80%.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring and analysis of data will take place at least twice a year not to include a diagnostic exam at the beginning of the year
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	District developed progress monitoring assessments US History practice workbooks Civics workbooks
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who are regularly practicing to take a pass the EOC, and receiving feedback will be better prepared to score a level 3 or more.

Action Steps to Implement	
Teachers will work with district support staff to develop progress monitoring assessments and pacing guides	
Person Responsible	Zanda Warren (zanda.warren@jcsb.org)
Teachers will ensure that lesson plans are aligned to state standards and that student understanding is properly assessed and re-taught.	
Person Responsible	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)

#10. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2020 High School Acceleration (combined CTE and Dual Enrollment) was 61%. This leaves 39% of students not earning an industry certification and/or credit hours towards a higher degree/technical certification.
Measurable Outcome:	Cottondale High School's 2022 High School Acceleration will be at 70% for both industry certification and dual enrollment/technical degree.
Monitoring:	Data collection and analysis will be taken each semester for passing rates on industry certification, credit hours earned by students in dual enrollment and technical school.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Liza Speers (liza.speers@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Microsoft, Adobe, Photoshop, Excel, and Agriculture certification practice tests
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who are properly taught with practice skills associated with industry certification are better equipped to show mastery when taking the certification exam.

Action Steps to Implement	
Teachers will identify areas of content that are tested on the industry exam and ensure that lesson plans focus on these standards	
Person Responsible	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)
Teachers will ensure students are actively practicing the skills required to pass the industry certification	
Person Responsible	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)
Teachers will administer practice test as needed for all skills covered on the industry certification exam and re-teach as necessary.	
Person Responsible	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@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.

Cottondale High School ranked 173/505 high schools statewide. CHS ranked 1/4 in violent incidents and property incidents, which is the best out of the county with these types of incidents. CHS ranked 2/4 in drug/public order incidents. Total Incidents per 100 Students: 2.227
Total Incidents: 11
Enrollment: 494

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.

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.

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

Business Partners: Enviva pellet plant helps with rewards for FSA scores. Cottondale Chevron- donate to athletics and students for rewards. Lassiter Tax- donates to the school. Country Candy store provides student of the month awards.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Teacher Recruitment and Retention	$0.00

5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American**	**$0.00**
6	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation**	**$0.00**
7	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards**	**$0.00**
8	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**	**$0.00**
9	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies**	**$0.00**
10	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**