Conway Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Conway Elementary

4100 LAKE MARGARET DR, Orlando, FL 32812

https://conwayes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Judy Bransford

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (55%)
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	
* 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 Elementary

4100 LAKE MARGARET DR, Orlando, FL 32812

https://conwayes.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bransford, Judy	Principal	The Principal will provide a common vision and direction for the school through rigorous academic goals for all students and staff. The Principal will meet weekly with the leadership team to ensure school resource are maximized to achieve school improvement goals. The Principal will oversee Tier I core instruction as well as Tier II and Tier III intervention and progress monitoring plans for all students. The Principal will meet weekly with the Leadership Team to discuss the needs of the school and plan action to support instruction and assessment of all students. In addition, weekly data meetings are held to review student performance and support the MTSS process.
Zambrano, Angela	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will assist the Principal to provide a common vision and direction for the school through rigorous academic goals for all students and staff. The Assistant Principal will assist the Principal with weekly leadership team meetings to ensure school resources are maximized to achieve school improvement goals. The Assistant Principal will assist the Principal to oversee Tier I core instruction as well as Tier II and Tier III intervention and progress monitoring plans for all students. The Assistant Principal will assist the Principal with the Leadership Team to discuss the needs of the school and plan action to support instruction and assessment of all students. The Assistant Principal will assist the Principal in monitoring student performance and support the MTSS process. In addition, the Assistant Principal will provide intense support to our instructional staff in their first three years of teaching or new to our school.
Peedin, Tawny	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Support will provide guidance with the K-12 ELA plan and support data collection and implementation for Tier I, II and III. She will assist in data analysis and provide professional development to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning. She support teachers to ensure student needs are met and SIP goals are addressed. She will also work directly with the lowest 25% during interventions.
Jordan, Nicola	Instructional Coach	The MTSS/CCT Support will ensure that the school based team is implementing MTSS with fidelity and addressing goals and targets in the SIP. She will provide guidance as well as monitoring effective ELL instructional strategies through professional developments, classroom walkthroughs and coaching to teachers. In addition, she will communicate with parents regarding school based MTSS plans as well as support the implementation of Tier I, II and III best instructional practices.
Sanabria, Nicole	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist will provides guidance with data collection and analysis to ensure ESE students are successful. She supports the implementation of Tier I, II and III intervention plans. She works directly with our ESE resource team to to ensure student IEP goals are monitored, adjusted and met.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Knight, Cynthia	School Counselor	The School Counselor designee will provide support to students and staff concerning mental health awareness through healthy emotional and social development strategies and implementation of the SEL initiatives. She will monitor the early warning signs of all students and assist with monthly threat assessment meetings to discuss students at risk and their progress.
Pappas, George	Behavior Specialist	The Behavior Specialist works directly with the ASD units and ensures the academic and social emotional success of students.
Hafele, Danielle	Instructional Media	Ms. Hafele will monitor and provide support for digital tools in Tier I instruction. Ms. Hafele will support the school in digital resources that support standard based instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/13/2021, Judy Bransford

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.*
2

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.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
49

Total number of students enrolled at the school
409

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	22	81	70	73	62	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	8	29	21	28	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/16/2021

2020-21 - 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	49	81	83	72	109	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474
Attendance below 90 percent	12	19	14	15	21	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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

2020-21 - 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	49	81	83	72	109	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474
Attendance below 90 percent	12	19	14	15	21	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				59%	57%	57%	52%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	58%	58%	46%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	52%	53%	28%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				63%	63%	63%	56%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				65%	61%	62%	55%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	48%	51%	39%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				63%	56%	53%	49%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	55%	-8%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	52%	62%	-10%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	63%	8%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready mathematics and reading BOY, MOY and EOY data was used for grades 1-5. Science PMA data for grade 5.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/24	30/44	37/52
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/22	21/41	23/44
	Students With Disabilities	1/11	2/20	3/30
	English Language Learners	3/16	8/42	8/42
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11/17	24/35	41/59
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/22	16/31	26/51
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/20	5/56
	English Language Learners	4/21	6/32	9/47

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/16	18/29	37/32
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/18	11/25	13/28
	Students With Disabilities	1/8	4/31	4/31
	English Language Learners	3/15	6/25	6/24
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4/7	15/24	16/24
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/8	7/16	10/21
	Students With Disabilities	1/8	3/23	4/31
	English Language Learners	1/5	3/13	5/20

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/13	10/15	20/29
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/12	7/16	13/30
	Students With Disabilities	2/15	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	3/14	1/5	2/10
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0	5/7	14/20
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0	3/7	9/20
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/5

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13/15	16/18	23/24
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/10	6/10	14/22
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	3/12	2/7
	English Language Learners	1/3	1/3	3/9
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4/4	12/13	21/23
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/2	6/10	10/16
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/8	2/8
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	5/15

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/12	8/10	9/11
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/14	5/9	6/11
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/3	1/3	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2/3	12/15	16/20
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/4	6/11	12/22
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/12
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/3	6/17
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31/41	35/46	27/36
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/46	18/38	16/33
	Students With Disabilities	3/23	2/15	3/21
	English Language Learners	8/24	10/29	6/18

Subgroup Data Review

	2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	12	39		12	50		20				
ELL	21	34		26	48	73	23				
BLK	59			28	40		60				
HSP	33	38	50	36	55	73	33				
WHT	42			63							
FRL	38	46	50	34	49	70	36				
	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	24	50	54	26	59	46	23				
ELL	44	64	70	53	73	63	73				
ASN	60			70							
BLK	42	40		49	43		40				

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
HSP	57	54	59	59	66	53	60				
WHT	72	69		78	71		78				
FRL	56	55	55	62	62	52	55				
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	26	21	15	26	34	21	40				
ELL	26	38	33	44	51	45	28				
BLK	52	53		58	44		30				
HSP	45	40	30	48	51	42	44				
WHT	65	52		72	70		80				
FRL	46	42	23	52	51	38	44				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
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	47
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	53
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 Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA is the lowest performance component for grades 3-5 based on the 2020-21 EOY iReady data. Grades 3-5 in ELA had 13% of the students show proficiency on the BOY diagnostic which increased to 21% on the EOY diagnostic. Based on the 2019 subgroup data the greatest decline was in science for our white subgroup from 80% proficiency to 78% proficiency. The black subgroup shows a decline in ELA from 52% proficiency to 42% proficiency and a decline in math from 58% proficiency to 49% proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the most recent iReady data for the 2020-21 school year, our area greatest need for improvement is in ELA with only 21% of our students scoring proficient.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factor to this year's low performance were not reteaching standards that students were struggling with and spending too much time with whole group reading instruction instead of more small group rigourous centers.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the iReady 2020-21 EOY diagnostic, the data component that showed the greatest improvement is in math with a 72% proficiency for grades 3-5 with over 50% increase from the BOY diagnostic.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Contributing factors to this improvement in math was the implementation of rigorous small group activities with an emphasis on manipulatives and a strategic reteach plan.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

A focus on small group differentiated instruction and strategic reteach plan for both ELA and Math will occur and be part of the instructional focus calendars and lesson plans.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development trainings for rigorous small group and maximizing all resources.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

To ensure sustainability of improvement in this school year, we will be providing differentiated small group instruction for the lowest 25% (Tier II and III) in both ELA and Math. In addition, increase Social Emotional Learning for our students so they can achieve academic success.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will provide instructional staff with professional development for Tier I and Tier II instruction that focuses on standards-aligned instructional practices that target student growth to increase student achievement and provide targeted acceleration to our students with disabilities (SWD) by placing a focus on foundational literacy/mathematical strategies through support facilitation due to the results of our BPIE indicators and 2019 ESSA data. Targeted acceleration that is standards-aligned is a critical need to close the gap between our SWD and their general education peers as well as ensure all students are exposed to rigorous instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	- Increase Learning Gains by 6% in ELA and Math - Increase Learning Gains of Lowest 25% in ELA and math by 5% - Meet ESSA Percent of Points Index target for SWD (41%)
Monitoring:	-Implement monitoring instructional walks that focus on standards-aligned instruction in Math and ELA. -Detailed IFCs -Extra Tier I teachers to support lowest 25% (2 in primary and 2 in intermediate)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Bi-weekly data meetings will occur to desegregate common assessments data and drive instructional shifts that focus on acceleration. The instructional coach will work with teachers and interventionists to group students by acceleration that is needed to master grade level standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data meetings are critical to inform and to make adjustments that meet the needs of all students. Acceleration will be used if the standards are not mastered in order to ensure students continue to be exposed to standards-aligned instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

The leadership team, instructional coaches and intervention teachers will provide K-5 grade level support to small groups and monitor students weekly using i-Ready data from assigned path lessons. In addition, the leadership team will participate in the planning process and data meetings to ensure best practice are utilize.

Person Responsible	Angela Zambrano (angela.zambrano@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: * Differentiated small group instruction for the lowest 25% (Tier II and III) in both ELA and Math. *Professional development trainings for rigorous small group and maximizing all resources. *Strategic plan for reteach and acceleration in both ELA and Math.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on the Panorama Survey, 65% of students can manage their emotions, thoughts, and behaviors in different situations. The average for Orange County Schools is 69%.
Monitoring:	Classroom walkthrough and iObservation data will be used to monitor and provide support to students. Also Qualitative Panorama data from students, staff and families will be used to monitor measurable outcome throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families. Description of Monitoring: Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs, and family needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rationale for Strategy Selection: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement change. Resources/Criteria: Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum:
*Ensure a school team receives training on implementation of a school-wide SEL curriculum
*Create a training plan that leverages the trained school team members to train all necessary stakeholders in implementation of the curriculum
*Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum

Person Responsible Cynthia Knight (cynthia.knight2@ocps.net)

Integrating Aligned Instructional and SEL Strategies:
*Identify student social and emotional learning needs to prepare for academic instruction
*Determine cognitive and conative strategies that align with the standard
*interpret standards and student needs to intentionally integrate aligned instructional strategies

Person Responsible Angela Zambrano (angela.zambrano@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that (50% or more) 51% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA). (FSA)
	The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 19 percentage points from 41% to 60% overall.
Measurable Outcome:	To ensure 50 percent proficiency at each grade level for ELA, the 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase for the following grade levels: Third Grade - eight percentage points from 42% to 50% Fourth Grade - eighteen percentage points from 32% to 50% Fifth Grade - ten percentage points from 40% to 50%
Monitoring:	To monitor for the desired outcome, the following will be used: i-Ready Diagnostics i-Ready Growth Monitoring SIPPS Mastery Assessments Classroom Walkthroughs District Standards Based Unit Assessments District K-2 Foundational Unit Assessments Heggerty Assessments Literably Assessments
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to the letters. This instructional practice has a strong level of evidence. Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. This instructional practice has a strong level of evidence. Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. This instructional practice has a moderate level of evidence. Rationale for Strategy Selection: This selected instructional practice(s) has/have a [select strong or moderate- see above] level of evidence, as noted in this link for the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Resources/Criteria: The following strategies/resources were selected because [fill in blank using below resources] Does the evidence-based program/practices address the identified need? Does the identified program/practices show a proven record of effectiveness for the target population? Resource links: IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding. Schoolwide Improvement Plan Evidence Based Strategies
Action Steps to Implement	

Action Steps:
- Strengthen the common planning process.
- Use the district created K-2 and 3-5 Common Planning Resources to guide the agenda and discussions
- Include foundational planning in K-2
- Classroom walkthroughs are conducted regularly and ELA feedback is provided; when needed adjustments are made in common planning/PLCs.
- Ensure the 90 minute reading block contains statutory requirements.
- Utilize the 6 components of reading (as noted in Florida's Formula for success)
- Daily inclusion of on-level whole group instruction, and differentiated small group instruction
- Standards Based Unit Assessment (SBUA) Data and Foundational Assessment Data is used to plan small group instruction and differentiation opportunities.
- Provide targeted ELA PD based on teacher needs (consider B.E.S.T. ELA Canvas course, recorded sessions from the Early Literacy Summer Institute, and when applicable, ELA IMPACT).
- MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure:
* Students are appropriately identified.
* Students are matched to appropriate interventions and intensity.
* Data analysis is routinely part of the process, and adjustments are made to interventions.

Person Responsible   Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Conway Elementary School is ranked 693 out of 1,395 schools statewide and 15 out of 126 schools in Orange County for incidents that occur on campus. There are three categories for incidents that may occur at schools. These three categories include: Violent incidents, Property Incidents and Drug/Public Order incidents. Conway has had a total three violent incidents (two for Physical Attack and one for Sexual Harassment) with an enrollment of 572 students with converts to 0.52 percent for the Incident Rate in the 2019-2020 school year. The ranking ranges from Very Low to Very High to include five categories: [Very Low, Low, Moderate, High, and Very High]. Conway has a ranking of Moderate for the three incidents that occurred in 2019-2020. Since Physical Attacks and Sexual Harassment have been a concern, Restorative Practice and Conscience Discipline will be implemented with a focus on Social Emotional Learning (SEL) strategies infused into the daily curriculum. Ms. Knight, the school counselor designee, will visit classes with SEL lessons to support the key core competence areas of self-awareness, self-management, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. Ms. Bransford (principal) and Ms. Zambrano (assistant principal) will work in tandem to review teacher concerns with students in order to be proactive and achieve academic success.

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$15,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0551 - Conway Elementary	General Fund		$15,000.00
			Notes: Common planning days that allow teachers to vertically plan as well as desegregate data to make informed decisions for standards-aligned instruction.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$10,000.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6150	239-Other	0551 - Conway Elementary	Title, I Part A		$10,000.00
			Notes: The Parent Engagement Liaison will provide instructional and SEL workshops to the Conway community in order to support student achievement and success.			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$25,000.00**