

Collier County Public Schools

Gulfview Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	28

Gulfview Middle School

255 6TH ST S, Naples, FL 34102

<https://www.collierschools.com/gvm>

Demographics

Principal: Ryan Nemeth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	74%
2020-21 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 (75%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

Gulfview Middle School

255 6TH ST S, Naples, FL 34102

<https://www.collierschools.com/gvm>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	51%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	I	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.

We are committed to maintaining a positive school identity that promotes academic focus, personal safety, and maximum potential where success is recognized and celebrated for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to foster a lifelong love of learning and achievement for every student by utilizing an ongoing partnership among school, family, and community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lee, Kristina	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Supports school-wide implementation of an integrated (academic and behavior) databased planning and problem solving system using a variety of assessment tools to monitor student progress. *Assists teams in the selection and implementation of research and/or evidenced-based academic and behavioral interventions to promote student progress. * Assists teams in analyzing student data and identifying formative assessments to use as the basis for data-driven instructional decisions.
Kinstler, Mitchell	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Assists teams in the selection and implementation of research and/or evidenced-based academic and behavioral interventions to promote student progress. * Assists teams in analyzing student data and identifying formative assessments to use as the basis for data-driven instructional decisions.
Leiti, Meghan	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Provides intensive instructional interventions (Tier 3) to support student achievement (academic and behavioral). * Works collaboratively with district and school-based leadership teams, including academic coaches, to monitor fidelity and support capacity development and sustainability of MTSS implementation.
Brown, Elizabeth	Reading Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Works collaboratively with district and school-based leadership teams, including academic coaches, to monitor fidelity and support capacity development and sustainability of MTSS implementation. * Provides intensive instructional interventions (Tier 3) to support student achievement (academic and behavioral). *Provides training and leadership specifically to the ELA department, but extending to all instructional departments.
Ruemler, Kelsey	Instructional Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Participates in professional learning activities aligned with specific position requirements, and demonstrates active participation and follow-through at the school(s) of assignment.
Rubianes, Carmen	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Provides consultation to teachers in the development of the Student Success Plans (SSP) and Individual Education Plans (IEP), according to individual student needs.
Bobrow, Susan	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Provides consultation to teachers in the development of the Student Success Plans (SSP) and Individual Education Plans (IEP), according to individual student needs.
Colondres, Linda	Teacher, ESE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Maintains a working knowledge of local, state, and federal laws and regulations related to compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), ESEA and English Language Learners (ELLs), as

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		well as guidelines pertaining to eligibility, delivery of services, individualized plan development, and MTSS.
Carberry, Jason	Psychologist	* Assists teams in the selection and implementation of research and/or evidenced-based academic and behavioral interventions to promote student progress in addition to assessing students that have been identified as in need of additional supports.
Vessella, Marisa	Math Coach	* Works collaboratively with district and school-based leadership teams, including academic coaches, to monitor fidelity and support capacity development and sustainability of MTSS implementation. * Provides intensive instructional interventions (Tier 3) to support student achievement (academic and behavioral). * Provides training and leadership to the math teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/12/2021, Ryan Nemeth

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.*

9

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

600

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	197	190	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	18	26	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	36	32	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	45	19	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	31	30	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	30	27	0	0	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	32	26	0	0	0	0	72

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/3/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	208	221	215	0	0	0	0	644
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	9	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	26	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	22	17	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	24	16	0	0	0	0	52

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	3	10	16	0	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	208	221	215	0	0	0	0	644
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	9	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	26	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	22	17	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	24	16	0	0	0	0	52

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	3	10	16	0	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				77%	59%	54%	78%	61%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	55%	54%	68%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	45%	47%	55%	50%	47%
Math Achievement				86%	69%	58%	87%	71%	58%
Math Learning Gains				78%	62%	57%	78%	67%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70%	57%	51%	74%	62%	51%
Science Achievement				64%	55%	51%	63%	60%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				86%	75%	72%	87%	74%	72%

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	72%	56%	16%	54%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	81%	55%	26%	52%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
08	2021					
	2019	75%	58%	17%	56%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	77%	61%	16%	55%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	88%	66%	22%	54%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
08	2021					
	2019	51%	36%	15%	46%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	85%	72%	13%	71%	14%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	67%	33%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	59%	-59%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Quarterly benchmark assessments are utilized to monitor progress. These assessments, developed by the district and administered at all schools within specific windows of time are given toward the end of the first quarterly marking period (fall), second quarterly marking period (winter), and third quarterly marking period (spring). These assessments are then graded by the district and individual, teacher, and school comparative data provided to all schools to assist in a multi-layered progress monitoring process.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(132/195) 68%	(136/195) 70%	(116/191) 61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(53/92) 58%	(50/90) 56%	(37/86) 43%
	Students With Disabilities	(9/27) 33%	(7/28) 25%	(5/27) 19%
	English Language Learners	(10/21) 48%	(7/19) 37%	(4/20) 20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(143/196) 73%	(139/194) 72%	(115/186) 62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(54/92) 59%	(53/90) 59%	(38/82) 46%
	Students With Disabilities	(10/27) 37%	(5/28) 18%	(3/28) 11%
	English Language Learners	(7/21) 33%	(8/19) 42%	(6/20) 30%
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(116/198) 59%	(138/196) 70%	(142/196) 72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(43/99) 43%	(52/97) 54%	(55/95) 58%
	Students With Disabilities	(4/24) 17%	(7/24) 29%	(9/23) 39%
	English Language Learners	(4/20) 20%	(7/19) 37%	(7/20) 35%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(113/190) 59%	(145/197) 74%	(124/187) 66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(41/97) 42%	(59/99) 60%	(43/91) 47%
	Students With Disabilities	(2/23) 9%	(6/23) 26%	(7/23) 30%
	English Language Learners	(5/18) 28%	(11/19) 58%	(6/20) 30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	(150/189) 79%	(162/194) 84%	(171/192) 89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(63/92) 68%	(67/96) 70%	(78/92) 85%
	Students With Disabilities	(7/20) 35%	(11/23) 48%	(18/22) 82%
	English Language Learners	(8/19) 42%	(9/19) 47%	(11/20) 55%

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(123/189) 65%	(144/195) 74%	(131/189) 69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(52/89) 58%	(55/89) 62%	(48/87) 55%
	Students With Disabilities	(8/28) 29%	(8/29) 28%	(4/25) 16%
	English Language Learners	(2/4) 50%	(1/6) 17%	(1/8) 13%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(147/191) 77%	(164/198) 83%	(156/199) 78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(61/90) 68%	(66/91) 73%	(59/93) 63%
	Students With Disabilities	(12/29) 41%	(13/31) 42%	(11/30) 37%
	English Language Learners	(1/4) 25%	(4/6) 67%	(2/8) 25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	(117/191) 61%	(113/194) 58%	(114/183) 62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(43/89) 48%	(41/88) 47%	(41/81) 51%
	Students With Disabilities	(7/28) 25%	(8/29) 28%	(5/27) 19%
	English Language Learners	(0/4) 0%	(0/6) 0%	(0/6) 0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	27	33	33	36	50	50	19	32	92		
ELL	47	59	47	58	62	48		61			
ASN	90			100	80						
BLK	42	53	50	55	61	54	50	50	100		
HSP	64	61	41	71	70	53	54	73	93		
MUL	76	55		82	76						
WHT	77	60	40	88	73	74	65	86	99		
FRL	58	54	42	68	65	57	55	67	95		
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	38	44	40	48	54	51	20	48	71		
ELL	42	44	38	65	73	71	12		70		

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
ASN	100	63		100	88						
BLK	50	42	33	70	65	64	25	78			
HSP	71	63	51	79	76	71	44	83	83		
MUL	67	64		73	57						
WHT	84	68	60	91	81	73	74	88	96		
FRL	65	55	51	75	72	65	41	78	85		

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	29	41	39	45	59	60	11	57	55		
ELL	63	60	50	63	73	80		50			
ASN	89	82		95	100						
BLK	55	52	54	67	78	70	32	64	86		
HSP	73	62	53	80	75	72	46	83	95		
MUL	79	85		100	92						
WHT	83	72	55	92	78	75	75	90	93		
FRL	68	61	56	81	77	73	50	80	90		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	675
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	74
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

8th grade math overall proficiency decline seems to be an emerging trend as Quarterly Benchmark Assessment (QBA) progress monitoring data did not show growth throughout the SY21 school year despite the interventions that were put in place. This was also an area of concern in SY20 reflected in weaker progress monitoring data (QBA1) than in SY19.

8th grade science overall proficiency also shows a declining proficiency trend, with state assessment data as well as progress monitoring data.

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

Decline in overall proficiency for 8th grade math.

Decline in overall gains for ELA.

Decline in lowest 25% for math.

Decline in overall proficiency for 8th grade science.

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

We have seen this emerging trend over the last few years and have taken steps to work toward positive change for our department (listed below). One overarching factor is the need for all teachers to understand the importance and expectation of planning for high quality instruction in teaching grade level standards, not activities, in all grade levels.

We have made staffing changes at all three grade levels over the last 2 years. Through more intentional collaborative planning, we have also had more candid discussions among the department as to using resources with that intentionality (such as adopting a Nearpod lesson rather than creating one based on CCPS scope and sequence), this has not always been the case in our department, so we are still seeing the impact of this even though we started seeing that shift in focus and understanding at the start of last school year. Additionally, our Science department is working on regular scheduling of formative assessment with accountability for SY22.

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

Our 6th grade lowest quartile in math showed significant improvement from SY19, and our 7th grade math overall showed improvement from QBA1 to QBA2 to FSA SY21 Math.

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

We moved classrooms, so that 6th grade math teachers taught across the hall from each other to facilitate better planning and sharing of best practices. Additionally, our 6th and 7th grade regular/intensive math teachers created Reveal assignments for each student based on benchmark data. At 7th grade, there was a shift in prioritizing use of questioning strategies in alignment with Achievement Level Descriptors.

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

We need to allot time and planning for scaffolded instruction embedded within the standards-based lessons. This needs to be planned for in the pacing and scope of the curriculum guides, as well as part of the spiral review of concepts.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We need to plan for training on data analysis within the context of vertical articulation among departments, so teachers not only recognize the need for acceleration, but can articulate the standards where learning loss is most apparent and how/when/where to teach these standards within the context of moving forward.

We need to plan for professional development for creation and implementation of spiral review routines that are impactful in remediating learning loss as well as increasing understanding of current concepts.

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

District science support, that will gradually be released to school teacher leadership, provided weekly to guide planning as well as implementation of lessons. This is structured by grade level so all science teachers take ownership of 8th grade performance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

In comparison with SY19, the percentage of students achieving proficiency on the state Science assessment declined by 4 percentage points.

Measurable Outcome:

If teachers engage in weekly collaborative planning utilizing the district approved resources and materials with fidelity, committed to implementation of daily instructional activity in all classrooms that demonstrates an appropriate level of rigor, then overall proficiency will increase by 4% on the statewide science assessment.

Monitoring:

Administration will meet with the science department chair weekly to monitor the district support and the implementation of planning for and implementation of standards-based lessons across the grade levels. Utilizing formative district assessments embedded in Canvas as well as quarterly benchmark assessments, adjustments to support will be implemented if needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristina Lee (leek1@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will consistently plan and implement daily instructional activities that engage students in cognitively complex tasks (driven by the 5E model), regularly utilize collaborative structures, and monitor for student understanding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

It is a component of our research-based instructional model, one which can be utilized across all skill levels and needs in regards to rigor.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development (embedded into monthly meetings as well as on Early Release Days) designed to help teachers align student tasks to state standards.

Person Responsible

Sylvie Certa (certasy@collierschools.com)

A school-wide focus on Organizing Students to Interact with Content to support increased usage of collaborative structures.

Person Responsible

Kristina Lee (leek1@collierschools.com)

Vertical articulation planning for the Science department (all Science teachers scheduled for common planning with the expectation that bi-weekly teachers meet across grade levels).

Person Responsible

Sylvie Certa (certasy@collierschools.com)

Leveled planning for inclusive of district support (all Science teachers scheduled for common planning with the expectation that teachers with common grade level assignments meet weekly).

Person Responsible

Kristina Lee (leek1@collierschools.com)

Focus on a more intentional use of instructional technology and curricular supports.

Person Responsible Sylvie Certa (certasy@collierschools.com)

Strategically schedule weekly district TSA support for both common planning sessions with teachers and modeling lessons for specific classrooms (based on need).

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of****Focus****Description and Rationale:**

In comparison with SY19, learning gains were lower for the lowest 25% in language arts, which has become a trend we are concerned about. Specifically, in SY21, the gains of the 7th grade lowest 25% were half the gains of the lowest 25% in 6th and 8th grade.

Measurable Outcome:

If instructional activity in classrooms demonstrates an appropriate level of rigor in the 7th grade intensive and regular language arts classes, making the Florida Standards accessible to all students, then the percentage of students in the lowest quartile making gains in 7th grade language arts will increase by at least 10%, positively impacting the overall gains of the lowest 25%.

Monitoring:

Formative assessments and quarterly benchmark assessments will be closely monitored by the Reading Coach and Administration. Additionally, the Reading Coach will be completing a coaching cycle with one teacher that needs support in this area and debriefing with that teacher weekly (in collaboration with Administration).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Brown (browne1@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

On a regular weekly basis as determined by the Read 180 curriculum, the utilization of collaborative structures and rotations should be embedded into planning and implemented in instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

It is a component of our research-based instructional model, one which can be utilized across all skill levels and needs in regards to rigor.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development (embedded into monthly meetings, common planning sessions, and Early Release Days) designed to help teachers align student tasks to state standards.

Person Responsible

Elizabeth Brown (browne1@collierschools.com)

A school-wide focus on Organizing Students to Interact with Content to support increased usage of collaborative structures.

Person Responsible

Meghan Leiti (leitime@collierschools.com)

Focus on a more intentional use of instructional technology and curricular supports in the Read 180 program.

Person Responsible

Elizabeth Brown (browne1@collierschools.com)

Completion of coaching cycle with one teacher needing support.

Person Responsible

Elizabeth Brown (browne1@collierschools.com)

Leveled planning inclusive of the Reading Coach's support to provide professional growth based on appropriate levels of rigor. (ELA teachers that teach similar skill levels are scheduled for common planning with the expectation of weekly collaboration).

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Utilize Read 180 Representatives more strategically by having them work in the classrooms and model structures with teachers in need of more support.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Brown (browne1@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

In comparison with SY19, SY21 learning gains were lower for the lowest 25% in math, which has become a trend we are concerned about. Specifically, in SY21, the gains of the 6th and 7th grade lowest 25% were significantly lower than the gains of the lowest 25% in 8th grade (both FSA Math and Algebra).

Measurable Outcome:

If instructional activity in classrooms demonstrates an appropriate level of rigor, determined by the level of coursework the students are scheduled for (i.e. Intensive, Regular, Advanced, or Cambridge Advanced), making the Florida Standards accessible to all students, then the percentage of students making gains in the lowest quartile will increase by at least 5%.

Monitoring:

Formative assessments and quarterly benchmark assessments will be closely monitored by the Math Coach and Administration. Additionally, the Math Coach will be working alongside the teachers of intensive math classrooms to support and provide scaffolded training in instructional technology and differentiating assignments for students based on data. Mrs. Lee will follow up with the Math Coach on a bi-monthly to discuss training needs and progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristina Lee (leek1@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

On a regular weekly basis as determined by the ALEKS curriculum, the utilization of collaborative structures and rotations to provide differentiated small-group instruction should be embedded into planning and implemented in the intensive portion of the math block.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

It is a component of our research-based instructional model, one which can be utilized across all skill levels and needs in regards to rigor.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development (embedded into monthly meetings, common planning sessions, and Early Release Days) designed to help teachers align student tasks to state standards.

Person Responsible

Marisa Vessella (vessem@collierschools.com)

A school-wide focus on Organizing Students to Interact with Content to support increased usage of collaborative structures.

Person Responsible

Kristina Lee (leek1@collierschools.com)

Leveled planning inclusive of the Math Coach's support to provide professional growth based on appropriate usage of resources and levels of rigor. (Math teachers that teach the same grade levels are scheduled for common planning with the expectation of weekly collaboration).

Person Responsible

Mitchell Kinstler (kinstlmi@collierschools.com)

Focus on a more intentional use of instructional technology and curricular supports in the Reveal and ALEKS program.

Person Responsible Marisa Vessella (vessem@collierschools.com)

Targeted support (provided by the Math Coach) for specific students in the lowest 25% that did not make gains in FY21.

Person Responsible Marisa Vessella (vessem@collierschools.com)

After school home work club opportunities preserved to assist struggling students that need additional tutoring (utilizing both teacher support as well as NJHS tutoring volunteers).

Person Responsible Kristina Lee (leek1@collierschools.com)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Only 33% of our ESE students made gains in Language Arts in SY21. While we did have some staffing changes that may have impacted this data, the virtual instructional model in the first semester of the school year (due to the Pandemic) had the greatest declining impact on this subgroup of students, contributed to learning loss that needs to be addressed in SY22.

Measurable Outcome: If ELA teachers plan for and implement differentiated instruction which targets the specific needs of ESE students in each classroom and work with their grade level Inclusion teachers to make adjustments throughout the year given ongoing formative and summative assessments, then overall ESE student gains will increase by at least 10%.

Monitoring: Formative assessments, Read 180 and System 44 data, and quarterly benchmark assessments will be closely monitored by the Reading Coach and Administration. Additionally, the Reading Coach will be working alongside the ESE Specialist to schedule targeted classroom support where needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Linda Colondres (colonl2@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: The ELA department will be focusing on FTEM element “Using Questions to Help Students Elaborate on Content” to target subskill 3 (Integration of Knowledge and Ideas) which was the lowest performing area from SY21 ELA data overall, an area ESE students need targeted support in.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: It is a component of our research-based instructional model, one which can be utilized across all skill levels and needs in regards to rigor.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development (embedded into monthly meetings, common planning sessions, and Early Release Days) inclusive of both ELA and ESE Inclusion teachers designed to help align student tasks to state standards.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Brown (browne1@collierschools.com)

Focus on a more intentional use of instructional technology and curricular supports in the Read 180 program.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Brown (browne1@collierschools.com)

Leveled planning inclusive of the Reading Coach's support to provide professional growth based on appropriate levels of rigor. (ELA teachers that teach similar skill levels are scheduled for common planning with the expectation of weekly collaboration).

Person Responsible [no one identified]

ESE Inclusion support scheduled by grade level to build teaching partnerships and connections with students.

Person Responsible Linda Colondres (colonl2@collierschools.com)

Connect for Success utilized to build connections between ESE students and their Inclusion teachers.

Person Responsible Mitchell Kinstler (kinstlmi@collierschools.com)

Utilization of District Supports in training new ESE Specialist and building relationships with other similar programs that can help strengthen and guide our ESE services.

Person Responsible Linda Colondres (colonl2@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

N/A

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.

To promote a supportive and fulfilling environment, we begin with the student at the heart of all we do. Prior to even building the master schedule, our guidance department, administration, and instructional staff work to place students appropriately according to multiple data points, student learning style, and support system available to them outside of school. When building the master schedule, these things are all taken into consideration when

assigning teachers their course loads and teaching assignments. Many students are hand-scheduled to ensure that they are appropriately placed into a learning environment that will meet their needs to the best of our ability. With a small school, it is imperative to maximize resources and the scheduling process is an integral part of that.

Building a school culture that values trust, respect, and high expectations starts with school leadership. We work to model these values in all we do. From the way we communicate and treat each other to the goals we set each year, we know that words alone do not facilitate organizational values. They must be modeled, practiced, and a very intentional effort that embodies every part of the school organization.

Each school year, we utilize both survey data as well as the knowledge of our staff, students, and families and the areas currently in need of support or enhancement. We define where we want to be, how we get

there, and the needs that should be taken into consideration along the way (academic, emotional, physical, mental, and social). It is within this context that we set those goals and build a theme for the school year. This year, our theme is to "Be Includers". We have seen the results of the disconnections that the Pandemic created in many areas of our staff and students' lives. We know that in order to move forward, we have to build those connections or strengthen the foundation of the ones that currently exist. Thus, we will work to be a school organization that makes others feel included and valued.

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

- *Building a positive culture starts with leadership. We know that we set the tone for the attitudes, opinions, mindset, and approaches that guide what we do.
- *Our instructional and non-instructional staff have the most direct connections with our students-the reason for our work. It is important to build and maintain commitment among this stakeholder group to providing high quality instructional experiences, meaningful relationships with students, providing a safe and secure environment (socially, emotionally, and physically), and the opportunity for EVERY student to grow and see success.
- *Our students are the purpose for our work. Their weaknesses, needs, and challenges drive our sense of urgency in being the conduit for positive change. Their uniqueness, strengths, gifts, and contributions make our school organization a better place and make us better educators and people. They help us grow in many ways.
- *Our school district creates the map for our journey each year and provides the tools and support we need along the way to get to our destination as well as any aide that is needed when we face detours or challenges at various stops.
- *Our PTO and SAC are not only vital components to building this school culture, but also integral to helping improve our strategies and systems. Allowing each stakeholder (teachers, students, families, volunteers, etc.) to have a voice not only breeds a culture of collective responsibility, but can be a wealth of insight and creativity to help our school grow.
- *Additionally, through CCPS, we have partnerships with other community agencies that assist our students with mental health, financial need, and family support. These agencies allow us to ensure we are addressing the needs of the whole student and setting them up for success in all areas.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00