

Orange County Public Schools

Conway Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Conway Middle

4600 ANDERSON RD, Orlando, FL 32812

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bing, Joshua	Principal	Mr. Bing is the primary supervisor of all components of our academics core program. He oversees the school budget, professional development, Title I, community relations, and Exceptional Student Education. He serves as the assessing administrator of the ELA department and serves as the 6th grade administrator. He also serves as the assessing administrator for the leadership team.
Baumbach, Timothy	Assistant Principal	Mr. Baumbach assists with curriculum and instruction. He is the assessing administrator for the Social Studies, Science, and Performing Arts departments. He oversees facilities, data analysis, and development of the school safe plan. He also serves as the 7th grade administrator.
	Assistant Principal	Mr. Morosetti oversees curriculum and instruction at Conway Middle School. He is the assessing administrator of the Math department and electives. He oversees school accountability, 8th grade, master schedule, FTE, accountability reports, and Skyward.
Garland, Stephanie	Math Coach	Ms. Garland serves as the Math and Science coach. She assists with the the administration and analysis of instructional/district assessments as well as provides differentiated instruction and intensive intervention based on assessment results. She works with the Math/Science departments to develop instructional focus calendars and engaging STEM activities. Ms. Garland assists with curriculum nights and implementation of the Florida Standards. She also serves as our schools Partner in Education Coordinator.
Wigen, Deogracia	Reading Coach	Ms. Wigen serves as the lead Reading Coach and testing coordinator. She oversees administration and analysis of statewide assessments. She works with the reading teachers to provide differentiated instruction, development of instructional focus calendars, and analysis of assessment results. She also works with the instructional coach to plan curriculum nights, provide materials, and develop intervention schedules.
Rivers, Benjamin	Dean	Mr. Rivers oversees student discipline for students in Grade 8 and students in Grade 7 with a last name that starts with M-Z. He oversees Title IX, Wednesday detentions, student code of conduct forms, and transportation. Mr. Rivers will also assist with the school SAFE plan, Behavior Intervention Plans, and attend all 8th Grade data analysis/progress monitoring/grade level meetings.
Simmons, Gerald	Dean	Mr. Simmons supports discipline for students in Grade 6 and Grade 7 with a last name A-L. He also oversees field trips and is the STAT lead. Mr. Simmons assists with classified staff, Wednesday detentions, PASS, and facility repairs.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Coe, Brooke	School Counselor	Guidance counselors support students with academic, social, and emotional support and guidance. Ms. Coe performs individual, peer, small group, and classroom counseling. Ms. Coe takes part in crisis counseling, master schedule building, student schedule changes, Skyward, and building 504 plans. She serves as the 8th grade and 7th grade A-L guidance counselor.
Johnson, Shane	School Counselor	Guidance counselors support students with academic, social, and emotional support and guidance. Mr. Johnson performs individual, peer, small group, and classroom counseling. Mr. Johnson takes part in crisis counseling, master schedule building, student schedule changes, Skyward, and building 504 plans. He serves as the 6th grade and 7th grade M-Z guidance counselor.
Jofre, Jeanette	Other	Ms. Jofre serves as the school SAFE Coordinator. She supports with referrals for mental health services for students and families based on screenings provided. She provides resources for programs, strategies, events, and training that promote a safe working and learning environment. Ms. Jofre is also the student services coordinator to support students with peer tutoring, peer mediation, and peer ambassadors, and school threat assessments.
Dukes, Krista	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Dukes serves as the instructional coach with focused support in English Language Arts and Civics. She leads new teacher induction, and administration and analysis of instructional assessments. Mrs. Dukes will assist with development of instructional focus calendars, professional development for teachers, planning and development of and provide materials to teachers as needed for their content area.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

To develop the school improvement plan, members of the school leadership are involved in the initial development of the plan. This includes data analysis and developing of the goals. Once the school improvement plan is developed, the plan is taken to the department leaders and then disseminated to the teachers. During the start of the school year, students are involved in the implementation of school improvement by being provided with the school goal and discussion with their part of the school results.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Throughout the school year, the school administration will continue to address the improvement plan with the staff by revisiting the improvement goals during staff meetings. The instructional coaches and administration will work with teachers to monitor and assess students in alignment with the goals. During the mid-year review, the school improvement plan will be reviewed and discussed through the school advisory committee. At that time, the plan will be evaluated for potential adjustments.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	76	72	223	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	42	31	85	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	13	28	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	21	36	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	111	82	275	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	71	69	235	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	94	88	272

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	70	83	230	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	26	68	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	12	34	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	16	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	60	93	233	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	79	63	241	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	80	85	251

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	70	83	230	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	26	68	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	12	34	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	16	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	60	93	233	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	79	63	241	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	80	85	251

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	35	48	49	38	49	50	41		
ELA Learning Gains				51			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			44		
Math Achievement*	47	57	56	47	36	36	43		
Math Learning Gains				60			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			44		
Science Achievement*	43	53	49	38	55	53	37		
Social Studies Achievement*	49	64	68	58	61	58	46		
Middle School Acceleration	63	77	73	66	52	49	65		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	39	43	40	33	79	76	47		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	276
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	501
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	4	4
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	43			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	41			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	3	3
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	45			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	35			47			43	49	63			39
SWD	13			24			18	22			4	
ELL	21			32			26	42	61		6	39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			37			30	48	60		5	
HSP	31			43			43	45	67		6	31
MUL	45			60							2	
PAC												
WHT	50			59			50	68	59		6	67
FRL	30			43			39	43	67		6	26

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	38	51	52	47	60	58	38	58	66			33
SWD	7	35	35	17	45	41	7	30				
ELL	26	55	57	35	54	52	27	38	60			33
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	38	64	70	35	61	67	28	69	53			
HSP	34	49	50	45	59	56	36	52	66			33
MUL	38	53		50	80							
PAC												
WHT	47	45		59	62	50	48	69	68			
FRL	32	51	51	38	56	54	27	55	55			31

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	41	44	44	43	37	44	37	46	65			47
SWD	12	30	33	16	27	35	13	12				50
ELL	24	46	50	25	45	41	17	33				47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	29	12	46	33	38	47	35	73			
HSP	39	46	50	40	37	43	35	42	59			50
MUL	15	20		23	45							
PAC												
WHT	53	50	62	51	39	64	41	64	68			
FRL	33	38	40	35	33	42	29	38	60			37

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
07	2023 - Spring	31%	45%	-14%	47%	-16%
08	2023 - Spring	34%	46%	-12%	47%	-13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	29%	44%	-15%	47%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
07	2023 - Spring	22%	38%	-16%	48%	-26%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	58%	2%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	39%	50%	-11%	44%	-5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	47%	22%	50%	19%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	45%	49%	48%	46%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	45%	61%	-16%	66%	-21%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 data component from the 2022-23 school year that showed the lowest performance was the ELA achievement score of 35%. A significant contributing factor to the lowest performance scores was the adjustment from previous standards to the new standards. The complexity of the questions on the FAST were also an adjustment for teachers and students.

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

The data component from the 2022-23 school year that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is the Civics data which dropped from 58% to 49%. During the school year, the data on the PMAs were tracking that students were performing consistently with students in other schools. By the end of the year, the data tracked in the wrong direction. The group from last school year also had the lowest literacy rate as a grade level. The Civics EOC is a longer test in which the students were struggling with reading endurance that exam.

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.

The area that had the greatest gap compared to the state average was in Civics where the state average was 66% while Conway Middle School was at 49%. Part of the gap within the content area was with the resources that were used for instruction. The resources that are used in class as a handout are not translating to students being able to answer similar questions on computer based assessments.

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

The areas with the most improvement were in math achievement (47% to 50%) and science (38% to 41%). The improvement can be attributed to the focus on interventions with students that were struggling in those areas. Before and after school tutoring took place based on district assessment data for all content areas, particularly in math. The instructional leadership team pulled student data and created a schedule of administration to push in to classrooms to provide small group and whole group support.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Two potential areas of concern are the number of students that are absent for more than 10% of the school days and the number of students that scored a level 1 on statewide assessments. According to current enrollment for the 2023-24 school year, 31% of students are on the attendance watch list. Also, 33% of students scored a level 1 on the math assessment.

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

ELA Achievement
Lowest 25% achievement (ELA and Math)
SWD achievement (ELA and Math)
Civics achievement

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus is related to students with disabilities and increasing overall achievement levels for those students in the sub-group. During the 2022-23 school year, 10.7% students with disabilities scored a level 3 or higher on the ELA FAST test and 19.5% of SWD scored a level of 3 or higher on the Math FAST.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Based off the results of last year's data, there is a need for improvement with our students with disabilities. In ELA, the number of students that score proficient within the subgroup will rise from 10.7% to 20%. In Math, the number of students that score proficient within the subgroup will rise from 19.5% to 30%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through progress monitoring assessments, common assessments, and intervention logs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Bing (joshua.bing@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Part of the instructional practice that will lead to the improvement in this area will be around push-in support and utilizing instructional rotations. Students with support facilitation on their IEPs will have the support in smaller groups. It will become a practice for students to receive support through group rotations and increase content driven instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The SWD subgroup continues to be an area of growth for the school. Instructional strategies that are implemented to support the subgroup are also best practice strategies that will help all students as well.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Monitor assessment data and provide teachers with strategies to successfully reteach materials ESE students struggle with during the PLC and planning process.

Person Responsible: Krista Dukes (krista.dukes@ocps.net)

By When: Materials will be reviewed in weekly PLCs.

Providing ESE team members with adequate planning time with Staffing Specialist, ELA, and Math teachers in order to better understand the process for which content will be taught.

Person Responsible: Delores Santiago (delores.santiago@ocps.net)

By When: Continuous throughout the school year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In order to improve on school culture, the area of focus for the 2023-24 school year will be for teacher retention and recruitment. This school year, we have 9 teachers that are new to the school.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

To start the 2022-23 school year, there were 8 teachers that left the school. While starting the school year for 2023-24, we have 9 new teachers this year as well. As we start the next school year, we would like to retain more teachers and decrease the turnover rate by 5 teachers total.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The final number of teachers for teacher retention will be monitored by the need for hiring and the staffing report at the end of the school. Utilizing the data from last year's Panorama survey, 60% of teachers responded favorably about the positive attitudes of colleagues. This was a decrease of 27% from the previous year. Also, 60% of staff responded favorably about the respectful relationships between staff and students. On the survey concerning this school year, we will increase the favorability rating of each component by 20% which will entice teachers to remain at the school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Bing (joshua.bing@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

To improve teacher retention, we will be focusing on mentoring and induction programs as well as promoting positive teacher collaboration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With the increase in the number of new faculty members to the school, we want to be able to support the teachers with their transition to the school. Through an induction program, the teachers will receive the guidance and resources needed to be successful and have a mentoring opportunity. Also, through Professional Learning Community collaboration, norms and interactions are kept in a positive manner to allow for cultivating a growth mindset.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

We will conduct a mid-year culture and climate survey to determine progress on overall teacher climate.

Person Responsible: Jennah Oddo (jennah.oddo@ocps.net)

By When: December 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Through the district budget process, personnel resources are allocated based on school-wide data trends and predictive trends for the upcoming school year.

Within the current year, resources are allocated using a combination of current student data, teacher needs assessments, and community input.