

Cottonwood Elementary Board Report 2023-2024

### School Demographics

Staff	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
Certified	24	25	24
ESP	21	18	19

### School Enrollment

Fall	К	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	Total
Oct. 1st 2021	28	27	33	31	28	24	26	197
Oct. 1st 2022	30	26	27	30	29	30	19	191
2023-2024 (Current)	30	28	30	27	33	33	31	212

#### <u>Subgroups</u>

\*Subgroup data from the state is a year behind.

		:	2021-2022	2	2022-2023		2023-2024 (Current)			
Cat	egory	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Gender	Female	45%	49%	48%	50%	50%	TBD	54%	49%	TBD
	Male	55%	51%	52%	50%	50%	TBD	46%	51%	TBD
IEP	-	13%	11%	17%	15%	12%	TBD	15%	13%	TBD
Free/Redu	uced	28%	28%	35%	43%	39%	TBD	42%	34%	TBD
Mobility		27%	16%	NA	28%	15%	NA	TBD	TBD	NA
ELL		3%	4%	3%	5%	4%	TBD	5%	4%	TBD
Ethnicity	White	84%	83%	78%	85%	85%	TBD	87%	84%	TBD
	Hispanic	9%	12%	14%	9%	11%	TBD	9%	11%	TBD
Ot	her Minority	7%	5%	8%	6%	4%	TBD	4%	5%	TBD

### **Overall School Performance**

	WAEA Target	ESSA Norm	Count of	
Indicator	Level	Category	Students	Description
Growth	Below Target	Below	72	WAEA: The mean student growth percentile (MGP) in reading
	41	Average		and math combined for all students in grades four through eight
		40.6		as measured from prior year PAWS to current year WY-TOPP.
			72	ESSA: The mean student growth percentile (MGP) in ELA and
				math combined for all students grades four through ten.
Equity	Below Target	Below	23;63	The weighted mean student growth percentile (MGP) with MGP of
	43	Average		students who scored in the bottom 25% of students on the prior
		43.3		year test weighted at 80% and the MGP of the remaining
				students weighted at 20%. The reported count of students for this
				indicator reflects the number of students with tests in the
				consolidated subgroup and the number of students with tests not
				included in the consolidated subgroup. In some cases, students
				have a test in each group.
Achievement*	Below Target	Below	104	WAEA: The percent proficient or above on the state test in
	36	Average		English language arts, mathematics, and science.
		36.5		
			104	ESSA: The percent proficient or above on the state test in English
				language arts and mathematics.
ELP	Meets Target	Average	17	The percent of English learners who met their annual goal for
	47	47.1		English language proficiency.

#### **Overall School Performance on Indicators**

\* A school's achievement score may be lowered if the school does not meet the 95% participation rate requirement

WY-TOPP Participation Rate Status WAEA: Met

WY-TOPP Participation Rate Status ESSA: Met

ACCESS Participation Rate Status WAEA and ESSA: Met

#### **Overall School Performance**

	WAEA F	Performance Category Cut	Scores	ESSA Performance Category Cut Scores		
	Below	Meeting	Exceeding	Below		Above
	Targets	Targets	Targets	Average	Average	Average
Growth	< 48	>= 48 and < 60	>= 60	< 47.1	>= 47.1 and < 54.5	>= 54.5
Equity	< 48	>= 48 and < 60	>= 60	< 47.5	>= 47.5 and < 56.2	>= 56.2
Achievement	< 51	>= 51 and < 68	>= 68	< 47.7	>= 47.7 and < 58.6	>= 58.6
ELP	< 36	>= 36 and < 60	>= 60	< 27.7	>= 27.7 and < 50.0	>= 50.0

### State Assessment (WY-TOPP)

		School 2022	School 2023
Grade	Subject	% Proficient & Advanced	% Proficient & Advanced
3	ELA	25.80	31.30
3	Math	35.50	28.10
4	ELA	41.40	40.60
4	Math	37.90	35.30
4	Science	31.00	29.40
5	ELA	47.60	29.00
5	Math	57.10	22.60
6	ELA	65.50	63.30
6	Math	79.30	52.60

\*Students will demonstrate proficiency or growth as measured by WY TOPP

\*Grade levels will exceed the state average in content areas measured by WY TOPP

		School 2023	State 2023
Grade	Subject	% Proficient & Advanced	% Proficient & Advanced
3	ELA	31.30	48.25
3	Math	28.10	53.52
4	ELA	40.60	45.48
4	Math	35.30	51.10
4	Science	29.40	50.23
5	ELA	29.00	54.87
5	Math	22.60	53.66
6	ELA	63.20	59.84
6	Math	52.60	51.48

## Overall School Performance (Past Five School Years)

School Year	Overall Rating	
2017-2018	Meeting Expectations	
2018-2019	Partially Meeting Expectations	
2019-2020	No Rating	
2020-2021	No Rating	
2021-2022	Meeting Expectations	
2023-2024	Not Meeting Expectations	

# SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GOALS

ELA: Cottonwood will improve the number of students proficient or advanced from 39.4% to 50% as measured by the 2023-2024 School Performance Report.

MATH: Cottonwood will improve the number of students proficient or advanced from 33.7% to 50% as measured by the 2023-2024 School Performance Report.

SCIENCE: Cottonwood will improve the number of students proficient or advanced from 34.6% to 50% as measured by the 2023-2024 School Performance Report.

WELL-BEING: Cottonwood will create a School-Wide PBIS handbook by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

# **ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT GOALS**

ACHIEVEMENT: Cottonwood will improve from a 36% to 51% on the Achievement Indicator as measured by the 2023-2024 School Performance Report.

GROWTH: Cottonwood will improve from a 41 to 48 on the Growth Indicator as measured by the 2023-2024 School Performance Report.

EQUITY: Cottonwood will improve from a 43 to 48 on the Equity Indicator as measured by the 2023-2024 School Performance Report

ELP (IF Applicable): Cottonwood will improve from a 47% to 50% on the ELP Indicator as measured by the 2023-2024 School Performance Report.

# **Cottonwood SIG**

Anchor Statements	Beyond Proficient	Proficient	Below Proficient
Educators work in collaborative teams, rather than in isolation, and take collective responsibility for student learning.	Teachers meet bi-weekly in collaborative teams for a minimum of 45 minutes during the regular school day. Utilize norms, working <b>interdependently</b> to adjust and complete the teaching cycle.	Teachers meet weekly in collaborative teams for a minimum of 45 minutes during the regular school day. They write norms and goals, and participate in common planning to improve student learning. Teams collaborate and refer to the teaching cycle.	Teachers meet inconsistently. Norms and goals are not present. Teaching cycle is independent or not present at all.
Collaborative teams implement a guaranteed and viable curriculum, unit by unit.	Teacher teams prioritize and unwrap standards, identify learning targets, create student friendly proficiency scales, and follow pacing guides created by the district or publisher. Teachers are planning the next teaching cycle while implementing the current cycle.	Teacher teams prioritize and unwrap standards, identify learning targets, and follow pacing guides created by the district or publisher. Teacher teams use materials that are cohesively aligned with the learning target and meet the priority standard. Teacher teams are using the curriculum throughout the teaching cycle.	Planning is not based on priority standards. Lessons are based on independent materials that are not aligned to priority standards.
Collaborative teams monitor student learning through an assessment process that includes frequent, team-developed, common formative assessments.	Teacher teams share the responsibility for using and/or creating common formative and summative assessments that are targeted and consistent. CFA's are administered on a weekly basis throughout the school year. Student data is	Teacher teams share the responsibility for using and/or creating common formative and summative assessments they administer on a regular basis throughout the school year. Student data is collected and reviewed bimonthly at a minimum.	Common formative and/or summative assessments are independently created and administered or not created at all. Teams do not review and use the data collected. No data is not collected.

	collected and reviewed weekly.		
Educators use the results of common assessments to improve individual practice, build the team's capacity to achieve its goals, and intervene and enrich on behalf of students.	Teacher teams will use data to review, and refine instructional practices through peer coaching and observation. Teacher teams analyze the results of common formative and summative assessments to identify which students need more time and support. Formulate SMART goals per standard and use it within the teaching cycle. Provide intervention for all students at every level depending on the SMART Goal.	Teacher teams will use data to review and use instructional practices. Teacher teams analyze the results of common formative and summative assessments to identify which students need more time and support. Formulate SMART goals per standard. Provide intervention for all students at every level depending on the SMART Goal.	Teachers discuss practices that are not pertinent to data or teachers do not discuss instructional practices. There is minimal or no data based on common formative and summative assessments. Data is not used constantly to identify student needs.
The school provides a systematic process for intervention and enrichment.	Teacher teams provide Tier 1,2 and 3 support and enrichment based on data from the SMART goal targeted interventions that are systematic (based on flow chart), practical, effective, essential, and directive (skill based).	Teacher teams provide Tier 1,2 and 3 support based on data from the SMART goal targeted interventions that are systematic (based on flow chart), practical, effective, essential, and directive (skill based).	Teacher teams provide support based on data.

## Cottonwood Goal Plan

- 1. What is your team's current reality?
- 2. What is your team goal for this year?
- 3. What steps will your team take to achieve this goal?