Flagler Schools

Imagine School At Town Center School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Imagine School At Town Center

775 TOWN CENTER BLVD, Palm Coast, FL 32164

www.imagineschooltowncenter.org

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Spires, Rachael	Principal	Instructional school leader overseeing all schoolwide practices, educators, school employees, and classroom instructional routines.
Menard, James	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal assigned to oversee grades K-8, ESOL, Behavior, MTSS, and SWD.
Hilton, Maryann	Instructional Coach	Reading and Math Coach. Meets regularly with K-8 teachers and leadership team to assess individual student and school data to make instructional decisions.
Martin, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Data Coach. Meets regularly with teachers and leadership team to assess individual student and school data to make instructional decisions.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We have had collaborative discussions with our stakeholders to discuss the best ways in which to improve our lower ranking areas.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Each month our leadership team will meet with our regional team to review data and the implementation of strategies within classrooms. We will discuss what is working and what is not, areas in which we are noticing growth, and those that we are noticing drops. As a team, we will make decisions on what needs to be changed and the best ways to address those changes. Daily walk throughs will be completed and the data collected from the walk throughs will also be used to adjust instruction.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	37%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	63%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	36	31	27	26	25	25	23	15	20	228
One or more suspensions	8	5	13	7	10	4	5	14	5	71
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	5	4	7	2	1	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	23	15	8	19	22	107
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	21	30	13	3	8	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	12	19	46	42	33	34	0	0	0	186

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	4	14	7	8	2	0	8	46

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	1	14	3	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	33	39	28	32	32	38	35	30	25	292
One or more suspensions	6	15	5	6	4	4	5	8	10	63
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	4	0	1	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	16	16	13	15	17	92
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	24	28	9	12	15	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	22	78	51	47	33	37	0	0	0	268

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	57	58	53	55	58	55	58		
ELA Learning Gains				53			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			40		
Math Achievement*	57	55	55	57	47	42	54		
Math Learning Gains				58			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			40		
Science Achievement*	48	51	52	38	56	54	49		
Social Studies Achievement*	93	82	68	93	58	59	89		
Middle School Acceleration	64	59	70	58	55	51	62		
Graduation Rate			74		46	50			
College and Career Acceleration			53		85	70			
ELP Progress	70	70	55		46	70			

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	450
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	4	1
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	43			
HSP	69			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	51			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	3	
ELL	73			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	43			
HSP	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	51			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	57			57			48	93	64			70
SWD	16			25			18	64			5	
ELL	50			64							3	70
AMI												
ASN	56			71							2	
BLK	39			35			22	82			5	
HSP	57			54			63	100			4	
MUL	59			54			29				3	
PAC												
WHT	61			62			51	94	58		6	
FRL	46			49			34	84	47		6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	55	53	47	57	58	54	38	93	58			
SWD	16	37	39	26	46	43	14	73				
ELL	64	57		76	96							
AMI												
ASN	75	79		87	85							

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	38	45	50	39	49	52	25					
HSP	60	58	50	68	56	64	26					
MUL	61	61		56	50		50					
PAC												
WHT	55	52	44	58	59	52	40	95	58			
FRL	46	48	46	49	54	57	33	90	36			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	58	52	40	54	50	40	49	89	62			
SWD	22	30	34	23	46	45	11	67				
ELL	48	58		56	37		36					
AMI												
ASN	87	85		79	58							
BLK	43	49	42	35	31	22	35	73				
HSP	58	53		59	57		58					
MUL	53	45		44	50							
PAC												
WHT	60	51	40	58	54	48	52	91	67			
FRL	52	54	45	49	44	37	43	89	47			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	54%	59%	-5%	54%	0%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	52%	3%	47%	8%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	53%	50%	3%	47%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	57%	2%	58%	1%
06	2023 - Spring	66%	52%	14%	47%	19%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	57%	1%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	58%	55%	3%	54%	4%
07	2023 - Spring	84%	45%	39%	48%	36%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	64%	0%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	62%	-9%	61%	-8%
08	2023 - Spring	62%	65%	-3%	55%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	32%	58%	-26%	55%	-23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	54%	55%	-1%	44%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	42%	57%	-15%	51%	-9%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	56%	44%	50%	50%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	51%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	71%	22%	66%	27%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

At Imagine Town Center the data component showing the lowest performance was our students with disabilities in both ELA and Math. Factors that may have contributed to this include new math benchmarks and a new math curriculum. For both ELA and Math, we see a significant achievement gap for our students with disabilities population. A contributing factor may be the instructional methods of the intervention team. If methods do not meet students specific learning needs we will not see significant results in closing the achievement gap. Overall contributing factors may also come from COVID and gaps in learning due to students losing learning time and having high absences during that period of time. As a result, we are currently working towards closing those gaps.

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

The data component with the greatest decline from the prior year was 6th-grade math, the proficiency dropped 6% points. Factors that may have contributed to this include; new math benchmarks and the unpacking of benchmarks. With the differences in benchmarks between what was previously taught and what is currently taught there was a gap. Another factor included a new math curriculum, that was more hands-on and also had technology-based components that required more one-to-one student laptops which we did not have, as well as a change in teachers beginning in October. Our STAR assessment that we take quarterly also showed very similar data to that of FAST.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 5th grade math, the gap was a 23% difference. While this is a significant difference from the state the decline was small in relation to the 5th grade math scores from the 2021-2022 school year. Factors that may have contributed to this gap include new benchmarks that were put into place for the 2022-2023 school year as well as new curriculum. Looking at previous data a trend seems to be low test scores within 5th grade math at Imagine Town Center, even though the same students did well in 4th grade math.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was 6th-grade ELA. There was overall proficiency of 66% and exceeding the state proficiency of 47%. In 6th-grade students completed engaging assignments that involved much discussion and collaboration. All students completed monthly fluency, met with their teacher for small group instruction regularly, and were held to high expectations. The teacher unpacked standards, reviewed data, and knew what her students needed to grow. The teacher set individual student goals and conferenced with students often.

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

Based on EWS data areas of concern include the number of students being retained in 3rd grade based upon not passing the state test showing there is a reading deficiency. The second area of concern is the amount of absences in all grade levels, this leads to a lack of learning.

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

Students with disabilities will increase their proficiency by 4% bringing our target to 42%.
Based on FAST testing, our proficiency in Reading will increase from 57% to 62%.
Based on FAST testing, our proficiency in 5th-grade math will increase from 32% to 50%.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with disabilities were identified as an ESSA subgroup based on student performance data. Overall, students with disabilities demonstrated a value of 37 on the federal percent of point of index rating. According to STAR data, the percentage of students proficient across grade levels as compared to students with disabilities reveals a gap of 19 percentage points in ELA and Math.

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

In the 2023-2024 school year Imagine Town Center will decrease the gap between grade level proficiency and proficiency of students with disabilities to 18 percentage points or less at all grade levels in ELA and Math as evidenced by grade level common assessments (Fundations, STAR Customs, Wit & Wisdom, Eureka 2, Math Nation), FAST assessments, and STAR diagnostics.

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

Teachers and students will track their own progress toward their goals with data chats taking place within the classroom. The leadership team will review all grade-level ELA and Math assessments within a week of their completion to determine proficiency on each assessment as well as the gap between grade-level proficiency and proficiency of students with disabilities. Leadership team members will then hold data chats with classroom teachers, the intervention teacher for that grade level, and the director of ESE. These data chats will focus on student growth and proficiency. The leadership team will also review FAST and STAR diagnostic assessments to determine the proficiency of each assessment and determine the gap between grade level proficiency and the proficiency of students with disabilities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Martin (stephanie.martin@imagineschooltowncenter.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Classroom teachers and intervention teachers will meet with all students to set goals, discuss the progress of goals, and require students to graph their progress toward goals consistently throughout the whole school year. This school year the intervention teacher will participate in all team-level collaborative planning to have a deeper understanding of the lessons being taught within the classroom. Intervention teachers will use this information to create small group lesson plans that will preview vocabulary terms multiple times before it is used in the classroom and provide background knowledge on concepts that will be taught within whole group instruction time.

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

According to the Science of Reading, explicit instruction of vocabulary and building background knowledge allows students to be successful in learning content. Research shows that small group instruction for all students holds student engagement and increases learning. Finally, goal setting and follow-through are effective as evidenced by self-reported grades, allowing students to take ownership of their learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Step 1. Professional learning on teachers using data to plan for small group instruction and how to have data chats with students.
Step 2. Walkthroughs of classrooms to monitor the use of small group instruction and monitor the implementation of data chats.
Step 3. Analyze walkthrough anecdotal data and determine if additional professional development is needed.
Step 4. Analyze student progress monitoring data to determine if the strategy is effective.
Step 5. Continue monitoring implementation.

Person Responsible: James Menard (james.menard@imagineschools.org)

By When: This will be completed within one week of students taking FAST PM1 and STAR 1.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students were not proficient in ELA per the FAST assessment and STAR assessment. Overall, students in ELA scored slightly higher than in the state. However, according to FAST data our overall proficiency was 57% leaving room for growth.

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

In the 2023-2024 school year Imagine Town Center will increase the reading proficiency level from 57% to 60% in all grade levels as evidenced by grade level common assessments (Fundations, STAR Customs, Wit & Wisdom), FAST Assessments, and STAR quarterly diagnostics.

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

Leadership members will complete daily walk-throughs to provide feedback to teachers regarding their uses of the Science of Reading strategies as well as Kagan Cooperative learning. Leadership members will be specifically looking for a rate of 95% of student engagement within the classroom.

Leadership team members will hold data chats with classroom teachers on the results of common assessments, FAST assessments, and STAR quarterly diagnostics after each completion to determine proficiency on each assessment as well as the gap between grade level proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maryann Hilton (maryann.hilton@imagineschooltowncenter.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will use the Science of Reading strategies to best encompass the foundational reading needs of students. These strategies will be enhanced by the use of Kagan Cooperative learning to ensure student engagement and conversations for the lessons and standards being presented.

Teachers will complete data chats bi-weekly to give immediate feedback on students' fluency growth as well as complete a data review, discussing if goals have been met. Teachers and students will determine the next steps if a goal wasn't met and will set a new goal if the goal had been met.

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

According to the Science of Reading, the use of explicit and systematic instruction helps to support the foundational learning needs of students.
Kagan Cooperative Learning helps to increase student engagement so that students are actively learning with their peers.
Finally, goal setting and follow-through are effective as evidenced by self-reported grades, allowing students to take ownership of their learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Step 1. Professional learning on teachers using various strategies under the Science of Reading and Kagan Cooperative Learning.
Step 2. Walkthroughs of classrooms to monitor the use of the Science of Reading and Kagan strategies.
Step 3. Analyze walkthrough anecdotal data and determine if additional professional development is needed.
Step 4. Analyze student progress monitoring data to determine if the strategy is effective.
Step 5. Continue monitoring implementation.

Person Responsible: Maryann Hilton (maryann.hilton@imagineschooltowncenter.org)

By When: Students will be identified quarterly after each STAR assessment.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to our 2022-2023 Math FAST data, only 32% of our 5th grade students scored a level 3 or higher showing grade level math achievement. While math data has fluctuated over the past 4 years, 3 of those years has resulted in a proficiency level of 40% or less.

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

The goal is for each of the 5th grade math classes to score a 70% or higher on the grade level Math assessments (Unit assessment and benchmark based assessments).

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

The leadership team will review all grade level Math assessments within a week of their completion to determine proficiency on each assessment as well as the critical areas to focus on reteaching. Leadership team members will also review the progress monitoring data collected monthly to make any adjustments and interventions to be provided.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maryann Hilton (maryann.hilton@imagineschooltowncenter.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

In addition to evidence-based core Math curriculum, students who are in need of additional practice and exposure to math vocabulary and content will receive these opportunities through grade level success time. Success time will occur 4 days a week to provide targeted instruction. Success time will be taught by math teachers that focus on Math Thinking and Reasoning Standards, hands-on activities, and critical thinking problem-solving.

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

Based upon the Florida Math Benchmarks students need to be provided with opportunities to balance conceptual understanding and procedural fluency. Math Thinking and Reasoning Standards allow for guidance in self-monitoring tools and for teachers to incorporate many levels of learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Step 1. Professional learning on teachers using various strategies under the Science of Reading and Kagan Cooperative Learning.
Step 2. Walkthroughs of classrooms to monitor the use of the Science of Reading and Kagan strategies.

Step 3. Analyze walkthrough anecdotal data and determine if additional professional development is needed.
Step 4. Analyze student progress monitoring data to determine if the strategy is effective.
Step 5. Continue monitoring implementation.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Martin (stephanie.martin@imagineschooltowncenter.org)

By When: By the end of the first 9 weeks.

Determine a progress monitoring tool to be given once monthly that requires students to demonstrate their knowledge of mathematical fluency.

Person Responsible: Maryann Hilton (maryann.hilton@imagineschooltowncenter.org)

By When: The progressive monitoring tool will be placed into effect by the end of August.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Staffing allocation to ensure proper staffing of SWD population.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes