

Orange County Public Schools

Conway Middle



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Conway Middle

4600 ANDERSON RD, Orlando, FL 32812

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

Demographics

Principal: Joshua Bing

Start Date for this Principal: 12/19/2019

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Conway Middle

4600 ANDERSON RD, Orlando, FL 32812

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moss, Sidney	Principal	Dr. Moss 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). He 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.
Morosetti, James	Assistant Principal	Mr. Morosetti 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 12/19/2019, Joshua Bing

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	246	240	254	0	0	0	0	740
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	23	33	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	6	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	97	88	0	0	0	0	221
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	102	127	0	0	0	0	266
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	52	68	0	0	0	0	181
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	62	78	0	0	0	0	203

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	65	102	117	0	0	0	0	284

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	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		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	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		

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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		
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		

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
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%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
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	47
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.

The lowest performing data component was English Language Arts. Specifically the 7th grade cohort had the lowest scores overall on ELA achievement. 44% of students school-wide performed at a level 3 on the FSA test or higher. 43% of students in the lowest quartile of students obtained learning gains

based on their test performance. This is a continuation of a trend in the last few years. Students are not receiving standards based instruction that focuses on deficiencies based on common assessment data. Remediation and ESOL support are not supporting students by bringing them to a proficient level called for by the end of the school year.

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

7th Grade English Language Arts showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019. Analysis showed the same grade comparison decline 13% year over year in this subject area and grade level. Lack of consistent and rigorous instruction appears to be a main factor when looking at the decline from 2017-18 to 2018-19. Lack of planning for support facilitators to support teachers, building on remedial reading courses in core English Language Arts classes, and supporting ESOL students through data driven decision making are also contributing factors for the decline.

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.

Civics and 7th Grade English Language Arts achievement both lagged behind the state by 19 percentage points. Lack of consistent and rigorous data driven instruction is a major contributing factor with these gaps. Teams did not use data from common assessments, district assessments, and iReady diagnostics to make decisions on how to instruct students by meeting them where they are academically and bringing them where they need to be by the end of each unit. A direct correlation between English Language Arts and Civics (Social Studies) achievement gaps shows a need to focus on retention and understanding of informational text and academic vocabulary which was not present.

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

Overall, the greatest improvement was with the Math Lowest 25th percentile subgroup. The improvement in this area was from 39% (2017-18) to 45% (2018-19). While this data shows a very modest improvement, nonetheless it is the only area Conway Middle School showed improvement in the 2018-2019 school year. Intensive focus on deconstructing standards and test item specifications along with small group push-in support contributed to this improvement.

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

- I. Approximately 10% of students have less than 90% attendance.
- II. An increase in the number of referrals that does not correlate with increase in enrollment. 835 referrals in 2017-18 to 1008 referrals in 2018-19 school year.

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

1. English Language Arts achievement and growth
2. Science Proficiency
3. Civics Proficiency
4. Subgroup ESSA Data (SWD 26%, ELL 39%, both below 41%)
5. Math achievement and growth

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Social Emotional Learning will be an integral part of the success of students and staff at Conway Middle School for the 2020-2021 school year. During the 2019-2020 school year, PBIS was introduced as a tool to reinforce positive behaviors and actions by students. Discipline data revealed that most referrals fell under a Level I or Level II offense and were related to disruptive behaviors in the classroom. Disruptive behaviors cause a disruption to the learning process for not only the student causing the disruption, but also the class as a whole. By introducing Positive Behavioral Interventions, students will be provided the opportunity to earn rewards for their positive choices.

Measurable Outcome:

Conway Middle School plans to reduce the number of referrals by 10% year over year with the use and implementation of PBIS and CHAMPS. We also anticipate a decrease in the number of students absent more than 10 days in a school year from 10% to 8%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeanette Jofre (jeanette.jofre@ocps.net)

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports along with CHAMPs will be utilized.

Quarterly professional development will be offered to teachers to support with the implementation of these strategies.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Instructional staff will receive district provided professional development during pre-planning week on Social and Emotional Learning.

Students will have quarterly grade level meetings to both learn and reflect on coping strategies and correct decision making.

Students will have the opportunity to use SOAR bucks weekly during lunch to receive rewards for exemplary behavior and decision making.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

PBIS and CHAMPs have proven to be effective in both an improvement in school discipline and attendance; our two domains that are an area of focus. Student social and emotional well-being is a priority due to both internal and external factors effecting the school, community, state, and country. The external factor of COVID-19 will require us to focus and prioritize student mental health needs. From an internal standpoint, implementation of PBIS and focusing on student well-being through counseling and instructional PD will contribute to an improvement in attendance and student and staff morale. This in turn will improve student academic achievement and success.

Action Steps to Implement

1.) Professional Development will be provided to teachers during pre-planning and throughout the year on proper implementation of PBIS.

Person Responsible

Sidney Moss (sidney.moss@ocps.net)

2.) Attendance and discipline data will be tracked and monitored on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible

Benjamin Rivers (benjamin.rivers@ocps.net)

3.) SOAR bucks will be distributed to students that earn them for following proper protocol and weekly rewards will be given for the earning of SOAR bucks.

Person Responsible James Morosetti (james.morosetti@ocps.net)

4.) Counseling services will be provided to students in a timely manner to provide students with guidance and support. Parents and guardians will be provided with support to support student academic and social and emotional deficiencies.

Person Responsible Kim Allen-Jackson (kimberly.allenjackson@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Professional Learning Communities are an integral part of the culture, classroom instruction, and academic success of a school. Proper implementation and meeting as PLC teams allows for a collaborative environment where teachers are able to share in instructional practices that have been effective in showing improved student achievement and mastery of standards taught for the courses the PLC meets on. Conway Middle School has struggled with deconstruction of standards as well as in the moment monitoring which will be a focus of our PLC's during the 2020-2021 school year. School-wide we have seen a decline in academic performance in several areas used to calculate a school grade during the 2018-2019 school year from prior school years. Furthermore, a deficit is anticipated in academic performance at the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year due to an extended lapse in time from face to face instruction the prior school year. This will require teachers and the leadership team to come together and collaborate through PLC's how to remediate, re-engage, and advance our students to meet the required level of mastery their current standards call for.

Measurable Outcome:

1. An increase in both proficiency and learning gains of 5% in the area of English Language Arts.
2. An increase in proficiency of 5% on Grade 8 FCAT Science.
3. An increase of 8% on the Civics EOC exam.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sidney Moss (sidney.moss@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Collaborative discussions through PLC's in the areas of deconstructing standards, in the moment monitoring, and data based decision making will be key to meeting the measurable outcomes we have set with regards to this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Administrators and curriculum leaders had the opportunity to attend a virtual PLC institute over the summer through Solution Tree. This institute provided insight into the effective protocol and discussion to be had within a PLC.

Administrators will support PLC's and departments as assigned by the principal. These will be the same departments that the administrative team will monitor for effective classroom instruction and achievement throughout the school year.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1.) Administrators will provide professional development on protocol for PLC's at the beginning of the school year.

Person Responsible

Kim Allen-Jackson (kimberly.allenjackson@ocps.net)

- 2.) Administrators will engage teachers in collaborative discussion and support curriculum leaders with proper facilitation of PLC meetings.

Person Responsible

Sidney Moss (sidney.moss@ocps.net)

- 3.) Administrative team will track and monitor common assessment data and district assessment data to work with teachers and adjust instruction to ensure mastery of standards throughout the year.

Person Responsible

James Morosetti (james.morosetti@ocps.net)

4.) Coaching observations that focus on in the moment monitoring strategies will be provided by the instructional coach.

Person Responsible Linda Innocent (linda.innocent@ocps.net)

5.) The administrative team will identify teachers that need additional support with in the moment monitoring and provide observations to better support this specified group.

Person Responsible Sidney Moss (sidney.moss@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Another improvement priority for the 2020-2021 school year is improving instructional practice relating to monitoring. Teachers will be provided with support and professional development that focuses on in the moment monitoring for understanding for the learning target, standard, and/or cluster of standards being addressed. The administration and instructional coach will provide timely feedback on the practice of monitoring within observations based on the instructional framework OCPS utilizes. If a sufficient amount of monitoring is not witnessed (a majority of students), the administration and instructional coach will provide feedback on monitoring for understanding. In some cases, modeling of lessons for teachers may need to take place to provide teachers with successful monitoring tools.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

At Conway Middle School we strive to bring all stakeholders to the table when making decisions at the school level. Creating a positive and strong culture is key to a school's success. The administration meets with the Faculty Advisory Committee on a monthly basis to gather teacher input on past, present, and future decisions to be made. Administration meets monthly with the PTSA (Parent, Teacher, Student, Association) and SAC (School Advisory Council) to hear the concerns and input of students, parents, and community members. The district vision and mission is at the forefront of all decisions made at the school level. Along with listening to all stakeholders, we hold that providing the community with information on what is happening inside the building on a daily basis is key. We have adopted the usage of multiple social media platforms (Facebook and Twitter) along with the ConnectEd system to provide parents and the community

with such details. Our goal for the 2020-2021 school year is to not only involve the community, but to also engage the community in the education process at Conway Middle School. Involvement brings community members like parents to the table and shows them what we are doing to support student learning. Engaging the community brings community members to the table, shows them what we are doing to support student learning, and provides community members with the tools to support student learning as well. Through the effort to engage and invest all stakeholders, we believe a positive climate and environment will be sustained in turn improving student academic, social, and emotional well being.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$299,568.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6120	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1391 - Conway Middle	General Fund		\$224,676.00
			<i>Notes: Guidance Counselors will support both teachers and students with the PBIS approach. Each grade level will have an assigned counselor that will rotate with students on a yearly basis to build positive relationships with students.</i>			
	5900	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1391 - Conway Middle	General Fund		\$74,892.00
			<i>Notes: A dean will support both teachers and students in the implementation of PBIS. When PBIS do not work, students will be supported through restorative practices under the dean's guidance.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				\$74,892.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5900	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1391 - Conway Middle	General Fund		\$74,892.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coach- The instructional coach will work alongside Admin with working with PLC's.</i>			
Total:						\$374,460.00