

Flagler Schools

Imagine School At Town Center



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Imagine School At Town Center

775 TOWN CENTER BLVD, Palm Coast, FL 32164

www.imagineschooltowncenter.org

Demographics

Principal: Rachel Sp IR Es

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	63%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Flagler County School Board on 10/15/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Imagine School At Town Center

775 TOWN CENTER BLVD, Palm Coast, FL 32164

www.imagineschooltowncenter.org

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>56%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>38%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Flagler County School Board on 10/15/2019.

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.

We deliver quality instruction that exceeds the academic needs of each learner by fostering relationships through communication and collaboration

Provide the school's vision statement.

We personalize success in the academic and character development of our students by fostering a nurturing environment where every student and family is known and loved.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
O'Grady, Lisa	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the school has a shared vision for learning while developing a positive school culture conducive to student learning Communicate the school's vision and goals, setting strategies to achieve goals, regularly reviewing progress, and adapting as needed Ensure an effective management of the organization, operations, and resources for safe, efficient, and effective learning environment Collaborate with faculty and community that responds to diverse interest and community needs Recruit, select, nurture and retain effective personnel in coordination with school leadership team Review and monitor professional growth plans for all staff Collaborate with families, business, and community members to mobilize community resources Conduct formal and informal observations of teachers, evaluations of staff, and give feedback on performance Mentor Assistant Principal in school leadership Foster healthy relationships across the school, providing a calm and orderly environment for teaching and learning, and nurturing a culture that is aspirational and motivational Utilize formative assessment data to determine learning support needs on campus Monitor the success of all students in the learning environment, align the curriculum, instruction, and assessment processes to promote effective student performance, and use a variety of benchmarks, learning expectations, and feedback measures to ensure accountability for all participants engaged in the educational process Collaborate with colleagues to continue the development of a rigorous curriculum aligned to the Florida Standards

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	111	108	110	90	98	93	94	93	83	0	0	0	0	880
Attendance below 90 percent	3	7	2	3	4	3	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	3	2	6	6	5	4	8	4	0	0	0	0	38

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	4	1	0	0	0	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	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/20/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	6	12	8	6	6	5	6	10	4	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	2	5	4	1	5	2	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	14	23	19	26	13	0	0	0	0	107

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	3	2	6	6	5	4	8	4	0	0	0	0	38

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	60%	60%	61%	58%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	59%	53%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	54%	43%	43%	51%
Math Achievement	64%	64%	62%	62%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	49%	49%	59%	57%	57%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	39%	52%	45%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	47%	47%	56%	38%	38%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	69%	78%	64%	64%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Number of students enrolled	111 (0)	108 (0)	110 (0)	90 (0)	98 (0)	93 (0)	94 (0)	93 (0)	83 (0)	880 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 ()	7 ()	2 ()	3 ()	4 ()	3 ()	2 ()	7 ()	1 ()	32 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	68%	6%	58%	16%
	2018	61%	62%	-1%	57%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	60%	-7%	58%	-5%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	58%	58%	0%	56%	2%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
06	2019	61%	62%	-1%	54%	7%
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
07	2019	49%	54%	-5%	52%	-3%
	2018	60%	50%	10%	51%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	69%	62%	7%	56%	13%
	2018	52%	63%	-11%	58%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	80%	72%	8%	62%	18%
	2018	69%	69%	0%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	60%	-5%	64%	-9%
	2018	62%	63%	-1%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	51%	58%	-7%	60%	-9%
	2018	59%	59%	0%	61%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
06	2019	56%	67%	-11%	55%	1%
	2018	56%	65%	-9%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
07	2019	71%	61%	10%	54%	17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	78%	56%	22%	54%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
08	2019	54%	49%	5%	46%	8%
	2018	14%	49%	-35%	45%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		40%				
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	53%	-13%	53%	-13%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	55%	54%	1%	48%	7%
	2018	43%	62%	-19%	50%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	68%	75%	-7%	71%	-3%
2018	76%	67%	9%	71%	5%
Compare		-8%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	60%	30%	61%	29%
2018	61%	65%	-4%	62%	-1%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		29%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	100%	59%	41%	56%	44%

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	42	38	25	38	29	10	25			
ELL	55	55		77	55						
ASN	68	57		95	79						
BLK	40	52	63	47	59	65	21	57			
HSP	61	50	23	68	54	43	21	59			
MUL	57	62		43	38						
WHT	64	56	48	66	45	26	53	73	57		
FRL	55	52	54	57	47	44	32	58	53		
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	15	22	18	20	37	36	4	29			
ELL	36			64							
ASN	89	69		83	63						
BLK	38	47	35	42	40	33	31				
HSP	51	47	36	60	43	25	39				
MUL	48	50		55	56						
WHT	58	52	42	66	59	52	47	77	71		
FRL	45	47	37	53	50	44	40	62	56		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	11	43	46	21	40	35	6				
ELL	23			54							
ASN	88	91		94	91						
BLK	44	42	43	44	40	35	33	57			
HSP	54	48	14	60	47	29	29	50			
MUL	65	69		55	47						
WHT	60	53	47	65	62	49	41	67	66		
FRL	52	49	41	57	54	48	33	60	70		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	564
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	63
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Achievement of SWD Students at only 28%
 Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in Math at only 39%

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

Middle School Acceleration was our greatest decrease from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019, decreasing from 67 to 56. This was attributed to a grave concern we had from 2017-2018 where we placed all Level 3s of a cut score of 337 or higher as well as all Level 4s and 5s in to Algebra 1, whereby reducing our percentage of students who were proficient in 8th grade math to only 14%. In 2018-2019

we only placed students who were Levels 4s and 5s in to Algebra 1, reducing our acceleration opportunities while increasing our percent of achievement on both the Algebra 1 EOC and the 8th grade math FSA. For 2019-2020, we will balance more students eligible for Algebra 1 by placing more Level 3s in to that acceleration course, rather than only providing the opportunity to our 4s and 5s.

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.

5th grade science had a 13 point gap between our school performance and the state's performance.

Both 4th and 5th grade math had a 9 point gap between our school performance and the state's performance.

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

The greatest area of increase came in the Learning Gains for our lowest quartile in ELA, improving from 38% in 2017-2018 to 50% in 2018-2019. Success Time is a focused time, devoted to providing on level instruction above and beyond the core instructional block with peers of like ability level. Additionally, intensive reading courses in middle school were smaller in class size to allow for more individualized and personalized instruction than they were the prior year. As a result of an increase to our Learning Gains in the lowest quartile, we also saw an overall increase of 5% (from 55-60%) in overall ELA Achievement.

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

Daily Attendance 12% of our students in grades 3-8 are in attendance less than 90% of the time. 20% of our students in grades 3-8 scored a Level 1 in ELA or Math.

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

1. SWD students achieving proficiency will increase from 28% to 41% as evidenced by outcomes on the 2019-2020 FSA. Identification and strategic placement of SWD students for the purpose of progress monitoring through STAR on a monthly basis in order to track growth
2. The Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in Math will increase from 39% to 50% as evidenced by outcomes on the 2019-2020 FSA. Identification and strategic placement of the Lowest Quartile students for the purpose of progress monitoring through STAR on a monthly basis in order to track growth.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improve Proficiency within our SWD subgroup
Rationale	Historically, over the past four years, our Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup has under-performed, with only 23% to 28% scoring a Level 3, 4, or 5 on the State Assessment. This is our priority focus of our school, as our population increases in the SWD category and we recognize the need to close the gap.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the school year, the Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup's proficiency will increase from 28% to 41%, as measured by the State Reading and Math Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa O'Grady (lisa.ogrady@imagineschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Teach self-regulation and self-monitoring through students tracking their understanding and progress, ask students about their learning and progress, have students graph their own progress, and have students set goals and monitor them. Together teachers and students set individual learning goals in STAR and hold student conferences monthly. Additionally, student goals and progress toward goals are discussed monthly in collaborative data chats occurring with grade level teams and administration, allowing the school staff to respond with adjustments, as needed, in areas where progress is insufficient.</p> <p>The Opportunity Myth raised awareness to the fact that "most students do what they are asked in school - but still aren't prepared to meet their goals after graduation because so few of their assignments actually gave students the chance to complete grade level work." Our school has dedicated time to lesson planning, focused on task alignment to the standard. Teachers must first buy-in and show dedication to this critical component in planning to raise the bar for student achievement. Once students are exposed to on grade level tasks and activities, they will take greater ownership in their growth when presented the opportunity to be empowered to make decisions about their learning, as they seek to reach an end goal of a proficiency.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will plan collaboratively, focusing on task alignment to ensure they are teaching to the depth of rigor required. 2. Teachers will develop and administer common formative assessments to check for understanding and differentiate instruction based upon student needs. 3. Students will track progress in data notebooks toward the goals they have established and meet to discuss decisions about their learning. 4. School Leadership Team will conduct weekly informal walk throughs, providing feedback to teachers on student engagement, variety of formative assessments, and the depth of questioning evidenced in their lessons. 5. A diagnostic progress monitoring tool will be administered to the students in our SWD subgroup monthly in both reading and math to provide data for leaders and teachers to make informed decisions about the pacing and delivery of instruction.
Person Responsible	Lisa O'Grady (lisa.ogrady@imagineschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improve Proficiency within our SWD subgroup	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00