Cottondale Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Cottondale Elementary School

2766 LEVY ST, Cottondale, FL 32431

http://ces.jcsb.org

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At CES, we are striving to be the B.E.S.T.
Believe
Excuse Free
Student Centered
Teacher Friendly

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stephens, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
French, Erin	School Counselor	Guidance, enrollment, and ESE support for Cottondale Elementary School.
Brockett, Reid	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Brockett teaches all students at CES in grades K-5. He is responsible for teaching character education to students and participates in our CES Leadership Team.
Register, Thomas	Principal	Principal and leader of Cottondale Elementary School, handles curriculum, data, RTI, and any other school or staff related development.
Brown, Joanna	Teacher, K-12	Joanna Brown is a 4th grade teacher at CES. She is also a parent of a CES student.
King, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Instructional Reading Coach for Cottondale Elementary School.
Russ, Alanna	Instructional Media	Media Specialist for Cottondale Elementary School
Newsome, Tammie	Instructional Technology	Technology support and training for Cottondale Elementary School.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team at CES is comprised of administrators, teachers, school staff, parents, and business leaders. Annual surveys are given to receive feedback from parents, and this data is used to create our Parent and Family Engagement Plan. After looking at the previous year's state achievement scores and state requirements for the current school year, the team develops goals for school improvement plan. ELA, Math, and Science goals are addressed. The team meets alongside additional teachers and staff to brainstorm ideas and ways to increase parental involvement. A draft plan is constructed, and our school leadership team reviews, amends as needed, and gives approval for submitting the plan to the county office.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school improvement plan will be regularly monitored by the CES Administration Team. The school leadership team will also meet as needed and after Progress Monitoring One and Two (FAST) to

analyze data in ELA and Math. We will be looking for learning gains from PM1 to PM2. The team will also focus on the learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA and Math. By using our data to ensure students are showing growth, we can adjust the plan as needed.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	19	24	21	23	17	11	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	4	11	7	9	15	9	0	0	0	55
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	6	6	1	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	11	7	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	6	11	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	6	5	5	10	6	0	0	0	34

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	12	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	2	1	4	2	2	0	0	0	11

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	25	15	21	14	9	11	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	3	1	2	4	8	7	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	2	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	5	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	13	9	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	10	5	0	0	0	20
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	2	5	7	7	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	4	5	7	3	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	3	2	3	3	0	0	0	11

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	25	15	21	14	9	11	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	3	1	2	4	8	7	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	2	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	5	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	13	9	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	10	5	0	0	0	20
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	2	5	7	7	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	4	5	7	3	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	3	2	3	3	0	0	0	11

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	57	63	53	62	72	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				59			70		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			55		
Math Achievement*	58	66	59	59	45	50	60		
Math Learning Gains				43			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33			27		
Science Achievement*	39	41	54	53	73	59	68		
Social Studies Achievement*					60	64			
Middle School Acceleration					62	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress			59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	214
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	350
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP				
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP				
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	57			58			39					
SWD	40			33			35				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			48			18				4	
HSP												
MUL	50			60							2	
PAC												
WHT	63			62			51				4	
FRL	54			53			33				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	62	59	41	59	43	33	53					
SWD	46	43	18	37	33	23	53					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	32		53	41							
HSP												
MUL	60	50		57	55							
PAC												
WHT	68	67	41	59	42	35	51					
FRL	57	55	37	57	43	35	49					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	68	70	55	60	33	27	68					
SWD	61	73		52	55		70					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	62			55								
HSP												
MUL	53			59								
PAC												
WHT	71	78		64	38		67					
FRL	62	66		49	28		55					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	51%	12%	54%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	61%	3%	58%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	58%	1%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	78%	66%	12%	59%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	64%	-1%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	47%	-3%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	41%	0%	51%	-10%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The lowest performing subject area for CES was science. Our proficiency was at 41%, which was equal to the district average, but well below the state average of 51%. A contributing factor may have been a change in the classroom teacher. The science assessment was also the final test the 5th grade students took, and they took this test the day after the state math assessment. Eleven 5th grade students also had attendance below 90%. Attendance continues to be a negative trend at CES. Nine students received one or more suspensions which reduced seat time in the science class. We saw an increase in the number of discipline referrals in 5th grade.

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

Science data showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Our proficiency score dropped from 53.2% to 41%. A teacher change was likely to contribute to this decline. Lack of testing stamina, attendance, and suspensions may have also contributed to this decline.

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.

Science and math proficiency levels were both 10% below the state average. In math, the 5th grade teacher was still making adjustments to the new standards and how they were being assessed with the new FAST Assessment. We see the greatest gaps in 5th grade where attendance and suspensions were a concern.

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

We showed the most improvement in our overall math proficiency score. In the past year, CES was only 58.5% proficient. Based on PM3 data, we are 70% proficient in grades 3-5. Last school year, we had a paraprofessional who provided math remediation to students in grades 3-5. She provided daily, standards-based, differentiated remediation to students scoring below the 50% percentile. We also began to target math along with reading in our CES After-School Program.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

After reflecting on the EWS data, attendance below 90% continues to be a concern at Cottondale Elementary School. Students with one or more suspensions was also a concern due to the increasing number of students in this area.

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

1. Increasing 5th grade science proficiency.
2. Increasing 5th grade math proficiency.
3. increasing attendance above 90%.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on our assessment data from the state, we saw a 1% increase in reading proficiency levels. While we did not see a decrease with the current scale scores in place, we want to continue an upward trend in proficiency levels.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA Proficiency will continue to be at or above district and state averages. Although learning gains were not calculated by the state assessments in the prior year, we would like to see learning gains and learning gains of the lowest 25% at or above state averages.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

State Progress Monitoring Assessments will be administered in the fall, winter, and spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Register (thomas.register@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention: Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rigorous standards based instruction with additional remediation time to increase ELA achievement.
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 for students needing reading support.
6. FSA Reading Coach to prepare students for FSA (Tier1 Instruction).
7. Pull out remediation (Tier2) for lowest quartile
8. Reading Resource Teacher for professional development, data analysis, and classroom modeling.
9. Tier3 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. Lexia in grades K-2 and ESE students for support in phonics and vocabulary instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention (Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Although we only saw a positive increase of 11% in Math Achievement, we want to have an upward trend in data. Therefor math instruction is still a critical need for school improvement. We also saw a negative data trend in 5th grade math being 9% below the state average.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Math Proficiency Achievement will be at or above district and state averages. Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25th Percentile will be at or above district and state averages.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Math instructional progress will be monitored by the state progress monitoring assessments given three times a year: fall, winter, and spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Register (thomas.register@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rigorous standards based instruction with additional remediation time as specified in students' RTI Plans to increase math achievement.
1. Standards based instruction to all learners with Go Math Programs.
2. Differentiated, small group instruction driven by ongoing progress monitoring with I-Ready Math and state progress monitoring assessments.
3. I-Ready Math, incorporate technology and further supplement math standards (Tier1 Instruction).
4. FSA Math Coach to further prepare students for the FSA (Tier1 Instruction).
5. Remediation 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 in small groups and individually by classroom teacher. Tier3 instruction given by resource teacher for students with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rigorous standards based instruction with Go Math Programs, remedial math time based upon the individual learners' needs as determined by IReady Diagnostic Assessments, prior FAST Math Scores, and state progress monitoring data.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Science proficiency declined from 53% to 41%. This is a negative data trend of 12%. We were also 10% below the state proficiency average.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Science proficiency scores will be at or above state and district averages based on the state science assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Science will be monitored with classrooms grades and with the IXL Science Program. Students will also take a pre and post district science assessment to monitor standards mastery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Greg Ohler (greg.ohler@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rigorous, standards based instruction, opportunities for inquiry based projects, and the use of technology to promote student learning.
Implementation of intensive instructional model of vocabulary, standards review, and hands-on activities for reinforcement 3-4 days leading up to the state assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Due to sickness and other family circumstances, CES had many students with attendance below 90% and more students who missed at least one period per day. 115 students at CES had attendance below 90%.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Student attendance will be at 90% or higher for 80% of our students.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Attendance will be monitored daily with FOCUS by administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Register (thomas.register@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Attendance incentives school-wide and at grade levels.
1. Attendance will be taken and monitored daily by teachers.
2. Assistant Principal Jessica Stephens will also monitor attendance daily and enforce county truancy policies.
3. Each 9 weeks, Principal Thomas Register will select a reward for students achieving perfect attendance.
4. Principal Thomas Register will give shout outs to students with perfect attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Cottondale Elementary School is a Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program. Improving student achievement is the rationale for serving all students to improve the overall performance of the entire school.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Improve performance in all graded areas for all subgroups measured on the state accountability system for 2024 in alignment with the Areas of Focus stated within this Schoolwide Improvement Plan.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The Principal, School Improvement Chair, School Leadership Team, School Advisory Council and the Director of Federal Programs will monitor implementation of the program and measure its effectiveness through progress monitoring data through FAST and District assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Register (thomas.register@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Strategies for improvement are identified in the other Areas of Focus within the School Improvement Plan and in the action steps below for the major activities of federally funded education programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for all strategies chosen are to improve student achievement. More detail is provided for each strategy in the Area of Focus above.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

CNA and SWP Development- The Principal and Director of Federal Programs conduct a comprehensive needs assessment interview during the Spring prior to the current school year to gauge the needs of the school based on current available data. This document is provided to the SIP Chair that provides it to the School Advisory Council to review in May. This serves as a draft form of the Schoolwide Program Plan. This document is then used to develop the Schoolwide Improvement Plan in floridacims.org using the State Template.

Person Responsible: Thomas Register (thomas.register@jcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Extended Learning Opportunities: the District provides access to extended learning opportunities through Title V, ESSER II, and ARP funds. After-school tutoring and summer school programs are available to all students

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Transition Services- During PreK Awards Day, Kindergarten teachers speak to parents and students about Kindergarten. PreK students were split before the end of the year and visited Kindergarten classrooms. A parent transition meeting scheduled for Headstart students. Open House provided students a way to meet individual teachers. Transition services benefitted students, parents, and staff. Students and parents were able to become familiar with staff school layout. Staff communicated important information to parents. Emails between the PreK teachers and Kindergarten Grade Group Chair about speaking at the PreK graduation/awards day. Fifth grade students tour the high school where they will go to 6th grade. Student Government showed them around campus. The Principal and Assistant Principal spoke to students reviewing expectations, policies, procedures answered questions. This benefitted both parents and staff by having the students become familiar with school, administrators, expectations and procedures.

Person Responsible: Thomas Register (thomas.register@jcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Professional Learning- utilization of Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A, ARP funding sources and general fund sources to provide professional learning on standards, utilization of purchased computer assisted instructional models, ESOL endorsements, Reading endorsements, and instructional practices.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

Title I, Part C- The Panhandle Area Educational Consortium (PAEC) Migrant Education Program has staff members that work as links between the district and the migrant families to identify and document the migrant eligibility of migrant youth, provide the data to the district data personnel and help to ensure that eligible migrant youth receive supplemental services that they may need beyond what the district can provide. In cases where students are no longer migrant-eligible, they may be able to receive continuation of services if they were enrolled in at least the 9th grade at the time their migrant eligibility expired.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

Title II, Part A- provides 3-year VAM bonus for highly effective teachers, Beginning Teacher Program Support, professional learning support for teachers earning their Reading and/or ESOL Endorsements.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

Title V- provides for extended learning opportunities through after school tutoring.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

Homeless Education support the unique needs of students experiencing homelessness with resources for educational needs, emergency housing, mental health supports, and attendance supports. Funds support the homeless liaison. Title IX, Homeless ARP funds, and donated funds support these activities.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

IDEA- The District utilizes funds for support staff to assist schools with process and procedures and additional staff to support ESE students.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

Food Service- Community Eligibility Provision for 100% free breakfast and lunch. Participation in snack program.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

State and Local Resources- The District allocates funds from state and local resources on a comparable basis utilizing per pupil calculations. Staffing is conducted using a formula utilized through Cognia Accreditation for equality and comparable staffing across the school types.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The District conducts a needs assessment for each school site identifying needs for academics, social well-being, and overall campus needs/wish list. Those needs are categorized and funding is identified to address the needs through the grants department and finance department. Special area funding, like UniSIG are used to address unique needs identified in the RFA for the purposes of supplementing the already established resources identified in June/July.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Our school School Improvement Plan may be accessed online at https://ces.jcsb.org.
School newsletters, our school Facebook page, and parent square also promote access to the SIP thru the website. We will also send a letter home with each student informing parents of how they can access the SIP.

The School Advisory Council discusses and supports the development of the Schoolwide Plan and School Improvement Plan (parallel documents). The plan is placed on the Board Document site at https://jackson.ic-board.com/ where the Board and Community are able to review and provide feedback in a public forum. After Board approval the plan is approved in the CIMS platform and a link posted to the

District Webpage and linked to school page, https://www.jcsb.org/apps/pages/
index.jsp?uREC_ID=1214135&type=d&pREC_ID=2495654. After Board approval Facebook and
ParentSquare posts will be made with the links to access the plan.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other
community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep
parents informed of their child's progress.**
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available.
(ESSA 1116(b-g))

Our CES Family Engagement Plan may be accessed online at https://ces.jcsb.org. By implementing all
the activities in the family engagement plan, CES will be able to build positive relationships with the
school community and stakeholders. Our family reading nights, family suppers, math and science
events, and technology nights will give the parents, faculty, staff, and students the opportunity to grow
together as a community. These engagement activities are crucial to fostering a positive school
environment. These activities will be advertised thru newsletters, the school sign, Facebook, and
ParentSquare.

The District and School Parent and Family Engagement Plans are provided at https://www.jcsb.org/apps/
pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=1214135&type=d&pREC_ID=2495654. The school pages are linked to the
District page to access the Parent and Family Engagement Plans. Utilization of Facebook and
ParentSquare provide links to parents and the community to stay informed on the improvement process
with the School. Each school holds a quarterly meeting with the School Advisory Council. The District
Parent Advisory Council will hold three meeting and the District will hold two parent trainings in addition
to the school-level trainings and cultural events.

**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the
amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))**

Rigorous whole group instruction, differentiated, small group instruction, and individualized online
instruction will be 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.
Differentiated and remedial instruction will be given to ESE 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.
Extended learning opportunities after-school will also be available to our students with disabilities.
Technology will be utilized and provided to all students to not only remediate but enrich our students
performing on grade level. The Accelerated Reading Program will also be used to close reading gaps
and challenge the students reading on or above grade level.

The District provides 1,950 minutes of additional instruction annually through regular scheduling.
Summer school is offered for K-5 18-20 days for 240 minutes per day. Credit Recovery is offered for
grades 6-12 for 40 days for 240 minutes per day. Supplements to the curriculum provide opportunities
for enrichment, acceleration, and remediation. After-school tutoring is provided to class achievement
gaps of struggling students.

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration
with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs
supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs,
Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and
schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

The District coordinates with all ESSA programs to enhance and provide supplemental services to improve the overall educational and well-being of students, staff, and parents. Title I Part A and Part D support graduation rates. Title I Part A and Title II improve teacher effectiveness. Title I Part A and Title III provide services for ELL students. Title IV and Title V provide extended learning programs. Title I Part A and IDEA support ESE services. Title I Part A, Mental Health and SRD support attendance and Homeless Students. Nutrition Programs support Head Start snacks and after-school tutoring snacks.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Jackson County School District employs twelve district school mental health counselors and one mental health administrator. Upon a student self-reporting, parental report, or referral by Jackson County School District faculty or staff, individual screening services and mental health services will be provided by the district employed School Mental Health Counselors, once parental consent is obtained for services, within fifteen days of the referral being received by the Jackson County School Mental Health Administrator. Screening will then take place to assess the students' mental health status and present mental health needs of each referred student. If the assessment/screening reflects a need for services beyond the counseling services provided within the educational setting, a referral will be made to a local collaborating mental health agency /service provider/primary care provider chosen by the parent/ guardian in a collaborative effort to address the mental health needs of the student. The local collaborating mental health agency/service provider/primary care provider will be responsible for insurance billing for mental health services provided to assess, diagnose, and provide treatment/ recovery services. The local collaborating mental health agency/service provider will initiate services within thirty days of receipt of the referral. Jackson County School District presently has a total of fifteen Memorandum's of Understanding with local providers to assist our district in providing expeditious, individualized care to meet the needs of our students. The MOU's ensure our district's ability to collaborate the care of our students and outcomes for the individual. Jackson County School District collaborates with Life Management Center through a referral process for students to receive services from the Mobile Response Team or Community Action Team to assist the students and parents in dealing with emotional and behavioral needs that will include family and student mental health services, health care, psychiatric evaluation, medication management (if necessary), case management services, and any other additional services necessary, as determined by service providers. Additionally, Jackson County School District collaborates with Northwest Florida Health Network, formerly Big Bend Community Based Care, to provide the opportunity for telehealth services for students through the usage of the Let's Talk Interactive technology at local school sites. The telehealth services platform is HIPAA compliant and has the capability to expand mental health and medical services available within the schools. Additionally, trauma informed care counseling group sessions are offered and conducted by the school mental health counselors that are trained in Bounce Back and Cognitive Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools (CBITS), with consent granted by parents/guardians, for students that have experienced various forms of trauma.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Students have access to dual enrollment, advanced placement courses, and career and technical education programs to improve opportunities for postsecondary success and career preparation. Juniors

and Seniors attend the regional career fair. Each high school holds a parent engagement night for college and career preparation.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

3- Schoolwide behavior systems are used in conjunction with the 3-tier model used for Problem-Solving/ Multi-tiered Systems of Support – Response to Intervention (PS/MTSS-RtI) used for academic and behavioral needs. Tier 1 is schoolwide expectations and systems based on the theory of positive behavioral systems. Students needing extra support are moved to Tier 2 or 3 depending on the level of need. Need would be based on data including classroom infractions, bus referrals, other office referral documentation, and observations. The school-based PS/MTSS team reviews behavioral data and initiates interventions based on individual student need. Functional Behavior Assessments (FBAs) and Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs) are completed to identify the problem-behavior and interventions/skill needed to initiate positive behavioral results. As needed, students with behavioral problems that are not responding to the BIP and recommended interventions, will be referred to Student Services for a more comprehensive evaluation for possible services under IDEA.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

The District utilizes local and federal resources to support beginning teachers, provide mentors to struggling teachers, provide consultants to support classroom management and instructional best practices. The District supports school Professional Learning Communities that are focused on Marzano Learning Strategies or Standards-based Instruction. The District utilizes Title I Part A, Title II, and ESSER funds to support curriculum resource teachers, technology integration resources, and data analysis. To recruit and retain teachers, the District provides VAM bonuses for high-impact teachers, provide Teacher Leadership Program, and supplements for mentoring new teachers.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Pre-K students at each school take a trip to kindergarten classrooms at their next school. They have an orientation to the classroom setting and tour of the school.

Parents of pre-k students receive orientation letters. There is articulation between staff at both campuses.