

Collier County Public Schools

Corkscrew Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Corkscrew Elementary School

1065 COUNTY ROAD 858, Naples, FL 34120

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Merhar

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	46%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To create a collaborative learning community that inspires success through high-quality, data-driven instruction, purposeful learning, and amazingly positive experiences for all stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To foster a learning community where students will engage in experiences that develop self-confidence and a love of learning resulting in respectful and responsible citizens.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Merhar, Rebecca	Principal	School leaders attend weekly common planning with grade level teams, review weekly lesson plans, observe classroom instruction, monitor the implementation of the curriculum, and develop schedules to ensure a safe and orderly learning environment. School leaders meet regularly with teachers to discuss their ideas regarding data-driven instructional decisions and school operations through common planning meetings, Grade level monthly Data Chat meetings, the Faculty Advisory Council and the School Improvement Plan (SIP) teams. Additionally, school leaders meet informally with teachers quarterly for Teacher Data Dialogues to discuss student growth and achievement and adjustment of instructional strategies within the classroom. The Administration team meets monthly with the School Advisory Council to update and inform them of school operations and school supported instructional strategies that support the School Improvement Plan.
Caseres, Maryann	Assistant Principal	
Fialko, Sue	Other	
Lyberg, Dan	Guidance Counselor	
McCosh, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/24/2020, Rebecca Merhar

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.*

1

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	46%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	88	107	105	114	116	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	5	4	3	5	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/24/2020

Prior Year - 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	105	114	111	108	106	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	654
Attendance below 90 percent	8	13	7	12	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	1	11	3	8	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	4	2	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	3	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	105	114	111	108	106	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	654
Attendance below 90 percent	8	13	7	12	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	1	11	3	8	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	4	2	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	3	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	77%	60%	57%	77%	61%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	59%	58%	64%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	51%	53%	52%	54%	48%
Math Achievement	81%	68%	63%	81%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains	72%	64%	62%	70%	65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	55%	51%	42%	55%	47%
Science Achievement	75%	59%	53%	76%	60%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	81%	61%	20%	58%	23%
	2018	77%	59%	18%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	58%	15%	58%	15%
	2018	73%	60%	13%	56%	17%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	74%	60%	14%	56%	18%
	2018	74%	59%	15%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	89%	68%	21%	62%	27%
	2018	87%	67%	20%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	65%	12%	64%	13%
	2018	75%	67%	8%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	75%	67%	8%	60%	15%
	2018	75%	68%	7%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	56%	17%	53%	20%
	2018	72%	58%	14%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	57	59	62	57	63	35	55				
ELL	55	63	63	68	70	31	50				
BLK	65	91		53	55						
HSP	70	62	55	74	71	41	65				
WHT	85	70	63	89	77	56	88				
FRL	65	65	63	68	63	25	64				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	55	50	50	65	58	36	31				
ELL	38	53	50	54	29	33					
BLK	70			80							
HSP	71	68	59	71	58	30	63				
WHT	81	60	45	89	81	67	86				
FRL	70	64	50	74	59	32	67				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	544
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	66
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	64
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	75
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	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our lowest 25% in Math performed the lowest for FY19. Data trends indicates that this subgroup has remained at or below 42% since FY 16. The contributing factor is the lack of student mastery of foundational math facts students need to know in order to apply to math problem solving.

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

Our third grade FY18 to fourth grade FY19 proficiency in math cohort data had the greatest decline from 87% proficient in FY18 to 77% proficient in FY19. This decline in third grade is contributed to not allocating time throughout the school day to provide tiered math interventions.

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.

In FY 18 our lowest 25% had the largest gap compared to the state of 5% with CES at 42% and the State at 47%. In FY 19, our lowest 25% had our largest gap when compared to the state average at a 9% difference (CES 42% State 51%). Since FY16, our lowest 25% has scored at or below 42%. Data trends indicate that supports are needed in Tier 2 and 3 interventions to prevent our lowest 25% from remaining stagnant. These students are in our Core Classrooms with only one teacher and without designated time throughout the day for Tier 3 math interventions. The contributing factors for this data could be the systems in place in the core classrooms for math instruction; one example being carving out time for math supports and strengthening Tier 1 instruction to include identifying the skills needed to master the standard, and to provide supports for our teachers in understanding the standard during planning.

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

ELA Lowest 25% increased from by 7% (FY19 59% FY18 52%) this is also 6% higher than the state average. Our ELA Learning Gains also increased by 4% and we attribute these increases to many actions including tracking Standards Mastery, and weekly i-Ready minutes and proficiency data and reviewing it weekly by all staff members. Administration sent weekly emails to teachers to deliver teacher specific i- Ready data so teachers could track their student's proficiency and usage. Students set i-Ready goals each quarter and also monitored and updated their data using their data binders to track and share.

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

A potential area of concern is that we have 9 students in third grade that have attendance below 90% for FY20. We also have 2 students in second grade that have two early warning indicators. In addition, we have 2 students that have a level 1 in math and ELA.

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

1. Math Lowest 25%
2. Science Achievement
3. ELA Lowest 25%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Carving out time in the schedule to provide support for students identified as needing tiered intervention to fill in learning gaps in math and Increase math achievement with our students who perform in the lowest 25%. Trend data indicates our Lowest 25% students are not making gains. In FY16, 18, and 19 only 42% of these students made gains, while in FY17 this percentage was only 39%.

Measureable Outcome: If students are provided differentiated instruction to meet their specific area of need, then by the end of the year, our lowest 25% math students will make gains by at least 3%, increasing from 42% to 45%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Restructuring morning core class intervention time to include two days of math tiered intervention to address student needs including utilizing interactive math notebooks through the gradual release model. Teachers will model note-taking that integrates strategy identifying critical content, step by step application of math concept, summarizing, and revising knowledge needed in mastering standard. Student evidences will include student work, and student notes in their math interactive notebook. As teacher models step by step to help fill in learning gaps, and monitor notes to revise misconceptions and error in math logic, adjustments in instruction will be made to help students revise knowledge, as instruction is chunked by breaking down math concepts and explaining steps to solve is provided through the gradual release model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy is selected because it will ensure teachers are monitoring student learning and mastery of standards including the ways they will collect evidences of student learning in their delivery of instruction and to drive instruction for additional supports. Monitoring student work including math interactive notebook will allow teachers to monitor misconceptions or errors in thinking and make adjustments in instruction or add additional supports. This will allow teachers to make informed decisions about how to instruct the students on a daily basis.

Action Steps to Implement

Restructuring morning intervention time to include two days of tiered math intervention.

Person Responsible Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

Administration will be at collaborative planning sessions to ensure lessons have student evidence pieces included in the lesson sequence and that success criteria for the standard are being discussed along with tasks and activities aligned to the standard.

Person Responsible Maryann Caseres (caserema@collierschools.com)

Administration utilizing FTEM to ensure plans are utilizing school wide element of revising knowledge as a evidence based tool for highly effective instructional strategies in lesson planning.

Person Responsible Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

Use of benchmark and other specific formative assessment results to target instruction with the students identified as lowest 25% in math and weaving in math spiral review with concentration on mastery and application of foundational math skills.

Person Responsible Maryann Caseres (caserema@collierschools.com)

Ensure ESE teachers' schedules enable them to push-in as a reading and math resource in the classroom to support lowest 25% math students

Person Responsible Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

Use of academic interactive notebooks providing opportunities for students to focus on mastering math vocabulary, revising knowledge focusing on correcting errors of math logic and misconceptions to support a progression of learning.

Person Responsible Maryann Caseres (caserema@collierschools.com)

Professional development provided for math differentiation addressing student area of needs.

Person Responsible Maryann Caseres (caserema@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students in fifth grade are assessed on science standards taught in previous grade levels and this continues to be an area of concern in meeting proficiency in science achievement. In the 2019 school year, students dropped 1% from FY 18.

Measureable Outcome: If students are provided spiral review aligned to standards and item test specifications, then by the end of the year, students will increase science achievement by 3%; 76% to 79%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Maryann Caseres (caserema@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Consistency in science being taught in all grades with alignment to standard. Data driven decisions, using various formative assessments and results from district benchmarks. Data discussed during planning sessions that includes monitoring the use of academic interactive notebook and USA Test Prep.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Review standards to strengthen content knowledge in science and align tasks to the standard to provide consistency in instruction and allow for monitoring of students.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration will attend collaborative planning sessions to ensure lessons have student evidence pieces included in the lesson sequence and that success criteria for the standard are being discussed along with tasks aligned to the standard.

Person Responsible Maryann Caseres (caserema@collierschools.com)

Review test item specifications and plan for re-teaching of standards taught in previous grade levels.

Person Responsible Maryann Caseres (caserema@collierschools.com)

Review formative assessment results and provide strategies to reteach standards.

Person Responsible Maryann Caseres (caserema@collierschools.com)

Include review of academic interactive notebook during planning sessions for misconceptions in science knowledge in order to reteach concepts.

Person Responsible Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

One day of morning intervention time in 5th grade is specifically focused for science to review standards taught in previous grade levels as a spiral review.

Person Responsible Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

Administration utilizing FTEM to ensure plans are utilizing school wide element of revising knowledge as a evidence based tool for highly effective instructional strategies in lesson planning.

Person Responsible Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Carving out time in the schedule to provide support for students identified as needing tiered intervention 2-3 days a week to fill in learning gaps for students scoring in the lowest 25% in ELA.

Measureable Outcome: If students are provided instruction focusing on meeting their specific area of need, then by the end of the year, our lowest 25% ELA students will make gains by at least 3%, increasing from 59% to 62%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Maryann Caseres (caserema@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Planned instruction and intervention based on grade level expectations to address student needs. Teacher will include academic interactive notebook used during Tier 1 instruction to complement and supplement instruction during intervention time. Academic notebook will include include vocabulary instruction and strategies to support comprehension of grade level text identifying critical content, summarizing, and revising knowledge needed in mastering standard. Student evidences will include student work, and student notes in their interactive notebook. As teacher models step by step to help fill in learning gaps, and monitor notes to revise misconceptions adjustments in instruction will be made to help students revise knowledge, as instruction is chunked through the gradual release model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy is selected because it will ensure teachers are monitoring student learning and mastery of standards including the ways they will collect evidences of student learning in their delivery of instruction and to drive instruction for additional supports. Monitoring student work including interactive notebook will allow teachers to monitor misconceptions or errors in thinking and make adjustments in instruction or add additional supports. i-Ready growth monitoring will provide additional data to allow teachers to make informed decisions about how to instruct students.

Action Steps to Implement

Morning intervention time focused on tiered ELA intervention.

Person Responsible Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

Administration will be at collaborative planning sessions to ensure lessons have student evidence pieces included in the lesson sequence and that success criteria for the standard are being discussed along with tasks and activities aligned to the standard.

Person Responsible Maryann Caseres (caserema@collierschools.com)

Use of benchmark, i-Ready Growth Monitoring, and other specific formative assessment results to target instruction with the students identified as lowest 25% in ELA.

Person Responsible Maryann Caseres (caserema@collierschools.com)

Grade level monthly meetings to monitor growth and needs of students and regroup student intervention groups based on current data.

Person Responsible Rebecca McCosh (mccosr@collierschools.com)

Include review of academic interactive notebook during planning sessions that include vocabulary instruction and strategies to support comprehension of grade level text.

Person Responsible Maryann Caseres (caserema@collierschools.com)

Administration utilizing FTEM to ensure plans are utilizing school wide element of revising knowledge as a evidence based tool for highly effective instructional strategies in lesson planning.

Person Responsible Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**Continue to monitor student attendance for virtual and on campus students and follow up with parents.
Monitor students in the lowest 25% in ELA, and math.**

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Leader in Me:
Lighthouse Committee
Action teams (parent involvement, student clubs,)

Banner Buddies - Yearbook
Gold level PBIS school
School Advisory Council (SAC)
PTA
2 - VPK - Head Start classes
Partner with FGCU/Ave Maria/FSW interns
Kids on the Go - NCH

Girls On The Run (GOTR)

Stakeholders are celebrated in various ways through social media (Twitter, and Facebook) as well as our weekly newsletter.

Survey, staff and parents to provide for decision making.

Continue parent communication through parent conferences. Student Led Conferences

Involve community in school wide activities:

Open House

STREAM

Fall Festival

Book Fairs at night

Friendship Ambassadors

Peer Mediators

National Honor Society

Odyssey of the Mind competition

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00