

Collier County Public Schools

Corkscrew Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	10
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)

Elementary School
PK-5

2018-19 Title I School

No

2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

46%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

49%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

2017-18
A

2016-17
B

2015-16
B

2014-15
A*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridaCIMS.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and

using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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
Merhar, Rebecca	Principal
Fialko, Sue	Other
Lyberg, Dan	Guidance Counselor
McCosh, Rebecca	Instructional Coach
Eaton, Kriste	Assistant Principal

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Both the Principal and Assistant Principal share the responsibility of providing instructional leadership.

The Leadership Team meets every Monday to discuss weekly iReady data, special school-community events, professional development support, upcoming testing for gifted/SWD and school counseling/Social-Emotional Learning support.

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.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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 identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators		0	1	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected

Saturday 8/25/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
-----------	-------------	-------

Students exhibiting two or more indicators

Year 2016-17 - 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	17	18	8	13	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	1	2	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	1	20	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators		1	0	1	5	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The data component that performed the lowest is the math lowest 25%. CES performed at 42% proficient while the state lowest 25% performed at 47% proficient and the district performed at 55% proficient. This does appear to be a trend with these students performing lower than the state and the district across multiple years, however the school is reducing the gap in the last 2 years.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Corkscrew Elementary did not have a data component that showed a decline but one that showed the smallest growth were the ELA Learning Gains. CES only grew 2% points from the previous year, which is the smallest growth in an area. Digging deeper into the overall gains, we are concerned with the number of 4th and 5th graders who did not make any gains at all. 75 of the 200 students in these 2 grade levels did not make gains in ELA and 32 of those students were a level 4 or 5 in FY17.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average was our Math Lowest 25%. CES performed at 42% proficient and the state performed at 47% proficient, in comparing CES to the District, there was a larger gap with 55% of the District L25% testing at proficiency.

Looking at grade-level data, 4th grade had 35% of the Lowest 25% (11 students) testing at proficiency in FY17. Of the 35% who were at proficiency in FY17, 64% of these students (7 of 11) did not maintain proficiency in FY18.

In fifth grade, 23% of Lowest 25% (7 students) tested at proficiency in FY17, and this number increased by 7% in FY18. Fifth grade also had 57% of the Lowest 25% making gain in Math achievement.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component that showed the most improvement is our science achievement with a 13% increase in proficiency. This is 16% higher than the District average and 21% higher than the state average. Typically we are above the district and state in proficiency. Each year we are increasing the gap of our percentage of students who are proficient.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

There are many factors that have led to the continued improved in 5th grade science achievement. Fifth grade teacher gave a beginning of the year FSA type science test. This test helped teachers determine areas of need and drive their instruction. They used the data from the test in planning to ensure that areas of strengths were cultivated and areas of need were reinforced. Corkscrew Elementary also has STEAM Fridays where teachers (K-5) design highly engaging lessons that are standards aligned, and STEAM focused. Students in grades 3-5 utilize a science lab once a week for hands-on experiments. Standards-based planning was also key in ensuring effective lesson delivery across all grade levels.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	77%	61%	56%	69%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	62%	55%	62%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	54%	48%	43%	57%	52%
Math Achievement	81%	69%	62%	75%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	65%	59%	59%	67%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	55%	47%	39%	58%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	60%	55%	63%	54%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	7 ()	10 ()	6 ()	7 ()	10 ()	7 ()	47 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	2 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	7 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 ()	2 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	11 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	17 (0)	23 (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	2018	77%	59%	18%	57%	20%
	2017	79%	57%	22%	58%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	73%	60%	13%	56%	17%
	2017	67%	57%	10%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2018	74%	59%	15%	55%	19%
	2017	60%	56%	4%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	87%	67%	20%	62%	25%
	2017	78%	67%	11%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	75%	67%	8%	62%	13%
	2017	77%	66%	11%	64%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2018	75%	68%	7%	61%	14%
	2017	60%	62%	-2%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	72%	58%	14%	55%	17%
	2017					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	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				

2017 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	68	50	67	54	31	38				
ELL	48	47		55	50	53					
BLK	72	79		72	71		50				
HSP	65	63	43	69	57	48	63				
WHT	72	61	48	78	59	25	64				
FRL	63	62	50	66	58	38	55				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Math Lowest 25%
Rationale	In 2017, the lowest 25% in Math was 39% proficient compared to the state at 51%. In 2018, the school's lowest 25% was 42% proficient and the state was 47%. CES is implementing a Math360 Club, inviting identified students in the lowest 25% in grades 3, 4 and 5.
Intended Outcome	Increase student proficiency and gains in grade level mathematical concepts.
Point Person	Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)
Action Step	
Description	The Math 360 Club for each grade level meets once per week in the morning before school to review grade level mathematics standards. Certified grade level teachers reteach targeted math concepts.
Person Responsible	Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Comparing quarter benchmark results to FSA/end of year grade level math data.
Person Responsible	Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)
Activity #2	
Title	Math Lowest 25%
Rationale	Teachers will be able to design differentiated cognitively complex activities to deepen student knowledge.
Intended Outcome	Teachers will be provided collaborative planning opportunities to analyze student performance data and plan for instruction.
Point Person	Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)
Action Step	
Description	Planning will be monitored through meeting notes, lesson plans, and observations.
Person Responsible	Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Lesson Plans will be reviewed by the leadership. Plans will be monitored for differentiated instruction, ELL and ESE strategies, and strategies for students in the lowest quartile. Monitor student growth through end of unit assessments and quarterly benchmarks.
Person Responsible	Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

Activity #3

Title Math Lowest 25%

Rationale Utilize Math360 Lab and various computer labs throughout the day. Inviting specific students to open labs in the morning for review and fact fluency practice based on teacher recommendation and data analysis.

Intended Outcome Increase student proficiency and gains in grade level mathematical concepts.

Point Person Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

Action Step

Description At CES we will continue to train teachers by sharing best practices on how to use the lab effectively across the grade levels. One morning a week our computer labs will be dedicated to FASTT Math for students in need of fact fluency. Another morning will be for Khan Academy, for students who need to review specific concepts.

Person Responsible Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Comparing quarter benchmark results to FSA/end of year grade level math data. Fastt Math data and Khan Academy reports will also be utilized to determine the effectiveness of the morning labs.

Person Responsible Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)