

Collier County Public Schools

Corkscrew Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Corkscrew Elementary School

1065 COUNTY ROAD 858, Naples, FL 34120

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Merhar

Start Date for this Principal: 8/22/2019

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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Corkscrew Elementary School

1065 COUNTY ROAD 858, Naples, FL 34120

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	46%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

Year Grade	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
	A	A	B	B

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.

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 and position title 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.
Eaton, Kriste	Assistant Principal	
Fialko, Sue	Other	
Lyberg, Dan	Guidance Counselor	
McCosh, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	

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	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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

55

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/23/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	6	7	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	3	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	6	7	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	3	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	
Number of students enrolled	105 (0)	114 (0)	111 (0)	108 (0)	106 (0)	110 (0)	654 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 (7)	13 (10)	7 (6)	12 (7)	7 (10)	6 (7)	53 (47)
One or more suspensions	1 (1)	11 (2)	3 (0)	8 (2)	3 (1)	2 (1)	28 (7)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (1)	3 (2)	3 (3)	0 (0)	1 (2)	1 (3)	8 (11)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (1)	4 (5)	12 (17)	19 (23)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
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%
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	
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. Trend data indicates that this subgroup has remained at or below 42% since FY16. The contributing factors for this is having Core Classes without Tier 3 math interventions in the school day. The lowest 25% math students are in core classes with one teacher the majority of the time. We do not have the personnel to support Tier 3 intervention during the school day.

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 is contributed high performance in third grade along with not having enough supports in the core classrooms.

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.

Our lowest 25% has 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%. Eighteen of the 68 students in the lowest 25% did make gains in math achievement but not enough to meet proficiency and all of these students are in our Core Classrooms. The contributing factors for this data could be the systems in place in the core classrooms for math instruction, one example being centers.

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 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 students proficiency and usage. Student data tracking for specific i-Ready proficiency/mastery was also a new initiative along with students setting i-Ready goals each quarter.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

One potential area of concern is that we have 4 students each in fourth and first grade with two or more early warning indicators. Another area of concern is the number of third graders (12) and first graders (13) with attendance below 90% for FY19.

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

1. Math Lowest 25th
2. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
3. Science Achievement
4. Increasing/maintaining our students scoring a level 4 and 5
5. Increasing our overall school attendance rate by 2%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase student math achievement with our students who perform in the lowest 25%.
Rationale	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%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the percentage of our lowest 25% math students making gains by at least 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kriste Eaton (eatonk@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will implement high yield strategies in classroom instruction with a focus on student evidences to make adjustments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This strategy is selected because it will ensure teachers are including the ways they will collect formal and informal evidences of student learning to drive instruction. This will allow teachers to make informed decisions about how to instruct the students on a daily basis.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administration will be at collaborative planning sessions to ensure lessons have student evidence pieces included in the lesson plans. 2. FTEM will ensure these plans are being delivered as planned for in collaborative planning sessions. 3. Use of benchmark and other specific formative assessments results to target instruction with the students identified as lowest 25% in math. 4. Adjust the schedule of ESE teachers to use as a resource for lowest 25% math students with the other students that are serviced in the small group setting.
Person Responsible	Kriste Eaton (eatonk@collierschools.com)

#2

Title Learning gains for all in ELA.
Rationale In fourth and fifth grades there was a decrease in students scoring Level 4 and 5, and no change in students scoring Level 1 and 2 from FY18 to FY19.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve In fourth and fifth grades, decrease students scoring Level 1 and 2, and increase students scoring Level 4 and 5 by at least 3% on FY20 FSA.

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

Evidence-based Strategy Increase academic rigor through thoughtful instructional planning, instructional delivery, student evidences and differentiated instruction during our school-wide intervention and enrichment time 4 days per week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Focusing on this strategy will allow teachers to focus their instruction on the needs of the students in their intervention group in order to help move students to proficiency and continue to grow our students scoring at a level 4 or 5.

Action Step

Description

1. Grade level monthly meetings to assess the growth and needs of students and regroup the student intervention groups based on student's needs.
2. School-wide Deliberate Practice Element: Using questions to help students elaborate on content. This element will allow teachers the time to plan out questions and think about the evidences they will collect to determine what the students have learned. Asking complex questions will allow students to critically think about the content, therefore increasing rigor.
3. Administration will evaluate during FTEM and provide specific feedback.
4. Reading Coach will plan with these teachers and have a Coaching Cycle with a new teacher to fourth grade. She will also help ELA teachers look at i-Ready and benchmark data to determine needs and extensions.
5. Teach Me Tuesdays will be designed to deliver PD to teachers in ELA instruction.

Person Responsible Rebecca McCosh (mccosr@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Another schoolwide improvement priority we have is student attendance. We have already implemented students tracking their daily attendance and setting a goal along with following the district Connection Coach initiative for those students missing 10% or more of school for FY19. We will also be implementing quarterly incentives for meeting our school-

wide attendance goal 97%. We will also use social media and our weekly message to parents to promote attendance.