Collier County Public Schools

Corkscrew Middle School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 3

School Information 4

Needs Assessment 6

Planning for Improvement 9

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 11

Corkscrew Middle School

1165 COUNTY ROAD 858, Naples, FL 34120

https://www.collierschools.com/cms

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	58%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	A	A*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier County School Board.

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.

The mission of Corkscrew Middle School is to provide a positive learning environment where each student has the opportunity to develop intellectual growth and to pursue the development of good character in a safe learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Corkscrew Middle School is to foster a lifelong love of learning and achievement for every student by utilizing an ongoing partnership between school, family, and community.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title
Smith, Ronna	Principal
Pierre-Peacock, Rania	Assistant Principal
Maya, Eric	Assistant Principal
Ramsay-Sinclair, Yolande	Instructional Coach
Thiewes, Lynn	School Counselor
Columbus, Karen	Teacher, ESE

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Principal-to provide strategic direction in the school system. Develop a standardized curriculum, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
Assistant Principal- assist the Principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe environment conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff and parents. Ensures teachers/staff members are providing standard-based instruction aligned with Florida State standards and Collier County School board policies and procedures.
Guidance Counselor-foster the academic development of students and to help them successfully complete the curriculum. Provide support, counseling, and strategies to help students with their social, emotional and academic learning.
Instructional Coach (Reading)-provides ongoing, job-embedded training and support for all teachers in the school to build capacity and effectiveness as reading teachers. Provides support for struggling readers and coaches teachers to improve reading instruction throughout the school.
Teacher, ESE- Facilitate and coach ESE teachers through the development and implementation of functional behavior assessments and crisis plans for identified students. Collaborate with school personnel, agencies, and families in coordinating individualized ESE services for students.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	21	23	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	27	22	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	37	34	0	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	75	69	0	0	0	0	188

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	40	43	0	0	0	0	105

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected

Friday 8/10/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students exhibiting two or more indicators		

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

FSA ELA trend data indicates that a majority of CMS students do not progress beyond their current levels from one test year to the next. In recent years this trend has shown on average only 2% of the level 1s and 2s increased a level.
In 7th grade, 24/33 students remained a Level 1, 23/57 students remained a Level 2 and 18 students dropped to a Level 1.
Math learning gains decreased by 11% in FY17 from FY18.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

FY17 overall math proficiency was 75%, FY18 math proficiency was 67% resulting in an 8% decrease in proficient students.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

In 6th grade Math, 72% of students were proficient (level 3 or higher) versus the state at 52% students proficient.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Reading lowest 25% gain improved from 44% in FY17 to 51% in FY18.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Consistent training and guidance from Reading Coach providing teachers with reading strategies for striving readers and low level students. Intensive double block scheduling provided teachers with ample time to monitor and provide support for students based on need.
Teachers used data from Achieve 3000 to drive instruction to fit the needs of all students.

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	63%	61%	53%	67%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	59%	54%	67%	61%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	50%	47%	55%	50%	45%
Math Achievement	67%	71%	58%	76%	69%	55%
Math Learning Gains	55%	67%	57%	69%	68%	55%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	62%	51%	60%	59%	47%
Science Achievement	63%	60%	52%	67%	58%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	74%	72%	80%	72%	67%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	13 ()	21 ()	23 ()	57 (0)
One or more suspensions	15 (0)	27 (0)	22 (0)	64 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	18 (0)	37 (0)	34 (0)	89 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	44 (0)	75 (0)	69 (0)	188 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	62%	56%	6%	52%	10%
	2017	62%	55%	7%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	58%	54%	4%	51%	7%
	2017	64%	57%	7%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2018	66%	63%	3%	58%	8%
	2017	65%	58%	7%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2018	72%	62%	10%	52%	20%
	2017	77%	62%	15%	51%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	65%	67%	-2%	54%	11%
	2017	76%	67%	9%	53%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
08	2018	27%	43%	-16%	45%	-18%
	2017	30%	44%	-14%	46%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2018	61%	56%	5%	50%	11%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018					
2017					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	73%	70%	3%	71%	2%
2017	80%	71%	9%	69%	11%
Compare		-7%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018					
2017					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	75%	67%	8%	62%	13%
2017	86%	65%	21%	60%	26%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
Compare		-11%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018					
2017					

Subgroup Data

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	20	42	40	37	46	40	33	40	53		
ELL	18	54	59	54	51	54		54			
BLK	59	63	53	60	49	48	42	87			
HSP	57	57	52	66	55	45	58	72	74		
MUL	65	60		75	45						
WHT	71	61	51	71	57	54	71	84	68		
FRL	57	57	52	64	53	46	57	71	71		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
SWD	24	39	34	46	57	53	14	58			
ELL	16	38	38	42	59	65					
BLK	57	67	57	69	67	68	70		78		
HSP	60	61	42	71	62	57	60	77	74		
MUL	68	59		74	65						
WHT	70	60	42	81	70	60	69	87	83		
FRL	54	57	41	66	61	58	52	75	65		

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Increase the number of students making reading gains
Rationale	The skill of reading and writing supports all content areas for all students. Providing daily reading exercises to build grammar, phonetic awareness related to specific content will lead to increased reading gains on state assessments.
Intended Outcome	Overall, 50% of students will increase a level in reading on the 2018-19 FSA ELA. Students with a level 5 will maintain a level 5 on the 2018-19 FSA ELA. The lowest 25% will increase by 5% on the 2018-19 FSA ELA.
Point Person	Rania Pierre-Peacock (pierrr@collierschools.com)
Action Step	
Description	• Consistent implementation of Read 180 with purpose driven instruction and activities. • Adjust lesson plans to be standards-based focused, on increasing engagement and knowledge assessment for every day use. • Homeroom reading contests by grade level created by the team leaders to motivated students to read more. • Reading coach pushing into classes to model instruction to support new ELA teachers. • Increase writing about reading to include all genres of reading. • ELA teachers will analyze their data and work with the reading coach to plan strategies to increase reading comprehension utilizing over 50% non-fiction text that is on grade level. Monthly PLC (professional learning community) meetings will be monitored to ensure teachers are collaborating and discussing best practices to increase student achievement. • Data chats and mentoring with students to make goals to improve their reading. - Monthly common assessments targeting power standards.
Person Responsible	Yolande Ramsay-Sinclair (ramsayyo@collierschools.com)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	-Use of Read 180 data -quarterly -PLC monitoring- twice a month (student centered, best practices) to ensure teachers are collaborating and analyzing data to identify what content areas/standards students need additional help in. -Lesson plans and actual instruction will be observed to provide feedback for effective implementation of literacy strategies. -WIG's (wildly important goals) focused on cross-curricular writing and reading in all content areas. -Data will be analyzed to determine if student achievement is increasing. Data chats will be used with teachers and coaches to determine effectiveness of literacy strategies and pre and post conferences will be used to provide specific feedback on implementation during lessons.
Person Responsible	Rania Pierre-Peacock (pierrr@collierschools.com)

Activity #2	
Title	Increase the number of students making math gains
Rationale	Math gains have declined by 11% from the FY17 to FY18 school year. Increased math gains will help CMS develop a strong math foundation for success in higher grade level math courses.
Intended Outcome	Overall, students will increase by 55% to 58% on the 2018-19 MATH FSA. The lowest 25% will increase by 5% on the 2018-19 MATH FSA.
Point Person	Rania Pierre-Peacock (pierrr@collierschools.com)
Action Step	
Description	-Hired experienced math teachers that have shown substantial gain scores. -School-wide focus on data for all teachers. -WIG (Wildly Important Goal) setting with grade level teams focused on student achievement. -Strategic scheduling of level 1s and level 2s in Intensive Math. -Implement daily problem solving questions as bell ringers to infuse rigor into instruction. -Hawk Hall and after school intervention to provide support for all students. -Utilize district math coaches to support low growth teachers. -Monthly PLC (professional learning community) monitoring with team leaders and department chairs to review data and discuss trends.
Person Responsible	Rania Pierre-Peacock (pierrr@collierschools.com)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	-Use of ALEKS data quarterly. -Focus on student engagement and use of available online resources. -PLC monitoring- twice a month (student centered, best practices) -Analyze quarterly benchmark data and formative assessments to determine areas of weakness for students. -Monthly common assessments targeting power standards.
Person Responsible	Rania Pierre-Peacock (pierrr@collierschools.com)

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$17,600.00**