



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Corner Lake Middle

1700 CHULUOTA RD, Orlando, FL 32820

<https://cornerlakems.ocps.net/>

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## 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 Department 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.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

**School Leadership Team**

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Browning, Paul	Principal	<p>Instructional leader</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring standards-based instruction across all content areas</li> <li>• Providing coaching and professional development of best practices</li> <li>• Equipping teachers to utilize student performance data to increase achievement</li> <li>• Working to develop strong and effective PLCs</li> <li>• Supporting a strong focus on learning and achievement</li> <li>• Creating a culture that holds all stakeholders responsible for student learning</li> <li>• Developing systems of support and intervention that meet the needs of every student</li> </ul> <p>Engagement of stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing strong and effective teams founded upon clear communication</li> <li>• Regularly soliciting feedback and input from stakeholders</li> <li>• Creating an environment where stakeholders feel free to communicate concerns, offer feedback, and provide suggestions</li> <li>• Instilling a deep-held belief among all stakeholders that every voice matters</li> <li>• Helping stakeholders understand that collaboration leads to making the best decisions for students</li> </ul> <p>Collaborative Decision-making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing strong and effective teams founded upon clear communication</li> <li>• Regularly soliciting feedback and input from stakeholders</li> <li>• Creating an environment where stakeholders feel free to communicate concerns, offer feedback, and provide suggestions</li> <li>• Instilling a deep-held belief among all stakeholders that every voice matters</li> <li>• Helping stakeholders understand that collaboration leads to making the best decisions for students</li> </ul>
Hyser, Katie	Assistant Principal	<p>Instructional leader</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring standards-based instruction across all content areas</li> <li>• Providing coaching and professional development of best practices</li> <li>• Equipping teachers to utilize student performance data to increase achievement</li> <li>• Working to develop strong and effective PLCs</li> <li>• Supporting a strong focus on learning and achievement</li> <li>• Creating a culture that holds all stakeholders responsible for student learning</li> <li>• Developing systems of support and intervention that meet the needs of every student</li> </ul> <p>Engagement of stakeholders</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing strong and effective teams founded upon clear communication</li> <li>• Regularly soliciting feedback and input from stakeholders</li> <li>• Creating an environment where stakeholders feel free to communicate concerns, offer feedback, and provide suggestions</li> <li>• Instilling a deep-held belief among all stakeholders that every voice matters</li> <li>• Helping stakeholders understand that collaboration leads to making the best decisions for students</li> </ul> <p>Collaborative Decision-making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing strong and effective teams founded upon clear communication</li> <li>• Regularly soliciting feedback and input from stakeholders</li> <li>• Creating an environment where stakeholders feel free to communicate concerns, offer feedback, and provide suggestions</li> <li>• Instilling a deep-held belief among all stakeholders that every voice matters</li> <li>• Helping stakeholders understand that collaboration leads to making the best decisions for students</li> </ul>
		<p>Instructional leader</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring standards-based instruction across all content areas</li> <li>• Providing coaching and professional development of best practices</li> <li>• Equipping teachers to utilize student performance data to increase achievement</li> <li>• Working to develop strong and effective PLCs</li> <li>• Supporting a strong focus on learning and achievement</li> <li>• Creating a culture that holds all stakeholders responsible for student learning</li> <li>• Developing systems of support and intervention that meet the needs of every student</li> </ul>
<p>Concannon, Adam</p>	<p>Assistant Principal</p>	<p>Engagement of stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing strong and effective teams founded upon clear communication</li> <li>• Regularly soliciting feedback and input from stakeholders</li> <li>• Creating an environment where stakeholders feel free to communicate concerns, offer feedback, and provide suggestions</li> <li>• Instilling a deep-held belief among all stakeholders that every voice matters</li> <li>• Helping stakeholders understand that collaboration leads to making the best decisions for students</li> </ul> <p>Collaborative Decision-making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing strong and effective teams founded upon clear</li> </ul>



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regularly soliciting feedback and input from stakeholders</li> <li>• Creating an environment where stakeholders feel free to communicate concerns, offer feedback, and provide suggestions</li> <li>• Instilling a deep-held belief among all stakeholders that every voice matters</li> <li>• Helping stakeholders understand that collaboration leads to making the best decisions for students</li> </ul>
Davidson, Terri	Instructional Coach	<p>Instructional Leader</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinate the NEST (New Eagle Starting Teacher) Induction Program for teachers who are new to Corner Lake MS as well as those who are new to the teaching profession</li> <li>• Assist new teachers with completing the requirements for their professional certificates</li> <li>• Coach specific new and veteran teachers on classroom management, student engagement, pedagogy, developing instructional plans, modeling of lessons, preparing their Deliberate Practice plans</li> <li>• Provide support for all teachers and any instructional need</li> </ul> <p>Engaging Stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assist with engaging stakeholders by attending events and various meetings</li> </ul> <p>Decision Making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attends SAC meetings and leadership meetings. and collaborate in decision-making for the school</li> <li>• Maintain open communication with the staff and based on concerns and suggestions, assist the leadership team to effect changes</li> </ul>
Young, Roderick	School Counselor	<p>Instructional Leader</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in leadership meetings to review data and make informed decisions regarding students, events, policies, as well as social-emotional instruction and events</li> </ul> <p>Engagement of Stakeholder</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in the PTSA and SAC meetings and work with, local restaurants, and families for student celebrations throughout the school year</li> <li>• Also work with feeder school principals, school board members, and a local community organization in preparation for the Evening of Excellence celebration</li> </ul> <p>Decision Making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborate with teachers, administrators, deans, families, and students to make decisions on best academic placement and support for students</li> <li>• Collaborate with students, families, and counseling agencies to provide mental health services</li> <li>• Work with the school SAFE counselor and social worker to provide families and students with services needed</li> </ul>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Thenn, Kimbra	Staffing Specialist	Instructional Leader <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide information to the staff on ESE strategies and accommodations</li> </ul> Engagement of Stakeholder <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborate with teachers, students, parents, and other stakeholders to write IEPs that provide appropriate services to meet the individual needs of the students</li> </ul> Decision Making <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involved in the various decisions regarding the ESE population such as curriculum and safety</li> <li>• Communicate with team members and help resolve issues and clarify information on an as-needed basis</li> </ul>
Ramos, Myrna	Dean	Instructional leader <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor and implement a behavior management system that is grounded by the student code of conduct and restorative practices to help ensure that infractions are teachable moments</li> </ul> Engagement of stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicate clearly and in a timely fashion, both verbally and in writing, with students, parents, and appropriate school staff regarding any disciplinary event or consequence</li> </ul> Collaborative Decision-making <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participate as a member of the school leadership team and work closely with school counselors, coaches, administrators, and the school resource officer on disciplinary events and restorative practices</li> </ul>
Powell, William	Dean	Instructional leader <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor and implement a behavior management system that is grounded by the student code of conduct and restorative practices to help ensure that infractions are teachable moments</li> </ul> Engagement of stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicate clearly and in a timely fashion, both verbally and in writing, with students, parents, and appropriate school staff regarding any disciplinary event or consequence</li> </ul> Collaborative Decision-making <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participate as a member of the school leadership team and work closely with school counselors, coaches, administrators, and the school resource officer on disciplinary events and restorative practices</li> </ul>

**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school has an active School Advisory Council (SAC) that meets regularly to discuss school needs, review data, discuss goals and action plan items, and monitor progress toward goals. The School Advisory Council is made up of the principal, teachers, classified personnel, parents, students, and community members.

**SIP Monitoring**

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SAC will regularly review data to monitor progress toward the SIP goals. The leadership team will also engage in an ongoing review of data including common assessments, state assessments, intervention data, and Panorama data to track progress toward goals. When it is necessary, the leadership team will make adjustments to the plan to ensure continuous improvement. These adjustments will be shared with the SAC during meetings.

**Demographic Data**  
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	68%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	95%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	

<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>
--

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	83	109	243
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	83	65	162
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	45	69
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	86	98	228
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	60	67	189
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	96	108	259

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:**

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	67	73	210
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	42	49	124
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	51	36	113
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	54	73	177
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	94	90	269
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	94	85	262
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	101	107	304

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	67	73	210
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	42	49	124
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	51	36	113
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	54	73	177
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	94	90	269
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	94	85	262
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	101	107	304

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	46	48	49	49	49	50	48		
ELA Learning Gains				45			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			26		
Math Achievement*	56	57	56	51	36	36	44		
Math Learning Gains				59			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			27		
Science Achievement*	49	53	49	56	55	53	46		
Social Studies Achievement*	57	64	68	65	61	58	62		
Middle School Acceleration	89	77	73	85	52	49	54		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	36	43	40	40	79	76	35		

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	333
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	537
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	4	1
ELL	30	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	58			
HSP	48			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	67			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	44			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	3	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	56			
HSP	50			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	47			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	46			56			49	57	89			36
SWD	17			25			25	40			4	
ELL	23			32			27	30			5	36
AMI												
ASN	80			89				83	91		4	
BLK	41			59			47	50	93		5	
HSP	38			44			40	45	86		6	36
MUL	54			71				80			3	



2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	54			67			55	69	90		5	
FRL	36			44			35	45	86		6	20

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	49	45	33	51	59	54	56	65	85			40
SWD	16	31	32	27	59	64	24	36				
ELL	26	35	29	30	55	57	31	44	73			40
AMI												
ASN	77	71		87	77				80			
BLK	47	44	20	51	64	44	58	76	100			
HSP	40	43	36	39	55	54	49	58	84			38
MUL	46	33		63	59							
PAC												
WHT	57	44	28	60	60	56	58	67	83			
FRL	36	38	33	36	51	50	43	55	85			38

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	48	41	26	44	32	27	46	62	54			35
SWD	19	27	25	25	26	12	24	41				
ELL	28	27	15	30	28	26	10	46				35
AMI												
ASN	81	38		86	44		64					
BLK	41	40	26	36	32	25	50	59	58			
HSP	43	43	24	36	31	25	38	56	41			35
MUL	63	39		58	22							
PAC												
WHT	52	40	26	50	34	27	51	68	60			
FRL	36	34	20	30	28	26	34	47	36			46

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	44%	45%	-1%	47%	-3%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	46%	1%	47%	0%
06	2023 - Spring	39%	44%	-5%	47%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	52%	53%	-1%	54%	-2%
07	2023 - Spring	29%	38%	-9%	48%	-19%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	58%	1%	55%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	46%	50%	-4%	44%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	47%	45%	50%	42%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	45%	49%	48%	46%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	66%	-10%

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 had the lowest performance in the 2022-2023 school year was math. The overall proficiency for the math FAST assessment was 44%. This does not include students who took the Algebra 1 or Geometry EOCs. Contributing factors for this performance include the need for additional support for common planning, standards-aligned instruction, data-driven interventions, and support for pedagogy and implementation of curriculum resource materials.

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

Science was the component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year (56% proficient to 46% proficient). Both 8th-grade science teachers last year were new to the school and one was new to the profession. This year, there is a new team in place and the teachers are attending IMPACT sessions to support their understanding of delivering standard-aligned instruction and using data to drive instruction. There is a need for continued support with common planning.

**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.**

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 7th grade math achievement. The overall achievement for the state was 48% and the overall achievement for Corner Lake was 29%. The main factor for this gap is that the students who were enrolled in 7th grade accelerated math took the 8th grade FAST test, so only the students taking 7th grade math counted in this data component for 7th grade.

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

There were drops in all data components in the 22-23 school year when compared to the 21-22 school year. The smallest area of decline was in ELA, which dropped one point from the previous school year. During the 22-23 school year, the ELA team focussed on delivering instruction that aligned to the new BEST Standards and Benchmarks. Additionally, teachers collaboratively examined data and planned purposeful interventions and scaffolds to support students in developing proficiency on the new standards.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

The greatest areas of concern based on the analysis of the Early Warning Systems indicators are the number of students scoring at Level 1 on the math (189 students) and ELA assessments (228 students), the number of students absent 10% or more days (243 students), and the number of students with one or more suspensions (162 students).

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

1. ELA achievement
2. Math achievement
3. Achievement of students with disabilities
4. Positive culture and environment

**Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Overall ELA proficiency was 48% on the FAST PM3 Assessment, which was a decline of 1% from the 2021-2022 administration of the FSA ELA test.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase the achievement of all students in English Language Arts from 48% on the 2023 FAST ELA PM3 administration to 51% on the 2024 FAST ELA PM3 administration.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The administrative team will meet regularly with ELA collaborative teams to review data on common assessments and FAST assessments (PM1, PM2, PM3). This data will be monitored and used to make adjustments to instructional delivery, to identify students for reteaching and remediation, and to make adjustments to the action plan as needed to support progress toward the goal. The data from Standards-Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) will also be used to monitor students' understanding of course content and to drive instructional decision-making.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Katie Hyser (katie.hyser@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is the use of collaborative planning to support standards-aligned instruction. Additionally, data-informed planning will be used to identify students needing intervention.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective collaborative planning and data-informed interventions will support teachers in delivering standards-aligned instruction and providing remediation and reteach opportunities to identified students based on their unique learning needs.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

Weekly collaborative team meetings that focus on standards-aligned instruction

**Person Responsible:** Katie Hyser (katie.hyser@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year

Ongoing data analysis to drive instruction - Teacher data chats with leadership team, data chats with students

**Person Responsible:** Katie Hyser (katie.hyser@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing, Quarterly data chats after PM administrations

Purposeful, data-driven interventions including the use of teacher-led small groups and individual and small group interventions based on identified student needs.

**Person Responsible:** Katie Hyser (katie.hyser@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing, adjustments to targeted interventions after each common assessment.

Classroom walkthroughs with coaching and actionable feedback, including standards alignment, engagement, processing and monitoring, and classroom climate and culture

**Person Responsible:** Katie Hyser (katie.hyser@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing, weekly feedback to teachers and collaborative teams

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Math proficiency was 44% on the FAST PM3 Assessment, which was a decline of 7% from the 2021-2022 administration of the FSA Math test.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase the achievement of students in math from 44% on the 2023 FAST Math PM3 administration to 49% on the 2024 FAST Math PM3 administration.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The administrative team will meet regularly with Math collaborative teams to review data on common assessments including Standards-Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) and FAST assessments (PM1, PM2, PM3). This data will be monitored and used to make adjustments to instructional delivery, to identify students for reteaching and remediation, and to make adjustments to the action plan as needed to support progress toward the goal.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Paul Browning (paul.browning@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is the use of collaborative planning to support standards-aligned instruction. Additionally, data-informed planning will be used to identify students needing intervention.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective collaborative planning and data-informed interventions will support teachers in delivering standards-aligned instruction and providing remediation and reteach opportunities to identified students based on their unique learning needs.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

Weekly collaborative team meetings that focus on standards-aligned instruction

**Person Responsible:** Paul Browning (paul.browning@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year

Ongoing data analysis to drive instruction - Teacher data chats with leadership team, data chats with students

**Person Responsible:** Paul Browning (paul.browning@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing, quarterly data chats after PM administrations

Purposeful, data-driven interventions including the use of teacher-led small groups and individual and small group interventions based on identified student needs.

**Person Responsible:** Paul Browning (paul.browning@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing adjustments to targeted interventions after each common assessment.

Classroom walkthroughs with coaching and actionable feedback, including standards alignment, engagement, processing and monitoring, and classroom climate and culture.

**Person Responsible:** Paul Browning (paul.browning@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing, weekly feedback to teachers and collaborative teams.



### #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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus is to improve the proficiency of students with disabilities in ELA and math. The rationale for selecting this area of focus is that our students with disabilities continue to perform below other students and other subgroups. In ELA in the 2022-2023 school year, 11% of students with disabilities were proficient on the FAST ELA assessment, compared to 48% of students overall. In math, 19% of students with disabilities were proficient, compared to 58% of students overall in math.

#### Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The specific measurable outcome that is planned for improvement is an increase in ELA achievement for students with disabilities from the 2023 FAST ELA PM 3 assessment (11%) to 15% on the PM3 state assessment in 2024 and an increase in math achievement for students with disabilities from the 2023 FAST Math PM3 and EOC assessments from 19% to 23% on the 2024 administration of the state math assessments (FAST and EOCs).

#### Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through common assessments and PM1 and PM2 state assessments. The staffing specialist will also monitor the implementation of appropriate accommodations. The behavior specialist will also support classroom teachers with the implementation of accommodations and work with students to improve classroom behaviors that could negatively impact the achievement of students with disabilities. Learning Strategies teachers engage in data chats with students with disabilities and adjust support as needed to help students increase achievement.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adam Concannon (adam.concannon@ocps.net)

#### Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is the use of collaborative planning to support standards-aligned instruction. Additionally, data-informed planning will be used to identify students needing intervention. Scaffolded instruction and interventions for students with disabilities will be planned and implemented with fidelity. ESE teachers will work with ELA and math teachers to provide additional support.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective collaborative planning and data-informed interventions will support teachers in delivering standards-aligned instruction and providing remediation and reteach opportunities to identified students based on their unique learning needs. Appropriate scaffolds and accommodations will help students with disabilities access the content and develop skills relating to the standards.

#### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

#### Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

**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.

Collaborative team meetings that focus on standards-aligned instruction

**Person Responsible:** Adam Concannon (adam.concannon@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year

Ongoing data analysis to guide instruction

**Person Responsible:** Adam Concannon (adam.concannon@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing, after each common assessment

Purposeful, data-driven interventions in the core classes and through Learning Strategies

**Person Responsible:** Adam Concannon (adam.concannon@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing, adjusted after each common assessment to meet students' needs

Classroom walkthroughs with coaching and actionable feedback, including standards alignment, engagement, processing and monitoring, implementation of accommodations, and classroom climate and culture

**Person Responsible:** Adam Concannon (adam.concannon@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing, weekly feedback to teachers and collaborative teams

The behavior specialist will work with teachers and students to reduce barriers for students that may impact achievement

**Person Responsible:** jeffrey davidson (jeffrey.davidson@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing, regular support for identified students

#### #4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

##### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Attendance is critical to academic success. In the 2022-2023 school year, 243 students missed 10% or more of school days. Additionally, 162 students and one or more suspensions. Based on this data, an area of focus will be on creating a positive culture and environment that results in increased attendance and fewer suspensions.

##### Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The measure outcomes for this area of focus include a reduction in the number of students who miss 10% or more of school days from 243 students to 200 students and a reduction in the number of students with one or more suspensions from 162 to 140.

##### Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The monitor this area of focus, attendance and discipline data will be analyzed regularly.

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adam Concannon (adam.concannon@ocps.net)

##### Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Corner Lake Middle School will implement a school-wide PBIS system to improve school culture. Additionally, the leadership team will regularly monitor student attendance and will implement the truancy process with fidelity when needed.

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Improved school culture through the implementation of the school-wide PBIS program should lead to reduced suspensions. Ongoing communication with parents and students about attendance issues and fidelity of implementation of the truancy process should reduce the overall number of students missing 10% or more of school days.

##### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

##### Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

##### 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.

Implementation of the school-wide PBIS program

**Person Responsible:** Adam Concannon (adam.concannon@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the school year

Regular meetings with leadership team, attendance clerk, and social worker to review attendance data and carry out truancy processes

**Person Responsible:** Katie Hyser (katie.hyser@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing, bi-weekly meetings

Discipline team implements progressive discipline and engages in ongoing communication with students and parents about behavior expectations, the OCPS Code of Student Conduct, and possible consequences

**Person Responsible:** Adam Concannon (adam.concannon@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing, including regularly reviews of the Code of Student Conduct with students throughout the year.

### **CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The budget is reviewed to ensure that allocations for supporting students with disabilities are used appropriately to meet students' needs. We review student to teacher ratios and examine IEPs to determine if there are appropriate numbers of teachers and paraprofessionals. Adjustments are made as appropriate based on funding and adult/student ratios. Allocations are discussed and reviewed with district ESE personnel and district budget personnel.