Imagine Schools At West Melbourne

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Imagine Schools At West Melbourne

3355 IMAGINE WAY, West Melbourne, FL 32904

http://www.imaginewm.org

Demographics

Principal: Brian Degonzague

Start Date for this Principal: 10/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: D (34%)
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	N/A

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

N/A

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.](http://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

Imagine Schools At West Melbourne

3355 IMAGINE WAY, West Melbourne, FL 32904

http://www.imaginewm.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-6	Yes	95%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	53%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

To give students a love of learning that will stay with them through school, university and beyond.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We inspire excellence in education through developing character and enriching minds of all students, becoming the leading school of choice in Brevard County.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
DeGonzague, Brian	Principal	Guide and Coordinate all Instructional and Operational aspects of the educational institution.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 10/1/2020, Brian Degonzague

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: D (34%)
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	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	90	93	93	75	59	45	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	2	5	10	4	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	10	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	3	0	4	4	7	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	6	9	4	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/1/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	78	86	74	63	48	51	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	444
Attendance below 90 percent	17	13	12	9	8	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
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	3	12	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	36	44	38	35	35	31	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	245

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	78	86	74	63	48	51	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	444
Attendance below 90 percent	17	13	12	9	8	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
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	3	12	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	36	44	38	35	35	31	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	245

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	62%	57%	49%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	60%	58%	55%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	57%	53%	54%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	47%	63%	63%	49%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	65%	62%	57%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	53%	51%	56%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	57%	53%	23%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	64%	-12%	58%	-6%
	2018	55%	63%	-8%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	61%	-9%	58%	-6%
	2018	33%	57%	-24%	56%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%
	2018	39%	54%	-15%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
06	2019	54%	60%	-6%	54%	0%
	2018	56%	63%	-7%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	61%	-16%	62%	-17%
	2018	55%	62%	-7%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	64%	-5%	64%	-5%
	2018	29%	59%	-30%	62%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		30%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	38%	60%	-22%	60%	-22%
	2018	29%	58%	-29%	61%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
06	2019	37%	67%	-30%	55%	-18%
	2018	48%	68%	-20%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	47%	56%	-9%	53%	-6%
	2018	42%	57%	-15%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	28	56	50	27	58	45					
ELL	39	62		39	46						
BLK	40	57	50	28	43		30				
HSP	59	60		59	76						
MUL	63			44							
WHT	58	63		56	69	70	65				
FRL	54	61	71	47	62	57	48				
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	17	19	25	17	41	33					
ELL	35	38		59	54						
BLK	33	50	42	16	31	27	20				
HSP	53	29		49	26						
MUL				40							
WHT	52	50	50	55	57	27	56				
FRL	49	45	43	42	44	31	43				
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	29	41		33	33						
ELL	47			47							
BLK	29	58	62	29	54						
HSP	39	53		35	50						
WHT	62	59		64	60						
FRL	49	55	54	49	57	56	23				

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)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

Students with disabilities showed a 44% federal index score, Black/African American students showed a 41% federal index. These were the lowest subgroup areas for Imagine West Melbourne. This data was corroborated with 2020-2021 FALL Baseline data through STAR.

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

Students in 3rd Grade ELA and students in 3rd and 6th grade Math each showed a decline, all three subgroups increase the achievement gap between the school and the district/state. Having new teachers on campus definitely impacted the level of content knowledge in mathematics on our campus last year. 2020-2021 FALL Baseline data through STAR showed that 5th grade proficiency in Reading and Mathematics had the greatest decline in percent proficient..

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.

Students in 3rd Grade ELA and students in 3rd and 6th grade Math each showed a decline, all three subgroups increase the achievement gap between the school and the district/state. Having new teachers on campus definitely impacted the level of content knowledge in mathematics on our campus last year.

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

ELA and Mathematics learning gains, specifically the lowest quartile learning gains, were areas of great success last year. Our focus on small group instruction seemed to have paid off.

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

Attendance rates are our greatest area of concern. We need to see how we can decrease the number of students that are missing over 10% of the school year.

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

1. Teachers unpack the reading standards in weekly horizontal and vertical planning and align their resources appropriately for ongoing assessment and progress monitoring through the use of Curriculum Guides
2. Continue to develop differentiation strategies in order to grow our lowest quartile students.
3. Teachers provide a physically and emotionally safe and supportive classroom learning environment, based on mutual respect and fairness, is established and upheld.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2021 baseline percentage of proficiency among students in grades 3-6 was 41% in Mathematics and 43% in Reading. Due to the need to increase proficiency, and due to the shortened 2020 school year because of the COVID pandemic, an area of focus for 2021 will consist of continued growth of our lowest quartile students needs to be maintained as there are possible reading gaps in learning that occurred during the loss of time in classrooms due to the pandemic.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the school year, 45% of students will be at the Proficient Level or higher, as measured by the ELA and Math State Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	(T) With the support and guidance of the Title I Instructional coach, teachers will utilize the math standards based pacing guides to collaboratively plan rigorous lessons that integrate the formative assessment data and address misconceptions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With teachers unpacking the standards in weekly horizontal and vertical planning and align their resources appropriately for ongoing assessment and progress monitoring through the use of Curriculum Guides, all student population will be provided with rigorous instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

(T) Title I Instructional Coach guides and coordinates teachers to analyze data to determine focus skills and address the science of reading.

Person Responsible	Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)

(T) Title I interventionists to pull small groups of students to provide remediation for students that are not successful on common assessments.

Person Responsible	Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)

(T) Title I Instructional Coach will conduct weekly data chat meetings to review benchmark data to ensure students are mastering the content.

Person Responsible	Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)

Incorporate the guidance counselor through MTSS for students that are continuously having difficulty in reaching the mastery level after several attempts at remediation.

Person Responsible	Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)

(T) Title I Instructional Coach will provide professional development to the instructional staff in the area of Reading Strategies/Science of Reading/Rigor (Higher order questions).

Person Responsible	Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2019 ESSA percentage of proficiency among SWD and Black/African American Students was at 44% and 41%. Overall, students in grades 3-6 showed baseline data of 41% proficiency in Mathematics and 43% proficiency in Reading. Due to the need to increase proficiency, and due to the shortened 2020 school year because of the COVID pandemic, an area of focus for 2021 will consist of providing Individualize instruction so that learning is personalized through a sophisticated use of data for differentiated instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the school year, 45% of SWD and Black/African American students will be at the Proficient Level or higher, as measured by the ELA and Math State Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	(T) With the support and guidance of the Instructional coach and guidance counselor, teachers will analyze and disaggregate data to create small groups for instructional intervention by Title I Interventionists that are fluid and are based on skills that were previously taught.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	(T) With the support and guidance of the Instructional coach and guidance counselor, teachers will analyze and disaggregate data to create small groups for instructional intervention by Title I Interventionists that are fluid and are based on skills that were previously taught. Intervention tools will be determined by the deficiency, but will include the use of 95%, LLI, and Journeys.

Action Steps to Implement

(T) The Title I Instructional Coach will establish collaborative planning calendar & Schedule for instructional staff.

Person Responsible	Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)

(T) The Title I Instructional Coach will establish an agenda structure to include guiding instructional staff to unpack standards, and work on the alignment of standards with activities and common assessments.

Person Responsible	Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)

(T) Title I Interventionists will pull small groups of students to provide remediation for students that are not successful on common assessments.

Person Responsible	Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)

(T) The Title I Instructional Coach will conduct data chat meetings with instructional staff to review benchmark data to ensure students are mastering the content. Students that are having difficulty mastering content will be assigned to their grade level interventionist for additional academic support.

Person Responsible	Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)

Incorporate the guidance counselor through MTSS for students that are continuously having difficulty in reaching the mastery level after several attempts at remediation.

Person Responsible	Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the effects of the pandemic, including the loss of five months of school and being isolated from peers, a physically and emotionally safe and supportive classroom learning environment, based on mutual respect and fairness, is critical to to ensure student priority needs are met.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the school year, the overall agreement rate for Moral Character Development survey items will be at least 90%, as measured in the Imagine Schools Student Surveys.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Billie Dee Davis (billiedee.davis@imagineschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	(T) Title I Behavior Interventionist will guide and coordinate teacher implementation of Morning Meeting through Responsive Classroom & Purposefull People through CharacterStrong to support rapport development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies focus heavily on community building, rapport, and trust. These resources provide tools and explicit procedures and processes to develop a community of respect.

Action Steps to Implement

(T) The Title I Behavior Interventionist will provide instructional staff professional development on Responsive Classroom to include conflict resolution, morning meetings, teacher language and rapport development.

Person Responsible Billie Dee Davis (billiedee.davis@imagineschools.org)

(T) The Title I Behavior Interventionist and the leadership team will conduct quarterly students character surveys in order to benchmark growth in the area of respect.

Person Responsible Billie Dee Davis (billiedee.davis@imagineschools.org)

(T) The Title I Behavior Interventionist and leadership team will disaggregate data each quarter to provide additional observations, coaching cycles, and in class support to teachers and students that are scoring below the 90% threshold on the questions of "At this school everyone treats each other with Respect".

Person Responsible Billie Dee Davis (billiedee.davis@imagineschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team meets monthly to analyze benchmark data along with EWS data. The Benchmark data is disaggregated into subgroups to gain better perspective of overall academic and social emotional growth. Professional development and individualized coaching cycles from the academic coaches (literacy coaches) and student intervention groups provided by the Title I interventionists target the needs that continue to be priorities.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Imagine Schools at West Melbourne has implemented the use of the Responsive Classroom
in order to provide enrichment activities that contribute to a well rounded education.
The Responsive Classroom is a classroom that fosters a sense of belonging, significance,
and fun through the use of specific "teacher language", logical consequences, and the morning
meeting. Students begin each day in a positive way through the four components of the
morning meeting: greeting, sharing, a group activity, and a morning message. Each component is
aligned to current ELA state standards. The Responsive Classroom is designed to teach and
reinforce good character, as well as provide opportunities to support academic excellence.
Imagine West Melbourne believes that the social-emotional well-being of the students is just
as important as the academic well being of the students. Imagine West Melbourne believes
that with a strong community and a sense of belonging, significance, and fun, students will be more
capable of being academically successful.

Shared values are at the heart of who we want to be. Three particular values guide our work as an organization: Justice. Integrity. Fun.
Justice gives to each person what he or she deserves and what is appropriate. Justice requires doing all in our power to ensure that every Imagine student has access to an outstanding education. Driven by the unique abilities and needs of each student, Imagine educators design instruction to equip all students to become successful learners. We align goals for each student and adult in our schools with what they need and deserve.
Integrity means wholeness, or how things fit together. Integrity drives us to live and model consistent ethics inside and outside the school. Integrity requires responsibility and accountability. It means every aspect of what and how we teach is done with rigor and fidelity. We hold ourselves individually and collectively accountable for strong academic outcomes, with each individual fulfilling his or her responsibility so that all students can succeed.
Fun means cultivating a Joy at Work environment in every school we operate. In our schools, each person has the opportunity to use his or her unique talents and experience to make important decisions contributing to the success of the school. Joy at Work combines integrity and justice with accountability for our decisions in order to achieve outstanding results for students and families.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching				$48,803.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	100-Salaries	6515 - Imagine Schools At West Melbourne	Title, I Part A		$48,803.50
			Notes: (T) Hire a Title I Instructional Coach to Implement collaborative planning by grade level with support from the Principal			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				$206,015.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	100-Salaries	6515 - Imagine Schools At West Melbourne	Title, I Part A		$206,015.00
			Notes: (T) Hire Title I interventionists to provide interventions for student that are not yet reaching mastery level of a skill. (T) Hire a Title I Reading interventionist to support students in the Reading Lab.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$48,803.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	100-Salaries	6515 - Imagine Schools At West Melbourne	Title, I Part A		$48,803.50
			Notes: (T) Hire a Title I Behavior Interventionist to Implement SEL support and professional development by grade level with support from the Title I Instructional Coach and Principal.			
					Total:	$303,622.00