

Brevard Public Schools

Imagine Schools At West Melbourne



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 10/1/2013

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	52%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
DeGonzague, Brian	Principal	
Davis, Billie Dee	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 10/1/2013, 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.*

1

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

547

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

6

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

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	92	98	90	98	70	54	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	544
Attendance below 90 percent	1	10	9	11	10	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	6	1	3	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	2	2	3	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	6	5	5	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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 9/16/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				54%	62%	57%	49%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	60%	58%	45%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	57%	53%	43%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				47%	63%	63%	42%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	65%	62%	44%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	53%	51%	31%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	57%	53%	43%	57%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	52%	64%	-12%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	61%	-9%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
06	2021					
	2019	54%	60%	-6%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	61%	-16%	62%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	64%	-5%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	60%	-22%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
06	2021					
	2019	37%	67%	-30%	55%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	47%	56%	-9%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA - STAR
 Mathematics - STAR
 Science - StemScopes

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35%	45%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28%	39%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	29%	43%	29%
	English Language Learners	50%	100%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	59%	65%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	58%	61%
	Students With Disabilities	57%	43%	29%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	50%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35%	41%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	43%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	29%	57%	43%
	English Language Learners	25%	22%	11%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23%	46%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	39%	51%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	43%	43%
	English Language Learners	13%	25%	33%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41%	49%	51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37%	45%	52%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	17%	34%
	English Language Learners	43%	43%	38%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	40%	63%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39%	59%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	17%
	English Language Learners	43%	67%	50%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39%	49%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	44%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	75%	50%
	English Language Learners	0%	33%	33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42%	64%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	69%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	75%	50%	75%
	English Language Learners	33%	67%	33%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30%	43%	41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	43%	45%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	29%	14%
	English Language Learners	20%	60%	20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36%	38%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	30%	45%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	57%	43%
	English Language Learners	50%	75%	40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	3%	34%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	30%	42%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	14%	43%
	English Language Learners	0%	25%	25%
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38%	44%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	26%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	50%	33%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51%	56%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	58%	47%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	67%	50%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	50%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	14	50		17	29						
ELL	46	73		33	45						
BLK	23	24		17	22						
HSP	49	85		41	50						
MUL	70	67		48	50						
WHT	48	41		44	38		14				
FRL	44	46	50	34	43	53	17				
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				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	334

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	51
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	17
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	43
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Overall, SWD are scoring well below the school average and below other subgroups. Learning of the lowest quartile in reading and mathematics continues to be an area of concern. Science proficiency on the 2020 FSA for 5th grade was also a concern.

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

2021 FSA data was well below expectations and demonstrates a great need for improvement in the areas of learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile. SWD data, based on Progress Monitoring data, shows a great need for improvement in proficiency percentage.

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

Some contributing factors include the impact of the pandemic stricken school year. Our student population, like many across the world, has developed a large learning gap that must be closed. During the 2020-2021 school year we saw an increase in time away from school, physically distanced classrooms that limited our unique intervention process, and virtual learning that created a divide amongst student learning structures.

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

Learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains showed great improvements in 2019.

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

in 2019, the school implemented a robust intervention process that incorporated Title I interventionists. While this idea was continued in 2020 and 2021, the process was required to be changed in order to address pandemic concerns.

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

Intervention strategies to support closing the learning gap seen within the lowest quartile of students, SWD, and black students will need to be implemented. Guidance and coordination of the development and implementation of a strong pacing guide will need to be implemented. Support with developing, implementing, analyzing, and reflecting on formative assessments and formative assessment data will be needed to be implemented.

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

Professional development in the areas of differentiation and intervention, developing and implementing a strong pacing guide, developing, implementing, analyzing, and reflecting on formative assessments and formative assessment data will be provided to accelerate learning.

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

Leadership team meetings to reflect on accountability measures and school wide data analysis will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement for years to come.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

SY20-21 FSA data shows 45% students performing at a proficiency (3+) compared to the state average 52% and the district average 57%.

Measurable Outcome:

ELA proficiency will increase, as measured by FSA ELA assessment from 45% to 49%.

The following ongoing monitoring through the following measures:

Monitoring:

*STAR Progress monitoring (4x yearly) in Reading

*STAR custom mastery assessments in reading for 3rd to 6th grade

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

(T) With the support and guidance of the literacy coach and guidance counselor, teachers will analyze and disaggregate data to create small groups for instructional intervention by Title I Interventionists and support from Title I paraprofessional that are fluid and are based on skills that were previously taught.

*Differentiated Small Group Instruction

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 Foundations, and Journeys.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible

Kailee Brothers (kailee.brothers@imagineschools.org)

(T) The Title I Literacy 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

Kailee Brothers (kailee.brothers@imagineschools.org)

(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 Literacy 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

Kailee Brothers (kailee.brothers@imagineschools.org)

(T) 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)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The 2021 percentage of proficiency among students in grades 3-6 was 37% in Mathematics, 45% in Reading, and 24% in Science. Due to the need to increase proficiency, and due to the shortened 2020 school year because of the COVID pandemic, and a hybrid structure in 2021, an area of focus for 2022 will consist of continued growth in proficiency and of our lowest quartile students needs to be maintained as there are possible 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, 49% of students will be at the Proficient Level or higher, as measured by the ELA, Math, and Science State Assessments.

The following ongoing monitoring through the following measures:

Monitoring: *STAR Progress monitoring (4x yearly) in Reading and Mathematics
*STAR custom mastery assessments in reading for 3rd to 6th grade
*StemScopes mastery assessments in Science for 5th grade

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kailee Brothers (kailee.brothers@imagineschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: (T) With the support and guidance of the Title I Lead Interventionist, Title I Instructional coach, and the Science Interventionist, teachers will utilize the ELA, math, and science 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) 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 Literacy 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)

(T) 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)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

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 coach) and student intervention groups provided by the Title I interventionists target the needs that continue to be priorities. Also analyzed on a monthly basis is behavioral and discipline data to determine trends and areas for training, intervention, and support.

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.

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.

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

The key stakeholders at Imagine Schools at West Melbourne;

Brian DeGonzague (Principal)
 Billie Dee Davis (Assistant Principal)
 Kailee Brothers (Literacy Coach)
 Carrie McLamar (Guidance Counselor)
 Joan Dean (Lead Interventionist)
 Brandon Hinchman (Interventionist)
 Alisar Bark (Interventionist)
 Amber Diaz-Deatherage (Interventionist)
 Lauren Burr (Peer Coach)
 Molly Koppelman (Peer Coach)
 Brendan Williams (Science Interventionist)