

Brevard Public Schools

Imagine Schools At West Melbourne



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
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: 10/3/2013

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2021-22 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	2021-22: D (40%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (42%)
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	CSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 10/25/2022.

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	14
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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-6	Yes	90%
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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 10/25/2022.

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

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.:

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 10/3/2013, Brian Degonzague

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

590

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

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	97	100	98	94	64	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	4	21	14	15	21	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	2	9	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	25	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	29	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	18	14	18	29	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	4	0	7	26	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	10	4	9	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/3/2022

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	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	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

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	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	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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	47%	61%	56%				54%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						61%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						71%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	37%	49%	50%				47%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	41%						62%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%						57%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	60%	59%				48%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	52%	64%	-12%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	61%	-9%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
06	2022					
	2019	54%	60%	-6%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	45%	61%	-16%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	64%	-5%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	60%	-22%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
06	2022					
	2019	37%	67%	-30%	55%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	47%	56%	-9%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	27	23	16	30						
ELL	52	79		26	54						
BLK	34	53	42	24	27		23				
HSP	37	35		40	54						
MUL	58	60		29	36						
WHT	54	53	50	45	44	45	38				
FRL	42	40	32	31	40	25	22				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	343
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
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	
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	47
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 2022 FSA for 5th grade was also a concern.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

2022 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. Our student population, like many across the world, has developed a large learning gap that must be closed. During the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 schools 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 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science proficiency increased 5 percentage points and mathematics learning gains increased by 4 percentage points.

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

Data analysis in the area of science and benchmarking in science supported a stronger instructional process in 5th grade.

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

A structured intervention block for both reading and mathematics will be needed to close the achievement gap. Additional resources for a phonics based instructional program to establish a strong reading foundation is needed. Mathematics manipulative resources will be needed to improve the overall math instructional program. Support for teachers in the area of benchmark analysis, practice alignment, and assessment alignment will be needed to guide teacher instruction with the new state benchmarks.

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. Science of Reading professional development will be provided to coordinate a development of a sound reading program.

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.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

SY21-22 FSA data shows 47% students performing at a proficiency (3+) compared to the state average 54% and the district average 61%.

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

ELA proficiency will increase, as measured by FAST ELA Spring assessment from 47% to 52%.

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

*STAR Progress monitoring (4x yearly) in Reading
 *STAR custom mastery assessments in reading for 3rd to 6th grade
 *FAST PM assessments in Reading

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

(T) With the support and guidance of the literacy coach, guidance counselor, and Academic Consultant, 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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

*Differentiated Small Group Instruction
 (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 Lexia.

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.

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

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, with the support of an academic consultant 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. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The 2022 percentage of proficiency among students in grades 3-6 was 37% in Mathematics, 47% in Reading, and 33% 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 2023 will consist of continued growth in proficiency and of our lowest quartile students. There are evident gaps in learning that occurred during the loss of time in classrooms due to the pandemic. With 11 new teachers, it will be imperative that specific teacher feedback and walkthroughs are completed to support teacher growth and guidance in closing the achievement gap.

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 school year, 49% of students will be at the Proficient Level or higher, as measured by the ELA and Math FAST Assessment, and Science State Assessments.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian DeGonzague (brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

(T) With the support and guidance of the Title I Lead Interventionist, Title I Instructional coach, the principal, and the academic consultant, teachers will utilize the ELA, math, and science benchmarks based pacing guides to collaboratively plan rigorous lessons that integrate the formative assessment data and address misconceptions. The principal and assistant principal, with support of the academic consultant, will conduct weekly walkthroughs to provide specific teacher feedback on instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

With teachers unpacking the benchmarks in weekly horizontal and vertical planning and aligning their resources appropriately for ongoing assessment and progress monitoring through the use of Curriculum Guides, all student populations will be provided with rigorous instruction. Instructional leader feedback and walkthroughs will guide and coordinate teacher efforts and will assist with accountability.

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.

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

Person Responsible

Kailee Brothers (kailee.brothers@imagineschools.org)

(T) The Principal will contract with an educational consultant with turn-around school experience to support the instructional leadership team.

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

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

Person Responsible Kailee Brothers (kailee.brothers@imageschools.org)

(T) The Title I Instructional Coach, Principal, and Assistant Principal 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@imageschools.com)

(T) The principal will hire a Teacher on Assignment to support with daily operations and behavioral support needs to provide the school's instructional leaders the ability to conduct walkthroughs and provide specific feedback to teachers.

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

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

Imagine Schools at West Melbourne had 48% of 1st grade students scored below expectation on the 2022 Spring STAR benchmark in Reading. The School will address the disproportionate impact of the coronavirus on students experiencing homelessness, and children and youth in foster care by offering additional intervention opportunities. The school will be increasing the percentage of students that are offered Tier II style reading interventions on a daily basis. The school has already purchased a state approved literacy resource, Lexia, and will provide professional learning aligned to the FELDS and the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards grounded in the science of reading and include professional learning on

evidence-based practices and programs. The school sent two instructional leaders to summer conferences to partner with State Regional Literacy Directors to provide services and supports to enhance reading interventions and targeted supports.

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

Imagine Schools at West Melbourne had 61% of 3rd grade students scored below grade level on the 2022 FSA in ELA. The School will address the disproportionate impact of the coronavirus on students experiencing homelessness, and children and youth in foster care by offering additional intervention opportunities. The school will be increasing the percentage of students that are offered Tier II style reading interventions on a daily basis. The school has already purchased a state approved literacy resource, Lexia, and will provide professional learning aligned to the FELDS and the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards grounded in the science of reading and include professional learning on evidence-based practices and programs. The school sent two instructional leaders to summer conferences to partner with State Regional Literacy Directors to provide services and supports to enhance reading interventions and targeted supports.

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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percentage of students at the Proficient Level or higher, as measured by the STAR EL/Reading PM3 will increase to 50% or greater in grades Kindergarten through 2nd grade.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percentage of students at the Proficient Level or higher, as measured by the FAST Assessment will increase from 47% to 52% or greater in grades 3 through 6.

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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

*STAR Progress monitoring (4x yearly) in Reading and Mathematics

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

*FAST Benchmark Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

DeGonzague, Brian, brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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. Â§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?

The school will be increasing the percentage of students that are offered Tier II style reading interventions on a daily basis. The school has already purchased a state approved literacy resource, Lexia, and will provide professional learning aligned to the FELDS and the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards grounded in the science of reading and include professional learning on evidence-based practices and programs. The school sent two instructional leaders to summer conferences to partner with State Regional Literacy Directors to provide services and supports to enhance reading interventions and targeted supports.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The School will address the disproportionate impact of the coronavirus on students experiencing homelessness, and children and youth in foster care by offering additional intervention opportunities.

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
The school send two instructional leaders to summer conferences to partner with State Regional Literacy Directors to provide services and supports to enhance reading interventions and targeted supports.	DeGonzague, Brian, brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com
The school will increase the percentage of students that are offered Tier II style reading interventions on a daily basis.	DeGonzague, Brian, brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com
The school will purchase a state approved literacy resource, Lexia, to utilize as an intervention tool to support closing the achievement gap.	Brothers, Kailee, kailee.brothers@imagineschools.org
The school will provide professional learning for teachers aligned to the FELDS and the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards grounded in the science of reading and include professional learning on evidence-based practices and programs.	Brothers, Kailee, kailee.brothers@imagineschools.org
Imagine Schools at West Melbourne will hire 1 teacher on assignment to provide proactive behavioral support along with facilitating restorative practices with students. This support will allow for the school leadership team to provide additional guidance and coordination of the instructional program through consistent and explicit feedback to teachers.	DeGonzague, Brian, brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com
Imagine Schools at West Melbourne will hire an educational consultant to support and guide the instructional leadership team in implementing Professional Learning Communities (PLC's), Benchmark Mapping, developing mastery assessments, and analyzing data.	DeGonzague, Brian, brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com
Imagine Schools at West Melbourne will purchase mathematics manipulative resource kits for (25) classrooms that align with the BEST Benchmarks.	Brothers, Kailee, kailee.brothers@imagineschools.org
Imagine Schools at West Melbourne will purchase additional chrome books (30) for students to utilize to access reading and mathematics intervention resources.	DeGonzague, Brian, brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com
Imagine Schools at West Melbourne will purchase on campus professional development in the area of Social Emotional Learning.	Davis, Billie Dee, billiedee.davis@imagineschools.org
Imagine Schools at West Melbourne will recruit, train and deploy 6-8 reading and mathematics tutors for K-6 students. Imagine will prioritize hiring mathematics and reading tutors that are certified teachers.	DeGonzague, Brian, brian.degonzague@imagineschools.com

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 school culture and environment.

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)
Jean McCualey (Interventionist)
Alisar Bark (Interventionist)
Amanda Brezina (Interventionist)
Jill Rohrer (Instructional Assistant Interventionist)
Lauren Burr (Peer Coach)
Taylor Kent (Peer Coach)
Brendan Williams (Science Interventionist)