Conway Middle

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Conway Middle

4600 ANDERSON RD, Orlando, FL 32812

https://conwayms.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Joshua Bing

Start Date for this Principal: 7/17/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Orange 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

Conway Middle

4600 ANDERSON RD, Orlando, FL 32812

https://conwayms.ocps.net/

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)
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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nampon, Margaret	Principal	Mrs. Nampon will monitor all faculty and staff to ensure evidence-based instruction, intervention, and assessment practices are in place and to 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.
Allen-Jackson, Kim	Assistant Principal	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.
Smith, Shane	Assistant Principal	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.
Rivers, Benjamin	Dean	Mr. Rivers will monitor students' behavioral and academic needs. He will provide service/intervention as soon as the student demonstrates the need. In addition, he will use Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) to prevent inappropriate behavior, through teaching and reinforcing appropriate behaviors.
Innocent, Linda	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Innocent will provide support to teachers in the areas of Florida Standards implementation, lesson planning, creation of common assessments, and differentiated instruction.In addition, she will assist in the tiering of teachers and will provide specific support to individual teachers based on need.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	306	359	342	0	0	0	0	1007
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	72	52	0	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	64	52	0	0	0	0	174
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	115	103	0	0	0	0	328
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	175	108	0	0	0	0	421

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	0	109	133	96	0	0	0	0	338

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
54

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 8/8/2019

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	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 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	0	101	102	93	0	0	0	0	296

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	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 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	0	101	102	93	0	0	0	0	296

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	44%	52%	54%	57%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	52%	54%	61%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	45%	47%	52%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	51%	55%	58%	53%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	55%	57%	56%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	50%	51%	58%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	51%	51%	51%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	55%	67%	72%	61%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	306 (0)	359 (0)	342 (0)	1007 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	48 (70)	72 (53)	52 (58)	172 (181)
One or more suspensions	58 (78)	64 (74)	52 (39)	174 (191)
Course failure in ELA or Math	110 (91)	115 (98)	103 (97)	328 (286)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	138 (125)	175 (132)	108 (128)	421 (385)

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**
06	2019	40%	52%	-12%	54%	-14%
	2018	42%	48%	-6%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	33%	48%	-15%	52%	-19%
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	51%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
08	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
	2018	53%	55%	-2%	58%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	39%	43%	-4%	55%	-16%
	2018	42%	35%	7%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	39%	49%	-10%	54%	-15%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	54%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	37%	36%	1%	46%	-9%
	2018	29%	32%	-3%	45%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	41%	49%	-8%	48%	-7%
	2018	42%	49%	-7%	50%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	66%	-14%	71%	-19%
2018	58%	66%	-8%	71%	-13%
Compare		-6%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	78%	63%	15%	61%	17%
2018	72%	61%	11%	62%	10%
Compare		6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	53%	44%	57%	40%
2018	85%	65%	20%	56%	29%
Compare		12%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	38	35	19	31	30	16	12			
ELL	21	45	45	33	47	44	10	33	56		
ASN	67	58		83	83						
BLK	36	44	43	36	55	44	17	57	55		
HSP	39	44	41	46	49	46	32	49	69		
MUL	48	35		44	45			73			
WHT	56	47	55	66	55	47	69	62	86		
FRL	37	42	39	44	50	45	32	48	69		
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		

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
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		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	73
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

ELA lowest 25th percentile demonstrated the lowest performance of 43% even though one percentage point gain occurred from the previous year. ELA Achievement of 44% and Science Achievement of 44% followed as second and third lowest performing areas. ELA Achievement had a decline of nine percentage points and Science Achievement decreased by three percentage points.

Science proficiency declined due to an over-scaffolded Physical Science curriculum and a second quarter review that lacked rigor thus hindering students reviewing 6th and 7th grade standards. In addition, it is clear the second quarter review of previously taught standards was not assessed properly and thus the data used to drive instruction was flawed. Even though PMA and CRM tasks did not indicate a decrease in proficiency, this must be considered a trend; through the last 4 years there has been a steady decline in Science proficiency (in five years Science proficiency has dropped 22%).

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

Overall ELA achievement proficiency dropped nine points, while 7th grade ELA proficiency dropped 15 points. Neither proficiency nor growth targets were met by 7th grade ELA teachers. Lack of consistent, rigorous instruction has to be considered the main factor when looking at the decline from 2017/2018 to 2018-2019. In addition, the team struggled to implement effective reteaching or remediation plans.

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.

There were several contributing factors as to why social studies achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average (15 percentage points). The first was an under-utilization of summative assessment data as well as county culminating task data. The team failed to use data to effectively plan units with the end in mind. As a result, the data from county-wide assessments was often discredited and not utilized for its designed purpose.The second major contributing factor was the lack of reading strategies effectively taught to students. As a result, students struggled with the heavy content-specific vocab associated with the Civics EOC.

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

Overall, the Math Lowest 25th Percentile subgroup showed the most improvement with a six point jump (39 to 45).It is clear adding intensive math units and adding a math push-in plan were successful in targeting the lowest 25% of students.

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

I. 10% of students have less than 90% attendance.
II. 35% of students have a course failure in ELA or Mathematics.

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

1. ELA achievement and growth
2. Science Proficiency
3. Civics Proficiency
4. Subgroup Data (SWD 26%, ELL 39%, both below 41%)
5. Algebra I proficiency (continuing upward trend)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Staff will improve standards-based Civics and Science instruction through close reading strategies and tiered levels of support to increase proficiency and learning gains.
Rationale	Science performance has continually declined three or more percentage points per year for the last four years. While Civics showed a 4 percent growth in 2017-2018 it showed the biggest decline (ten percent) of all subject areas in 2018-2019 (Accelerate student performance).

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	An increase in Science proficiency from 44% to 54%, and an increase in Civics proficiency from 55% to 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shane Smith (shane.smith@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Literacy team will support and facilitate staff development with the implementation of close reading and text-dependent questioning strategies..
	Administrators will continue with coaching observations to ensure teachers are supported and grow using close read strategies.
	The Science and Civics team will offer specific interventions based on performance trends. Afternoon pullout groups will be utilized for students in Tier three level of support.
	Afternoon push in groups will be established and scaffolded according to student reading level.
	Intensive and specialized interventions for struggling readers (example: small group instruction within the classroom)
	Civics and Science courses will have an increased focus on key academic vocabulary and continue to focus on cognates not only for ELL students but all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Utilizing close read strategies and comprehension strategies, prior to, during, and after reading, will help students comprehend the complex vocabulary required in answering text dependent questions.
	Tiered levels of intervention will occur as necessary for all students based on the outcomes of assessments. Students who are identified as being at some level of risk for not meeting academic expectations will be placed in an intervention tier. Our tiered interventions will vary based on the needs of individual students thus ensuring the instruction delivered to students is related to the nature and severity of the student's difficulties.

Action Step	
Description	1. Civics and Science teams will continue to receive literacy training; coaching observations will continue to focus on literacy so that teacher's comfort and skill in utilizing close read practices grow safely.
	2. Science and Civics teams will continually assess and monitor student progress using

PMA data, classroom artifacts and anecdotal data to determine level of tiered interventions needed.

3. Students will be placed in tiered groups where mobility is possible and their specific needs are met either by push in support or pullout support provided by instructional coach or instructional staff member (student data will continue to drive interventions students need).

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

#2	
Title	Continuous improvement of campus wide instruction through tiered pedagogical support for all teachers (accelerate student performance, and narrow Achievement Gaps).
Rationale	The decline in overall student proficiency across multiple content areas has shown a need for administrators to increase the amount of teacher coaching observations and utilize data from observations not only to provide specific actionable feedback to teachers but also develop specific pedagogical growth targets.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	An increase in proficiency across all content areas. ELA will see growth in overall proficiency from 44% to 54%. An increase in proficiency in Math from 51% to 61%. An increase of 10% in learning gains in both Math and ELA students in the bottom 25%. Growth in Science proficiency from 44% to 54% and growth in Civics from 55% to 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Margaret Nampon (margaret.nampon@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Administrators will conduct internal instructional reviews biweekly and conduct "Zone of Instruction" walks over the course of a two week period and provide immediate, actionable, non-evaluative feedback. Administrators will provide specific pedagogical support based on level of support each teacher is placed in (levels are fluid). Administrators will continue to review and discuss teacher standards-based instruction, appropriate level of rigor and student achievement during PLC.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Expertise is essential to building expertise. As administrators we must continually observe and coach our teachers and take in-depth examinations of their professional practices in order to assist them in authentic reflection of their practice. By tiering teachers, we can best provide an adequate level of support that helps all teachers on campus sharpen their specific tools and add strategies to their toolbox. By fostering a collaborative culture in PLCs, we can collectively take responsibility for student learning ensuring all students learn at higher levels.
Action Step	
Description	1. Administrators will Tier Teachers after coaching observations. 2. Administrators will conduct internal instructional reviews and conduct "Zone of Instruction" walks. Administrators will continue to review and discuss teacher rigor and overall standards-based instruction. 3. Administrative team will provide specific tiered levels of support designed to grow teachers pedagogy. (as a result, teachers may move from one level of support to another).
Person Responsible	Margaret Nampon (margaret.nampon@ocps.net)

#3	
Title	Build staff capacity for Cultural Responsiveness through reflective practice and targeted professional development to address student needs and reduce gaps in achievement.
Rationale	26% of Students with Disabilities are showing proficiency while 39% of English Language Learners are showing proficiency. In addition, while our lowest 25% showed growth in Math and ELA, a gap of five percent still exists between Conway Middle School students and their peers in the state of Florida (narrow Achievement Gap).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The overall goal is an increased collaboration between Conway Middle School and the Minority Achievement office resulting in a narrowing of the achievement gap between all subgroups, specifically SWD and ELL students. Students with Disabilities will show a 15% growth from 26% to 41%. In addition, English language learners will show an increase in proficiency from 41% to 50%. Lastly, the bottom 25% will show a 10% growth in both Math and ELA that will close the gap between them and their peers in the state of Florida.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Allen-Jackson (kimberly.allenjackson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Facilitate a year long continual study for all teachers that focuses on teaching students in poverty (monthly). Tiered support for lowest 25% of students as a result of increased data disaggregation by subpopulation to identify achievement gaps (this will occur weekly during PLC). Weekly pullout groups for ELL students with a focus on cognate vocabulary.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As the Conway Middle School student population has continued to shift, there is a need to ensure that teachers are prepared to teach all students from all backgrounds. A continual, monthly study will give teachers the opportunity to read and research specific strategies and will ensure all teachers are equipped with the tools required to teach all students. For Spanish-speaking ELLs, cognates are an obvious bridge to the English language. As students' cognate awareness grows, their ability to use cognates in a secondary language will increase their reading comprehension. The pullout plan will be essential in giving students opportunities to focus on this type of language acquisition.

Action Step	
Description	1. Facilitate a year long continual study for all teachers that focuses on teaching students in poverty (monthly). Effectiveness will be monitored quarterly. Data will consist of teacher surveys and student progress. 2. Students will be placed in tiered groups where mobility is possible and their specific needs are met either by push in support or pullout support (student data will continue to drive interventions students need). 3. ELL growth will be monitored and student movement through the groups will be fluid as student proficiency is measured. For SWD subgroup: 1. Student IEPs will be shared with general education teachers during early pre-planning to familiarize teachers with their students. 2. In the planning and delivery of instruction, ways to differentiate including student choice activities as well as explicit teaching of content vocabulary will be highlighted in the lesson

plans throughout the year (plan will be monitored by Instructional coaches, and Administrators, beginning August 12).

3. Instructional coach will lead professional development on tracking student sub groups, and progress monitoring strategies (beginning August 13).

4. Paraprofessionals will push in for support of SWD during ELA and Intervention on a daily basis. (August 12, 2019 start – Paraprofessionals, Coaches, Admin)

5. Data chats will take place weekly for the duration of the year. As these chats take place additional support will begin with before school tutoring (Tuesday/ Thursday) and after school torturing (to begin after first iready Diagnostic).

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

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).

N/A.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Staff will improve standards-based Civics and Science instruction through close reading strategies and tiered levels of support to increase proficiency and learning gains.				$2,310,364.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1391 - Conway Middle	General Fund		$2,304,364.00
			Notes: All science and civics teachers will provide support.			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1391 - Conway Middle	Other		$6,000.00
			Notes: Tutors will support students before and after school in the areas of math and science.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Continuous improvement of campus wide instruction through tiered pedagogical support for all teachers (accelerate student performance, and narrow Achievement Gaps).				$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1142	120-Classroom Teachers	1391 - Conway Middle	Other		$1,500.00
			Notes: Material and literature will be needed for the continual study of literacy strategies.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Build staff capacity for Cultural Responsiveness through reflective practice and targeted professional development to address student needs and reduce gaps in achievement.				$53,394.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	150-Aides	1391 - Conway Middle	General Fund		$49,894.00

	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	1391 - Conway Middle	General Fund		$3,500.00
			Notes: Reading Plus to be purchased for all students.			
					Total:	**$2,365,258.00**