

Orange County Public Schools

# Conway Middle



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>13</b>

## Conway Middle

4600 ANDERSON RD, Orlando, FL 32812

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

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	69%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

### School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	B	B	B*

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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 lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

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

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title
Nampon, Margaret	Principal
Allen-Jackson, Kim	Assistant Principal
Flowers, Lisa	Instructional Coach
Smith, Shane	Assistant Principal
Hamilton, Shannon	Dean

#### Duties

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

All instructional leadership team members will work collaboratively and make shared decisions that are in keeping with the school's improvement plan as well as students' best interest. As instructional team members monitor their areas of responsibility, they will actively report to the school principal.

Mrs. Nampon will monitor all faculty and staff to ensure evidence-based instruction, intervention, and assessment practices are in place and ensure that every student receives the appropriate level of support to be successful (school SIP areas of focus). She will also supervise and directly progress monitor student trends and learning in Social Studies and English.

Dr. Jackson will support teachers in delivering instruction, utilizing and developing effective curriculum, and using data to guide instruction. In addition, she will monitor student trends in all elective areas, as well as maintain an intense focus on student scheduling and course requirements.

Mr. Smith will support teachers in delivering instruction, utilizing and developing effective curriculum, and using data to guide instruction. He will also supervise and directly progress monitor student learning in Math and Science.

Ms. Hamilton will monitor students' behavioral and academic needs. She will provide service/intervention as soon as the student demonstrates the need. In addition, she will use Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) to prevent inappropriate behavior, through teaching and reinforcing appropriate behaviors.

Mrs. Flowers will provide support to teachers in the areas of Florida Standards implementation, lesson planning, creation of common assessments, and differentiated instruction.

## 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	53	58	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	74	39	0	0	0	0	191
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	98	97	0	0	0	0	286
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	132	128	0	0	0	0	385

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	0	0	0	0	0	101	102	93	0	0	0	0	296

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	
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 7/18/2018

### Year 2016-17 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	57	99	0	0	0	0	213
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	28	46	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	114	101	0	0	0	0	277
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	134	106	0	0	0	0	346

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	0	0	0	0	0	77	93	98	0	0	0	0	268

## 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	57	99	0	0	0	0	213
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	28	46	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	114	101	0	0	0	0	277
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	134	106	0	0	0	0	346

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	77	93	98	0	0	0	0	268

## 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 learning gains of bottom quartile in Math fell from 39 percent to 19 percent. This is not a trend.

#### Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The learning gains in Math of the bottom quartile students fell from 39 percent to 19 percent.

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

Math lowest 25th percentile was 39% vs 51% for the state.

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

Social studies achievement increased by 4%. We cannot definitively say this is a trend, as we decreased 2% the previous year.

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

The social studies department bought in to the vital PLC task of creating common assessments. This led to every teacher both understanding expected learning outcomes for their students and having a greater understanding of the curriculum. They then analyzed the results of the data immediately to determine their next steps for their students. In addition, the social studies department made the decision to

preteach the critical vocabulary with advance organizers, and also targeted background knowledge. As a result of preteaching interventions, students were able to link background knowledge and had a better understanding of new vocabulary.

### 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	53%	52%	53%	59%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	50%	54%	63%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	42%	47%	52%	44%	45%
Math Achievement	53%	53%	58%	51%	53%	55%
Math Learning Gains	46%	51%	57%	58%	53%	55%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	44%	51%	52%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	47%	51%	52%	57%	48%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	65%	68%	72%	63%	67%	67%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	70 (57)	53 (57)	58 (99)	181 (213)
One or more suspensions	78 (76)	74 (28)	39 (46)	191 (150)
Course failure in ELA or Math	91 (62)	98 (114)	97 (101)	286 (277)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	125 (106)	132 (134)	128 (106)	385 (346)

### 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
06	2018	42%	48%	-6%	52%	-10%
	2017	52%	52%	0%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	46%	48%	-2%	51%	-5%
	2017	50%	52%	-2%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2018	53%	55%	-2%	58%	-5%
	2017	55%	52%	3%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	42%	35%	7%	52%	-10%
	2017	48%	43%	5%	51%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	44%	51%	-7%	54%	-10%
	2017	42%	52%	-10%	53%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2018	29%	32%	-3%	45%	-16%
	2017	23%	30%	-7%	46%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2018	42%	49%	-7%	50%	-8%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	58%	66%	-8%	71%	-13%
2017	55%	67%	-12%	69%	-14%
Compare		3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	72%	61%	11%	62%	10%



ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2017	71%	53%	18%	60%	11%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	85%	65%	20%	56%	29%
2017	84%	43%	41%	53%	31%
Compare		1%			

## 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	14	34	33	19	23	25	17	23			
ELL	13	36	35	23	39	39	11	20	55		
ASN	69	60		88	73				100		
BLK	47	45	30	31	41	52	19	56	50		
HSP	41	44	40	46	45	37	31	49	56		
MUL	42	46		48	37						
WHT	68	54	56	65	49	39	71	86	73		
FRL	45	43	41	45	44	37	37	56	66		
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	18	44	42	24	52	55	24	29	50		
ELL	18	45	49	23	48	51	7	35	60		
ASN	78	73		78	40						
BLK	44	59	45	38	47	64	36	50	62		
HSP	46	56	51	41	53	54	36	49	70		
MUL	50	63		58	58						
WHT	72	68	56	68	61	64	67	78	76		
FRL	50	58	51	45	53	57	43	53	66		

## 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	
<b>Title</b>	Staff will improve standards-based instruction across all content areas through use of close reading strategies to increase student proficiency and student learning gains.
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>School-wide data trends revealed a need for an intense focus on all content areas to improve learning, not only for the lowest 25% but for all subgroups of students.</p> <p>Conway Middle School will improve to a school letter grade of “B” in the 2018-19 school year by achieving the following content-specific goals:</p> <p>Math: Student achievement will increase by 5 points from 53% proficient to 58% proficient.</p> <p>Student learning gains in the bottom quartile (lowest 25%) will increase by 15 points from 39 percent to 54 percent</p> <p>ELA: Student achievement will increase by 5 points from 53 percent proficient to 58 percent proficient.</p>
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	<p>Student learning gains in the bottom quartile will increase by 15 points from 42% of students showing learning gains to 57% of students showing learning gains.</p> <p>Science: Student proficiency will increase by 5 points from 47% proficient to 52% proficient.</p> <p>Social Studies: Student proficiency will increase by 5 points from 67% proficient to 72% proficient.</p> <p>Acceleration: The percent of students earning an acceleration point will increase by 10 points, from 67% in 2018, to 77% in 2019.</p>
<b>Point Person</b>	Margaret Nampon (margaret.nampon@ocps.net)
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	Administrative team will recruit, coach, and retain a highly qualified instructional team that will focus on using continual progress monitoring for all students and those who need additional supports.
	Assistant Principal will build the school’s master schedule based on prior year assessment data in order to strategically support student learning.
	DPLC Team will support and facilitate staff development with the implementation of close reading and text-dependent questioning strategies learned at district trainings.
	Administrative team will lead the staff in continual professional development which will

focus on culturally responsive teaching that imparts knowledge and skills and empowers students intellectually, socially, and emotionally.

Assistant Principals and instructional coaches will target students based on performance on prior year assessments as well as progress monitoring (common assessments) and diagnostic assessment (PMA) data throughout the year to intentionally provide students the adequate support or enrichment they need.

Digital Curriculum team will provide instructional staff with continual support to ensure teachers take advantage of new digital materials and use resources that are congruent with the standards created at the correct level of rigor.

School will offer targeted instruction (based on performance trends) on Saturdays, as well as after school Tuesdays and Thursdays.

School-based leadership team will provide frequent, focused, generative, non-evaluative feedback to teachers in order to support student learning in all content areas.

**Person Responsible** Margaret Nampon (margaret.nampon@ocps.net)

#### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description** Administrators will monitor classroom instruction and student performance data in their respective departments to collaborate and to determine whether specific action steps are effective in yielding the intended outcomes or determine what changes need to be made. In addition, the DCTL team will continue to monitor and report to the leadership team the needs of teachers, as it relates to teacher resources and digital training opportunities.

**Person Responsible** Margaret Nampon (margaret.nampon@ocps.net)

Activity #2	
<b>Title</b>	Teachers and staff will engage students and decrease occurrences of negative student behavior and discipline issues through the continued practice of culturally responsive teaching and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports.
<b>Rationale</b>	Our school behavioral data has shown a trend in the rising number of level two and three discipline infractions and the rate at which minority and low income students are involved in the infractions. In order to improve the educative experience for all subgroups, teachers need the knowledge and tools to better support their students and motivate them to achieve.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	Students will be engaged in standards-based classroom learning tasks; performance data will increase in all content areas as a result of increased student engagement with the standards. The number of Level 2 offenses will decrease by 20%, from 423 referrals to 340 referrals, as a result of increased student engagement. The number of Level 3 offenses will decrease by 20%, from 321 referrals to 255 referrals, as a result of increased student engagement. The number of suspensions will decrease by 35% from 160 to 105.
<b>Point Person</b>	Shane Smith (shane.smith@ocps.net)
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	School-based leadership team will train teachers in culturally responsive teaching and strategies to authentically engage students in learning tasks. In order to support the learning of all students, school and district-based leadership teams will facilitate professional development to teachers on understanding and teaching students from low-income families. Teachers will actively increase student motivation (as shown through engagement) in standards-based learning by building and maintaining strong relationships, and positive, safe learning environments. The Administrative team will utilize restorative justice practices with the goals of keeping students in class and fostering an environment founded on the values of respect, responsibility, and relationship. School-based leadership team will provide focused generative non-evaluative feedback to teachers, in order to support teacher adoption and appropriate use of authentic engagement strategies. Discipline team will continue to use the HERO system as a PBIS program. School based leadership will monitor school referrals bi-weekly through EDW, as well as hold daily meetings to discuss all discipline issues and possible prevention measures.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Margaret Nampon (margaret.nampon@ocps.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
<b>Description</b>	Formal weekly meetings will be held at which time all discipline trends are viewed by the administrative team. In addition, restorative justice sessions will be logged and tracked. Administrative team will survey teachers to monitor what relationship building tools are successful and to discuss any possible additional resources teachers may need. Lastly, Administrators will actively monitor classroom instruction and trends in student engagement to evaluate the effectiveness of specific action steps in yielding intended outcomes.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Margaret Nampon (margaret.nampon@ocps.net)

### Activity #3

<b>Title</b>	Build staff capacity for cultural responsiveness through reflective practice and targeted professional development to better address the needs of all students to reduce gaps in achievement across all subpopulations.
<b>Rationale</b>	School-wide data trends show a growing disparity in the achievement of all students.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	Narrowing of achievement gaps between all subgroups; increased collaboration between school and MAO.
<b>Point Person</b>	Shane Smith (shane.smith@ocps.net)

### Action Step

Ensuring a rigorous curriculum that is aligned with state standards is employed in every class.

Facilitate training on students from low-income families to all faculty and staff.

Collaborative work with PLCs and instructional coach to provide support and evidence to positively influence teacher mental models.

**Description** Increased data analysis with subpopulation disaggregation resulting in modified instruction to address individual student.

Increased teacher awareness and understanding of the differing needs of students across all subpopulations.

Increased discussion and reflection on cultural differences and similarities as a result of the inclusion of the Saudi Educators in school activities.

**Person Responsible** Shane Smith (shane.smith@ocps.net)

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

PLCs, with instructional coach support, will regularly analyze formative and summative data by subpopulation to continue focus on achievement gaps and develop intervention strategies to help address lagging performance.

Reflective PLC activity with staff members to discuss achievement gaps, causes, and possible teacher strategies to address gaps.

**Description** Data disaggregation by subpopulation to identify achievement gaps (data from common assessments and district assessments).

Monthly progress monitoring meetings with whole staff to discuss both discipline and achievement.

**Person Responsible** Shane Smith (shane.smith@ocps.net)

## Part V: Budget

**Total:**

**\$0.00**