Collier County Public Schools

Corkscrew Middle School

2022-23 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: 7/11/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (64%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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.](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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	82%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pierre-Peacock, Rania	Principal	Provides 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.
Wannop, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	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.
Vollrath, Adam	Assistant Principal	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	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	Fosters the academic development of students and assists them to successfully complete the curriculum. Provides support, counseling, and strategies to help students with their social, emotional, and academic learning.
McMillin, Brittany	Teacher, ESE	Facilitate and coach ESE teachers through the development and implementation of functional behavior assessments/behavior intervention plans and crisis plans for identified students. Collaborate with school personnel, agencies, and families in coordinating individualized ESE services for students.
Resemius, Elise	Instructional Coach	Provides ongoing, job-embedded training and support for Math teachers in the school to build their capacity and effectiveness as math teachers. Provides support for struggling students to include Tier 3 interventions. She mentors new teachers and shares best practices with the math department.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/11/2022, Rania Pierre Peacock

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

43

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

954

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	311	299	344	0	0	0	0	954
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	45	48	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	60	76	0	0	0	0	163
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	77	57	0	0	0	0	138
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	57	96	0	0	0	0	158
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	52	77	0	0	0	0	169
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	39	51	0	0	0	0	128
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	52	77	0	0	0	0	169

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	29	80	98	0	0	0	0	207

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/10/2022

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	271	310	343	0	0	0	0	924
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	36	56	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	61	99	0	0	0	0	175
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	59	62	0	0	0	0	123
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	43	81	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	53	73	0	0	0	0	143
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	26	53	0	0	0	0	103
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	15	60	92	0	0	0	0	167

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

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	271	310	343	0	0	0	0	924
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	36	56	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	61	99	0	0	0	0	175
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	59	62	0	0	0	0	123
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	43	81	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	53	73	0	0	0	0	143
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	26	53	0	0	0	0	103
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	15	60	92	0	0	0	0	167

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	58%	55%	50%				62%	59%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						57%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%						43%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	73%	34%	36%				69%	69%	58%
Math Learning Gains	70%						59%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%						53%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	67%	53%				63%	55%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	64%	58%				74%	75%	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	2022					
	2019	57%	56%	1%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	52%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
08	2022					
	2019	66%	58%	8%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	61%	61%	0%	55%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	69%	66%	3%	54%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
08	2022					
	2019	38%	36%	2%	46%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	63%	52%	11%	48%	15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	72%	72%	0%	71%	1%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	92%	67%	25%	61%	31%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	59%	-59%	57%	-57%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	17	29	26	40	57	53	18	54	57		
ELL	33	36	32	64	66	81	28	59	81		
BLK	42	48	42	59	64	68	37	72	67		
HSP	55	46	30	73	70	66	55	80	87		
MUL	63	60		81	73						
WHT	66	55	31	76	73	67	64	80	85		
FRL	50	44	30	67	68	66	48	76	83		
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	22	36	33	43	48	51	25	32	62		
ELL	42	50	41	56	47	51	38	53	44		
BLK	51	51	39	56	47	52	53	46	78		

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
HSP	57	58	35	66	56	53	54	65	75		
MUL	68	75		68	44						
WHT	63	53	28	74	59	44	71	69	76		
FRL	52	51	34	62	53	48	49	56	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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	573
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	69
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	66
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	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Trends- 6th grade ELA decrease in proficiency compared to FY21 FSA
Subgroups- ESE 9%, ELL 33%, Cam 94%, L25%-12%
Math- 6th grade increase in proficiency compared to FY21 FSA, met gains in all subgroups. Most gains in L25%- 29% increase in comparative gains, FY21- 7% compared to 49% FY22

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA- 6th grade focus on L1/L2 students, 43% L1/L2, 37%- L4/L5 -7% decrease in cohort data
ESE focus in 6th, 7th, 8th
ELA -6th IBI- 1/6 students proficient, Math-6th IBI- 0/4 proficient
8th ELA- ELL (45% L1/L2)
In ELL students who are in regular classes saw a significant decrease to level 1 or 2.
Math- 6th 7th ESE subgroup, 8th ELL and Cambridge subgroups
Algebra- ESE subgroup
Science- ELL subgroup (Subskill 1- Understanding Science Explanations), 3-year trend data decreasing each year

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

ELA- 6th graders- many had gaps in learning due to virtual learning/Covid protocols
2 New ELA Teachers (Both in intensive ELA), 1 LTS (42% proficient)
8th ELA- New Teacher- 15% proficient, 73% L1/L2

What new actions need to be taken to address this need?
ESE support from co-teacher during instruction
Small group rotations during Read 180/math intensive classes
MTSS review- consistent follow up to identify those students who need additional support Science- ELL tutor (new this year) will need training on best strategies
Focus on vocabulary, Wig goals, New standards Breakdown

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

6th grade Cambridge
7th ELA – ELL (LF- 33% proficient compared to 25% FY21)
8th ELA- Cambridge- 100% proficiency
Civics proficiency- 79% proficiency. Most gains in 3 years/ELL 23% increase in proficiency (54% FY22)
from (31% FY21)/All subgroups and Levels 3,4, and 5 increased from FY21 to FY22
Science- Cambridge subgroup proficiency
6th Math, proficiency and gains in all subgroups
Algebra/Geometry proficiency

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

Common planning for Civics Teachers, addition of experienced Civics Teacher to CMS, another year of experience for 2nd year teacher
Reading coach support of 3 LTS, 4 new teachers
Math coach support for new (1-2yr) teachers, 2 LTS
Reading coach worked with specific bubble students to help increase achievement
Veteran Algebra Teacher

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

Consistent review of quarter benchmark data during PLC's
Academic Coaches will model various instructional strategies such as small group rotations and Keagan strategies that will increase student achievement
Teachers will use FAST data to analyze student performance on quarterly benchmarks

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.

Professional Development will be focused on increasing the use of engagement strategies during instruction.
Trainings focused on unpacking the BEST standards will be provided for all teachers.

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

Support for lowest 25% students to include Student Success Plan monitoring and MTSS review.
Afterschool program provided for students for enrichment and remediation in core content areas.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on CMS student performance on the FY22 ELA FSA, students were not consistently engaged in literacy instruction. Based on the FY22 FTEM data CMS ELA teachers were inconsistent in the use of engagement strategies during instruction.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By June of 2023, 60% of all students will demonstrate proficiency on the FY23 FAST ELA assessment by implementing evidence-based engagement strategies during instruction.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	At the start of the school year, The Reading Coach and Administration will review FY22 ELA FAST performance data and discuss strengths and areas of concern. Based on these areas of concern the new ELA curriculum will be used to target focus to bridge the gaps for student proficiency During Faculty Meetings and Early Release Days Professional Development will be provided on the use of evidence-based engagement strategies such as scaffolding and explicit, systemic instruction practices. Administration will also monitor the use of engagement strategies through classroom observations and lesson planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rania Pierre-Peacock (pierrr@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	This year the focus will be on implementing evidence-based engagement strategies such as scaffolding and small group instruction. Constant monitoring of student progress through PLC collaboration and consistent data chats with students. The Principal and Academic Coaches will monitor grade-level planning and collaboration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Research shows engagement is correlated with academic success and increase in student participation. When students are engaged, they are motivated. and learning happens more easily. Based on the FY22 FTEM data CMS ELA and math teachers were inconsistent in the use of engagement strategies during instruction.

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

Teachers will analyze student assessment data from the FAST adaptive testing categories quarterly. Teachers will target specific areas such as vocabulary and basic math facts.

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

The Literacy Coach will provide monthly and morning professional development focused on specific engagement strategies (Ex. Keagan strategies, academic games, Socrative Seminar) to provide guidance on how to effectively during instruction.

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

Weekly PLC collaboration with all grade levels focused on teaching the tested BEST standards and consistent use of StudySync, Read180 and No Red Ink (District resources) to provide instruction aligned to the BEST (Benchmarks Excellent Student Thinking) standards.

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

Weekly focus on assessed writing standards to improve students' writing of Argumentative and Expository essays aligned to the new benchmarks and rubrics.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on CMS student performance on the FY22 Math FSA, students were not consistently engaged in math instruction. Based on the FY22 FTEM data CMS Math teachers were inconsistent in the use of engagement strategies during instruction.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By June of 2023, 60% of the students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate proficiency on the FY23 FAST Math by implementing evidence-based engagement strategies during instruction.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The administration will monitor and evaluate teaching and learning through Instructional rounds. During PLC collaboration teachers will discuss which engagement strategies are best for teaching or reviewing the standards. Teachers will focus on multiplication fact fluency weekly to build a strong math fact foundation for all students. Grade level teams will review 2 common standards/skills each week until students have met the standard 80% of the time. Teachers will analyze common assessment data in PLCs and identify students who need additional support. During PLC meetings and early release days the Math Coach will provide professional development on incorporating hands on math learning experiences. To include facilitating opportunities for partner and small group instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rania Pierre-Peacock (pierrr@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	This year the focus will be on the use of effective engagement strategies to teach math instruction. These strategies include incorporating hands on math learning experiences. Along with facilitating opportunities for partner and small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Research shows engagement is correlated with academic success and increase in student participation. When students are engaged, they are motivated. and learning happens more easily. Based on the FY22 FTEM data CMS Math teachers were inconsistent in the use of engagement strategies during instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

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

All math teachers will participate in PLC by grade level and collaboratively plan on a consistent basis to ensure pacing and standards alignment. Teachers will submit a monthly PLC collaboration document that will summarize the notes of each PLC meeting.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Wannop (wannops1@collierschools.com)

Provide Professional Development that will focus on strategies to engage students in math. Specifically using
academic games and collaboration strategies.

Person Responsible   Elise Resemius (reseme@collierschools.com)

The math coach will introduce monthly engagement strategies that will support small group instruction and peer collaboration focused on the new BEST standards.

Person Responsible   Elise Resemius (reseme@collierschools.com)

Consistent use of common assessments for each grade level.

Person Responsible   Stephanie Wannop (wannops1@collierschools.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Based on FY22 FSA data, the ESE subgroup has decreased in proficiency in both ELA and Math. In math students in the ESE subgroup overall performance decreased as compared to FY21. Overall in 6th grade-64% proficient, 7th grade- 60% proficient and 8th grade- 49% proficient. FY22-SWD – 39% Fed Index
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Students in the ESE subgroup will increase in ELA proficiency by 5%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	During Faculty Meetings and Early Release Days Professional Development will be provided on the use of evidence-based engagement strategies such as scaffolding and explicit, systemic instruction practices. Administration will also monitor the use of engagement strategies through classroom observations and lesson planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Wannop (wannops1@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	This year the focus will be on implementing evidence-based engagement strategies such as scaffolding and explicit, systemic instruction practices. Constant monitoring of student progress through PLC collaboration and consistent data chats with students. The Principal and Academic Coaches will monitor grade-level planning and collaboration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Research shows engagement is correlated with academic success and increase in student participation. When students are engaged, they are motivated and learning happens more easily. Based on the FY22 FTEM data CMS ELA teachers were inconsistent in the use of engagement strategies during instruction.

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

Consistent use of common assessments in ELA for each grade level.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Wannop (wannops1@collierschools.com)

ESE co-teachers will plan and collaborate with general ed teachers weekly to ensure ESE students receive differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Wannop (wannops1@collierschools.com)

Provide professional development that will focus on strategies to engage ESE students in ELA. Specifically using small grouping, academic games and collaboration strategies.

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

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Corkscrew Middle School will build a positive school culture and environment by establishing school norms that build values and set consistent discipline. This year CMS will focus on building our Student and Staff Lighthouse Team. The purpose of the Lighthouse Team is to promote The Leader in Me model inside the school so that it stays strong and vibrant year after year. The CMS Lighthouse Teams will coordinate the school-wide work needed to achieve and maintain Lighthouse status. At CMS our students, staff, and stakeholders are always working toward building positive strong relationships with our students and teachers. Throughout the year we invite our families to campus for SAC, PTA, curriculum night and other parent engagement events. During the Connect for Success period, we teach our students essential social skills needed to be productive students. Our staff are role models who serve as teachers and coaches who encourage our students both academically and athletically.
Throughout the year, various events will be held to celebrate the various cultural and diverse student groups in our building. Most importantly all staff and students will model the positive behaviors we want to see at CMS.

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

The stakeholders are teachers, parents, and community members. Our staff serve on either the Academic, Leadership or Culture committee. The Academic committee is focused on school, team and staff goals that will empower instruction. The Leadership committee is focused on teaching leadership principles through professional learning and student learning. The culture committee creates a leadership culture that helps students and staff find their voice to shape their school culture. Together these committees work to promote student belonging and student partnership in shared decision making.