Corkscrew Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Corkscrew Middle School

1165 COUNTY ROAD 858, Naples, FL 34120

https://www.collierschools.com/cms

Demographics

Principal: Rania Pierre Peacock

Start Date for this Principal: 8/8/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

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 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

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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	61%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	67%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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.

Our students are Empowered to Lead & Destined to 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	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Ronna	Principal	Principal-to provide strategic direction in the school system. Develop a standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
Pierre-Peacock, Rania	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals- assists the building principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe environment that is conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff and parents. Ensures teachers/staff members are providing standards based instruction aligned with CCPS standards.
Ramsay-Sinclair, Yolande	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach (Reading)-provides ongoing, job-embedded training and support for all/ELA teachers in the school to build their capacity and effectiveness as reading teachers. Provides support for struggling readers and coaches teachers to improve reading instruction throughout the school.
Thiewes, Lynn	School Counselor	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.
Columbus, Karen	Teacher, ESE	Teacher, ESE- Facilitate and coach ESE teachers through the development and implementation of functional behavior assessments/behavior interventions plans and crisis plans for identified students. Collaborate with school personnel, agencies, and families in coordinating individualized ESE services for students.
Hubing, Jessica	School Counselor	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.
Vollrath, Adam	Assistant Principal	Overall oversee safety and supervision of students in all grade levels. Ensure school wide expectations are followed along with student code of conduct.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/8/2017, Rania Pierre Peacock

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.*
4

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.*
19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
46

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	261	305	279	0	0	0	0	845
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	10	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	52	52	0	0	0	0	112
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	36	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	28	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	39	42	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	31	24	0	0	0	0	71

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	26	38	0	0	0	0	71

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/23/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	303	290	291	0	0	0	0	884
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	22	37	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	68	61	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	47	66	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	54	69	0	0	0	0	174

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	18	53	69	0	0	0	0	140

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year - 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	303	290	291	0	0	0	0	884
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	22	37	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	68	61	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	47	66	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	54	69	0	0	0	0	174

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	18	53	69	0	0	0	0	140

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%	59%	54%	64%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	55%	54%	61%	60%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	45%	47%	44%	48%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	69%	69%	58%	75%	70%	56%
Math Learning Gains	59%	62%	57%	66%	69%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	57%	51%	60%	67%	50%
Science Achievement	63%	55%	51%	65%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	75%	72%	82%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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	2019	57%	56%	1%	54%	3%
	2018	62%	56%	6%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	55%	3%	52%	6%
	2018	58%	54%	4%	51%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	66%	58%	8%	56%	10%
	2018	66%	63%	3%	58%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	61%	61%	0%	55%	6%
	2018	72%	62%	10%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	69%	66%	3%	54%	15%
	2018	65%	67%	-2%	54%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	38%	36%	2%	46%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	27%	43%	-16%	45%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	63%	52%	11%	48%	15%
	2018	61%	56%	5%	50%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	72%	0%	71%	1%
2018	73%	70%	3%	71%	2%
Compare	-1%				
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	67%	25%	61%	31%
2018	75%	67%	8%	62%	13%
Compare	17%				
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	59%	-59%	57%	-57%
2018					

Subgroup Data

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	37	33	30	40	36	29	27	60		
ELL	32	56	60	52	58	70	25	55			
BLK	51	52	31	59	56	52	46	75	75		
HSP	57	56	48	67	60	57	55	72	83		
MUL	55	50		64	48						
WHT	72	62	43	75	60	51	78	77	82		
FRL	51	54	42	62	55	57	54	65	79		

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		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	601

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 data component that showed the lowest performance was in ELA reading gains. The lowest 25% in ELA making gains is 57% (FY19). Decrease of 2% from FY18 (59%).
Factors:
-Reading Coach was used to support inexperienced teacher and long term guest teachers. New teachers without experience were hired to meet growth in 6th and 7th grade.
-Decrease in reading circulation and supplemental reading resources.
-Two teachers were being supported in a coaching cycle by the Reading Coach and Assistant Principal for performance review.
-Implementation of Read 180 program with fidelity during instruction was a work in progress for 6th grade Intensive due to inexperienced teacher and guest teacher.

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

ELA gains-lowest 25% (43%)
Factors:
-Reading Coach was used to support inexperienced teacher and long term guest teachers. New teachers without experience were hired to meet growth in 6th and 7th grade.
-Decrease in reading circulation and supplemental reading resources.
-Two teachers were being supported in a coaching cycle by the Reading Coach and Assistant

Principal for performance review.
-Implementation of Read 180 program with fidelity during instruction.

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.

Overall ELA learning gains and ELA lowest 25% were both 3% below the state average.
Factors:
-1 ELA 6th grade intensive teacher was in a coaching cycle due to poor performance. Teacher had majority of students (L1/L2) who did not make gains on Q2 benchmarks.
-New guest teacher was hired in 6th grade ELA to accommodate enrollment numbers.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in 7th grade math. CMS was 15% higher than state average (54%).
Action Steps:
-Continuous collaboration with Principal and math department during PLC's.
-District math coach support with new and experienced teachers.
-Training with new curriculum resources (Reveal) and aligned pacing guide.
-Common assessments in all grade levels.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Area of concern is the ESE/SWD subgroup. FY19 SWD subgroup had 20% level 3 in 6th grade math. In 7th grade, 25% are level 3 and 31% are level 3 in 8th grade.
CMS focus area will be to increase gain scores by 3%. Ensure students are exposed to grade level assignments during instruction.
Additional area of concern is in the ELL subgroup. In FY18, 80% of 8th grade ELL students were L1 or L2 compared to 92% in FY19, an 8% increase.
CMS area of focus will be to increase gain scores by 3%. Ensure students are exposed to grade level assignments during instruction.

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

1. Increase ELA learning gains in the lowest 25%
2. Increase Math learning gains in the lowest 25%
3. Overall gains in ELA in 6th, 7th and 8th grade

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Overall in ELA the lowest 25% are not making gains. Reading gains will impact student learning because students need a solid foundation in reading and writing to support all content areas. Reading gains in the lowest 25% was identified as a critical needs area due to previous trend data in ELA. Over the past two years ELA learning gains have fluctuated in all grade levels. In FY18, ELA learning gains were consistent with district average and in FY19, gains were 2% below district average.
Measurable Outcome:	Overall, 50% of students in lowest 25% percentile will make reading gains on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ronna Smith (smithr1@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	This year the focus will be on grade level appropriate reading and writing assignments during instruction. Research has shown L1/L2 students who are exposed to grade level work increase reading gains on state assessments. Constant monitoring of progress through PLC collaboration and consistent data chats with students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on CMS student performance on the FY19 ELA FSA, reading and writing is not done consistently within instruction. CMS ELA teachers did not consistently provide standard based instruction to all students. Students in intensive classes were graded on work that was not rigorous or challenging. Common assessment data revealed a trend that teachers did not differentiate instruction based on student need.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Consistent use of revised curriculum pacing guides during instruction and collaboration (Ronna Smith).
2. Strategic scheduling of reading endorsed teachers in intensive level classes (Rania Peacock).
3. Consistent use of common assessments every two weeks that include power standards (Dr. Yolande Sinclair).
4. PLC collaboration with ELA department to analyze assessment data and identify standards and areas of concerns (Ronna Smith).
5. Teachers will embed close reading of complex texts using sign posts in their lessons. (Ronna Smith)
6. The Reading coach will model instruction to support new ELA teachers. The focus will be on the school wide deliberate practice element, "helping students examine similarities and differences." (Dr. Yolande Sinclair)
7. Teachers will focus on writing a perfect (10) sample each semester . The focus for semester 1 will be on argumentative writing. he focus for semester 2 will be on informative writing. (Dr. Yolande Sinclair)

Person Responsible	Ronna Smith (smithr1@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Overall in math, the lowest 25% are not making gains as compared to the state average. In FY19 (53%) math lowest 25% had a 5% increase in FY18 (48%). Math gains will impact student learning because students need a solid foundation in math concepts to support career and college ready. Math gains in the lowest 25% was identified as a critical needs area due to previous trend data in Math. Over the past two years, Math learning gains have fluctuated in all grade levels. Overall math gains in FY19 were consistent with district average in grade 6th (61%) and 3% above district average in 7th grade (69%). Overall math gains in grade 8th were 8% below state average but 2% above district average.
Measurable Outcome:	Overall, 50% of students in lowest 25% percentile will make math gains on the 2020-2021 FSA Math assessment. Improvement on quarterly benchmarks and common assessments data. Increased daily math practice and math fluency during instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rania Pierre-Peacock (pierrr@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	This year the focus will be on grade level appropriate instruction based on standards during instruction. Constant monitoring of progress through PLC collaboration and consistent data chats with students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on CMS student performance on the FY19 Math FSA, grade level rigor needs to increase and done consistently within instruction. CMS math teachers did not consistently provide standard based instruction to all students. Students in intensive classes were graded on work that was not rigorous or challenging. Common assessment data revealed a trend that teachers did not differentiate instruction based on student need.

Action Steps to Implement

1. During planning teachers will analyze Aleks data to target areas that need to be reinforced. (Rania Peacock)
2. Strategic scheduling of teachers in intensive level classes to support students in the lowest 25% (Rania Peacock).
3. Grade level focus on math facts and strategies through repetition and practice (Rania Peacock).
4. Consistent use of common assessments every three weeks that include power standards (Rania Peacock).
5. PLC collaboration with math department to analyze assessment data and identify strengths and areas of concerns (Rania Peacock).
6. Mentorship of new math teachers to ensure they know how to use Reveal math resources and Aleks software to effectively guide their instruction. (Rania Peacock)
7. Quarterly child study discussions with the MTSS team and teachers to discuss interventions for struggling students (Rania Peacock).
8. Provide Professional Development that will focus on strategies to engage students in math. Specifically using technology resources such as Khan Academy, and Algebra Nation.(Rania Peacock)

Person Responsible	Rania Pierre-Peacock (pierrr@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Overall gains in ELA in all grade levels was identified as a critical need area. This area is a critical need due to past trend data on FSA ELA assessments. Over the past three years, CMS students have declined in proficiency on the FSA ELA assessment. In FY17 (64%), FY18 (63%) and FY19 (62%) respectively. Students who meet standards in reading will develop strong, fundamental reading skills that will set the groundwork for future success in all academic areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Overall, 65% of students will meet standards on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ronna Smith (smithr1@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	This year the focus will be on grade level appropriate reading and writing assignments during instruction. Students will do writing exercises daily that are standards aligned during ELA instruction Constant monitoring of progress through PLC collaboration and consistent data chats with students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on CMS student performance on the FY19 ELA FSA, reading and writing is not done consistently within instruction. CMS ELA teachers did not consistently provide standard based instruction to all students. Students in intensive classes were graded on work that was not rigorous or challenging. Common assessment data revealed a trend that teachers did not differentiate instruction based on student need.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers who teach regular ELA will focus on higher level thinking skills and complex tasks into their instruction (Ronna Smith).
2. During planning teachers will target the standards and focus on strategies that will move students up the continuum (Dr. Yolande Sinclair)
3. Consistent use of common assessments every two weeks that include power standards (Dr. Yolande Sinclair).
4. PLC collaboration with ELA department to analyze assessment data and identify standards and areas of concerns (Ronna Smith).
5. Using quarterly benchmark data to drive instruction and to concentrate on areas of weakness. (Ronna Smith)
6. Teachers in all content areas will implement writing across the curriculum to help increase student achievement in ELA. (Ronna Smith)
7. Providing professional development that will be focused on unpacking the standards. Specifically helping teachers interpret the standards in a student friendly context. (Ronna Smith)

Person Responsible	Ronna Smith (smithr1@collierschools.com)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with learning disabilities can have many different challenges that will impact their learning. These challenges can affect their academics, social and emotional leaning. SWD's that have language processing disabilities can have cognitive processing delays that may adversely affect their reading and writing skills.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on our our ESSA data, our students with disabilities subgroup was 35% which was below the Federal Index of 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rania Pierre-Peacock (pierrr@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SWD's will increase their overall quarterly benchmark data by 6%.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on quarterly benchmark data and prior FSA data (FY19). SWD's have historically scored below proficient in the areas of ELA and math. SWD's have also been identified in our lowest 25% for both ELA and math. The rationale for targeting the lowest 25% in ELA and math will also increase SWD's student performance in both ELA and math.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development to provide teachers with strategies to engage SWD students. One strategy will be PQ4R- preview, question, read, reflect, recite and review.

Person Responsible	Yolande Ramsay-Sinclair (ramsayyo@collierschools.com)

2. In ELA and math teachers will use diagrams, graphic organizers and pictures to support learning. Teachers will be trained on how to use the IPEVO and Studio in Canvas to represent visual models for students.

Person Responsible	Rania Pierre-Peacock (pierrr@collierschools.com)

3. Teachers will record their lessons through Canvas for use for SWD students to review to recall important information.

Person Responsible	Rania Pierre-Peacock (pierrr@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Weekly leadership meetings to discuss students of concern and high needs area. Throughout the year, the Leadership Team will discuss and make decisions that will impact scheduling. Use of data tracking through Canvas/online resources to monitor student progress.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Corkscrew Middle School will build a positive school culture and environment by first strengthening our school climate. Stakeholders, staff, students and community will be included in the discussion to establish school norms that build values. Core values that are rooted in an unwavering belief in all students' potential and leadership. CMS will provide more ways to increase parental involvement both in person and traditionally. Parents will be able to remotely join SAC and PTA meetings and other school events. Along with providing current information about school events, academics and SEL priorities on our school website/ Canvas pages. A diversity committee with be created for staff and students to foster Leader in Me 7 habits and skills school wide. The use of the 7 habits will help our students become leaders in their school community. Throughout the year, various events will be held to celebrate the various cultural and diverse student groups in our building. The diversity committee will work to ensure there is a student from each subgroup recognized and celebrated during academic and athletic performances. Most importantly all staff and students will model the positive behaviors we want to see at CMS.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.