Conway Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Conway Elementary

4100 LAKE MARGARET DR, Orlando, FL 32812

https://conwayes.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
Bransford, Judy	Principal	Mrs. Janvier provides a common vision and direction for the school through rigorous academic goals for all students and staff. The Principal meets weekly with the leadership team to ensure school resources are maximized to achieve school improvement goals and to discuss the school's needs, as well as the action plan to support instruction and assessment of all students. The Principal oversees Tier I core instruction, Tier II and Tier III intervention, and progress monitoring plans for all students. In addition, bi-weekly data meetings are held to review student performance and support the MTSS process. The Principal fosters positive relationships with students and stakeholders to promote a positive climate and environment.
Peedin, Tawny	Instructional Coach	Ms. Peedin provides guidance with the K-12 ELA plan and supports data collection and implementation for Tier I, II, and III. She assists with data analysis and provides professional development to teachers in regard to data-based instructional planning. She supports teachers to ensure student needs are met and SIP goals are addressed. She also works directly with the lowest 25% during interventions.
Sanabria, Nicole	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist 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 ensure student IEP goals are monitored, adjusted, and met.
Aguiar, Jannelle	School Counselor	Mrs. Aguilar provides 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 monitors and provides support for digital tools in Tier I instruction. Ms. Hafele supports the school in digital resources that support standard-based instruction.
Hernandez, Janeris	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision and direction for the school through rigorous academic goals for all students and staff. She assists with weekly leadership team meetings to ensure school resources are maximized to achieve school improvement goals. She oversees Tier I core instruction as well as Tier II and Tier III intervention and progress monitoring plans for all students. She discusses the needs of the school and plans action to support

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		the instruction and assessment of all students. Additionally, she monitors student performance and supports the MTSS process.
Roman, Ashley	Other	Ms. Roman provides guidance with the K-12 Math plan and supports data collection and implementation for Tier I, II, and III. She assists in data analysis and provides professional development to teachers in regard to data-based instructional planning. She supports teachers to ensure student needs are met and SIP goals are addressed. She will also work directly with the lowest 25% during interventions.
Paolozzi, Tamara	Other	Ms. Paolozzi ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS with fidelity and addressing goals and targets in the SIP plan. She provides guidance as well as monitors effective instructional strategies through professional development, classroom walkthroughs, and interventions. Ms. Paolozzi communicates with families regarding school-based MTSS plans as well as supports the implementation of Tier I, II, and III best instructional practices.

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.

The school included a diverse group of families, staff, and community members to provide input on the implementation of the plan during SAC meetings and PTA meetings. Stakeholders reviewed prior year data and discussed achievement by subgroup.

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))

The School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored by the administrators and stakeholders. During SAC meetings, data will be discussed and analyzed to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	82%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	11	27	22	22	11	17	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	3	1	4	0	0	0	14
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	12	13	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	14	21	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	15	16	12	0	0	0	0	57

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	5	9	10	13	16	0	0	0	53

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

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	12	28	32	26	24	22	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	15	27	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	12	27	0	0	0	44
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	1	5	13	24	0	0	0	43

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	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	12	28	32	26	24	22	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	15	27	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	12	27	0	0	0	44
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	1	5	13	24	0	0	0	43

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	44	57	56	59	57	57
ELA Learning Gains	52	62	61	57	58	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57	50	52	58	52	53
Math Achievement*	47	61	60	63	63	63
Math Learning Gains	51	66	64	65	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48	56	55	50	48	51

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	41	56	51	63	56	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	58			61		

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				

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%
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	51			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	44			

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)

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	44	52	57	47	51	48	41					58
SWD	15	38	50	18	49	48	17					
ELL	33	51	69	45	61	50	23					58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	43		29	33		32					
HSP	41	52	63	46	57	59	32					61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67	58		67	50		76					
FRL	40	51	56	43	43	42	25					54

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	53	40	50	71	42					56
SWD	12	39		12	50		20					50
ELL	21	34		26	48	73	23					56

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	59			28	40		60					
HSP	33	38	50	36	55	73	33					58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	42			63								
FRL	38	46	50	34	49	70	36					49

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	59	57	58	63	65	50	63					61
SWD	24	50	54	26	59	46	23					23
ELL	44	64	70	53	73	63	73					61
AMI												
ASN	60			70								
BLK	42	40		49	43		40					
HSP	57	54	59	59	66	53	60					61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	72	69		78	71		78					
FRL	56	55	55	62	62	52	55					58

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
05	2023 - Spring	31%	54%	-23%	54%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	60%	-5%	58%	-3%
03	2023 - Spring	55%	52%	3%	50%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	47%	59%	-12%	59%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	62%	-9%	61%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	32%	55%	-23%	55%	-23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	39%	59%	-20%	51%	-12%

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 2022-2023 school year was the first year that we used the F.A.S.T. as a tool for proficiency and new B.E.S.T. standards for math. Throughout the year it was clear that the strategies to close the gap between M.A.F.S. and B.E.S.T. standards required intensive planning and remediation. This resulted in math being the lowest performance component for grades 3-5 based on the 2022-2023 FAST scores. An additional contributing factor to this performance was the number of students with attendance below 90%.

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

The 2021-2022 school year data demonstrated a decline in ELA achievement for the Black ESSA subgroup. The factor that contributed to this decline was an understanding of the gaps between FSA to BEST standards.

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.

Based on 2021-2022 data, the greatest gap was in science. The reading proficiency in 5th grade was below 40% in 2021-2022 which contributed to this gap as reading skills are critical to science comprehension and application.

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

Based on the F.A.S.T. scores, the data component that showed the greatest improvement is in ELA with 55% proficiency. The contributing factors to this improvement in ELA were the implementation of rigorous small group activities with an emphasis on a specific reteaching plan as well as research-based resources.

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

The number of students with two or more indicators continue to be a concern.

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

1. A focus on small group, differentiated instruction, that targets each student's learning process and specific needs for all subject areas.
2. A strategic reteach plan for math that will be integrated into instructional focus calendars and lesson plans.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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 establish a positive school culture and climate, school leaders and staff members will engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning as well as leadership for student success, especially in ESE and BL subgroups. 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, our school supports a positive culture and environment that connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success.

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

Reduce the number of Level 1 students on statewide Math assessment by 50%.

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

Data meetings will occur bi-weekly to disaggregate common assessment data
and drive instructional shifts that focus on acceleration. The instructional coach and administrators
will work with teachers and interventionists to group students by the acceleration that is needed to
master grade-level standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Judy Bransford (judy.bransford@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.)

A supportive professional environment is associated with teacher improvement over time, leading to school achievement. As a community school, we are sustaining a positive atmosphere that includes safety measures, the opportunity for peer collaboration, the support of the administrators, the opportunity for teachers to participate in professional development, the respect, openness, and the commitment to student achievement.
Teachers working in more supportive professional environments improve their effectiveness more over time.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who are not proficient in reading or math require differentiated
instruction to meet their individual needs. Intensive instruction at the needed
level, in addition to the regular standards-based instruction, will help close the
achievement gap for all students.

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.

Teachers will group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit, and well-paced instruction. They will frequently monitor student progress and adjust their instruction accordingly.

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

By When: Weekly during PLCs

The leadership team will monitor early warning indicators and ensure each student is paired with a mentor on campus to support with academic needs and create a proactive relationship.

Person Responsible: Ashley Roman (ashley.roman@ocps.net)

By When: By November 1st, 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Conway Elementary will provide instructional staff with professional development for Tier I and Tier II math instruction that focuses on standards-aligned instructional practices based on the B.E.S.T standards. Teachers will focus on monitoring student growth to increase student achievement and to close the learning gaps, as well as ensure all students are exposed to rigorous instruction.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, students tested on the F.A.S.T. assessment will show an increase in math proficiency by 10%.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janeris Hernandez (janeris.hernandezvelazquez@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.)

A comprehensive curriculum review can ensure alignment with state and local standards and meet the needs of all students. As a school, we are constantly examining student achievement data to identify gaps in student learning through standards-based and classroom assessments. In addition, school stakeholders review the data to look for factors that contribute to or impede student learning, such as attendance and discipline, among other components.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who are not proficient in math require differentiated instruction to meet their individual needs. Intensive instruction at the needed level, in addition, to the regular standards-based instruction will help close the achievement gap for all students.

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.

Teachers, coaches and administrators will review the delivery of instruction to ensure alignment with state and local standards and meet the needs of all students.

Person Responsible: Janeris Hernandez (janeris.hernandezvelazquez@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly during PLC

Stakeholders will meet to discuss data, evaluate trends and make decisions based on students' achievement.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: SAC Meetings

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).

From the 2021-2022 ESSA categories, SWD and Black students were identified below the 41%. Funds are dedicated to providing smaller ratios to all SWD. Additionally, six Tier I interventionists were purchased through ESSER funds who provide direct support to any student performing below the ESSA subgroup expectations.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

On the most recent Early Literacy or STAR Reading, data indicated that 39% of students scored below the 40th percentile in English Language Arts. The following percentages for ELA achievement are: Kindergarten-43%, First Grade-28%, Second Grade-52%.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

On the most recent F.A.S.T. ELA (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking), data indicated that 46% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts. The following percentages for ELA achievement are: Third Grade-42%, Fourth Grade-42%, and Fifth Grade-64%.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

The 2024 EOY Early Literacy or Star Reading ELA Diagnostic will show an increase of 25% for each grade level (K-2) in comparison with the BOY Early Literacy or Star Reading ELA Diagnostic.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The 2023 ELA F.A.S.T. Assessment will show a decrease in the percentage of students scoring below Level 3 for the following grade level(s):
Third Grade - seven percentage points from 42% to 35%
Fourth Grade - seven percentage points from 42% to 35%
Fifth Grade - ten percentage points from 64% to 54%

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Monitoring will occur by using the outcomes of:
ExactPath Diagnostic Tests
SuccessMaker Diagnostic Tests
F.A.S.T. Standards-Based Unit Assessments
District K-2 Foundational Unit Assessments
SIPPS Mastery Assessments
Haggerty Assessments
Early Bird Assessments

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bransford, Judy, judy.bransford@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to the letters. Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. This instructional practice has a strong level of evidence. Each student will read connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. For students of greater need, small group instruction can occur where students can decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. Assessments and diagnostics, bi-weekly reports, and mini-benchmark tests will help clarify which students will need further support to attain proficiency on each ELA standard.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Having a growing population of ESE and ELL students at the school, specific literacy strategies will need to be a part of everyday instruction in ELA classes. Methodical vocabulary, comprehension skills, and reading stamina will continue to be implemented. To expand writing success, the use of textual evidence along with comprehension and interpretation to support the writing process will ensure that writing will be more directly infused into ELA instruction all year long.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
1. The MTSS team will meet with leaders and teachers to review student progress. 2. The reading coach will meet with teachers to construct a delivery plan for each standard/target, model and update any changes to delivery models based on student data talks and student samples, and participate directly in co-teaching in each ELA classroom. 3. ELA Interventionists will be assigned to assist with lesson progress and intervention within classrooms. 4. PLC/Data Room will provide a fluid visual for reference of the site-wide monitoring process, yearlong. 5. BPIE Indicators, as well as strategies to serve SWD, will be shared during the planning process. 6. Walkthroughs to support the teaching and learning process as well as improve the learning environment. 7. Engagement strategies will be included as a focus in PLCs.	Bransford, Judy, judy.bransford@ocps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The school included a diverse group of families, staff, and community members to provide input on the implementation of the plan during SAC meetings and PTA meetings. Stakeholders reviewed prior year data and discussed achievement by subgroup.
School webpage: conwayes.ocps.net

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school involved a diverse group of families, staff, and community members in decision-making, problem-solving, and planning processes. During meetings, stakeholders provide their input, feedback, and suggestions. As a school, we cultivate a collaborative environment by showing respect for their expertise, listening, and building rapport. Collaborating with stakeholders will help us foster a sense of

ownership, commitment, and accountability, and generate innovative and sustainable solutions for the benefit of our students.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Teachers, interventionists, coaches, and leaders will provide K-5 grade level support during small groups and monitor students weekly using data from assigned path lessons. In addition, the school leaders and administrators will participate in the planning process and data meetings to ensure data conversations are driven, adjustments are made as needed, and best practices are implemented. Professional learning opportunities focused on effective implementation strategies of the small group intervention will be provided on a regular basis. Teachers will be provided resources for differentiating instruction based on specific student needs.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The school counts on a counselor who advocates for the mental health needs of all students by offering instruction that enhances awareness of mental health, appraisal, and advisement addressing academic, short-term counseling interventions, and referrals to community resources for long-term support.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Through the MTSS process, the school provides academic and behavioral strategies for students with different needs. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) provide a continuum of supports and services designed to promote appropriate behaviors and to prevent and address challenging behaviors.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

School leaders, a core team of teachers, and stakeholders will 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. Administrators will ensure that the strategies implemented in the school are improving the achievement of the lowest-performing students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No