
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Imagine Schools At Broward

9001 WESTVIEW DR, Coral Springs, FL 33067

imaginebroward.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.

Mission: Imagine School at Broward is committed to excellence in academics, character, and building life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: Our goal at Imagine School at Broward is to empower students to grow and evolve into global thinkers and lifelong learners. Each child is recognized as a unique individual and is encouraged to reach their own true potential. Through collaborative efforts, parents, students, and staff will foster a positive, warm, loving environment in which students develop their whole selves.

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
Darling, Debra	Principal	<p>Establish and communicate standards for student and professional performance. Continually assess school practices and procedures to ensure the academic success and growth of all students.</p> <p>Responsibilities include disciplining or advising students, approving Teachers' curriculums and ensuring the school environment is safe for all students and staff members. Implement the school's charter in collaboration with the school's board of directors and the authorizing institution.</p> <p>Establish and communicate standards for student and professional performance.</p> <p>Continually assess school practices and procedures and adjust them to support the diverse learning needs of students.</p> <p>Assume responsibility for the health, safety and welfare of the students, staff and visitors. Infuse the school culture with Imagine Schools Non-Profit's Six Measures of Excellence. Demonstrate an understanding of the Imagine Schools Non-Profit Six Measures of Excellence in the execution of duties. Model positive character virtues and habits. Assist students in developing positive moral and performance character attributes.</p> <p>Responsible for overseeing the financial management of the school, including: development of the annual budget, overseeing the management of accounts payable and accounts receivable, approving payroll, and provision of required financial reports to the board, district and state. Also responsible for seeing that</p> <p>the annual financial audit is completed in a timely manner.</p> <p>Responsible for the hiring and supervision of school personnel. Collaborate and clearly communicate with parents/guardians, and other educators to assist the students.</p> <p>Regularly communicate with all members of the school community.</p>
Cardona, Melanie	Assistant Principal	<p>Administrative duties to assist the principal. Supervises and evaluates the performance of personnel.</p> <p>Performs a variety of administrative duties to assist the Principal in managing the school. Assumes the duties of the Principal in the absence of the Principal and as assigned. Assists the Principal in providing instructional leadership to the school.</p> <p>Supervises and evaluates the performance of designated certificated and/or classified personnel assigns duties to faculty and staff as appropriate to meet school objectives; Assists with the recruiting, interviewing, and selection of new faculty and staff. Supervises students on campus after school; assist with monitoring students during lunch when needed.</p> <p>Provides direction to a variety of faculty, staff, and student programs and services; participates in formal and informal classroom visitations and observations; provides recommendations and suggestions for improvement as appropriate.</p> <p>Directs the FAST program and summer school in collaboration with school staff and/or personnel from outside agencies. Provide Professional Development at Staff Meetings, Meets with educators to discuss data, complete reports and progress monitoring data.</p> <p>Serves as the testing coordinator. Assists in the development,</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>implementation, and evaluation of intervention programs that address the needs of at-risk students.</p> <p>Coordinate required ESE meetings. education teachers of students with disabilities to implement the Individual Education Plan (IEP) and monitor progress of IEP goals. Assist staffing committee members in developing appropriate IEPs and ensure parents receive draft IEPs for all annual reviews.</p> <p>Serve as the principal's designee for all exceptional student education (ESE) staff in accordance with the annual Local Education Agency (LEA) Memo. Administration and the ESE Specialists are required to submit a signed agreement annually. Coordinate required ESE meetings. Provide information to school-based personnel on a variety of topics to include updating staff on policy changes. Assist regular education teachers of students with disabilities to implement the Individual Education Plan (IEP) and monitor progress of IEP goals. Assist staffing committee members in developing appropriate IEPs and ensure parents receive draft IEPs for all annual reviews. Meet with ESE curriculum supervisors monthly with regard to curricula, related services and program delivery systems for students with disabilities. Provide explanations to parent(s) of the Procedural Safeguards as well as the availability of resources within the District to meet the unique needs of the student. Utilize facilitative behaviors consistent with the Facilitated IEP training provided by the District in order to conduct efficient and productive IEP meetings, in which all participants feel valued and heard. Assist in identifying, reporting and correcting IDEA compliance concerns identified internally. Shall report all compliance concerns directly to the schoolbased leadership. Correct compliance errors identified internally (within the school) and externally, in accordance with federal, state and local laws, rules, policies and procedures. Communicate effectively with parents, colleagues and other stakeholders to ensure that IEPs for students with disabilities are implemented with fidelity. Utilize the electronic management system to generate IEP documents. Perform and promote all activities in compliance with the equal employment and nondiscrimination policies of The School Board of Broward County, Florida. Participate in training programs offered to enhance the individual skills and proficiency related to the job responsibilities. Review current developments, literature and technical sources of information related to job responsibilities. Ensure adherence to safety rules and procedures. Follow federal and state, as well as School Board policies. Perform other duties as assigned by the school principal. Oversee the MTSS Process, Meet Weekly with Interventionist and share with the Leadership Team.</p>
DiMartino, Jessica	Other	
Gaskins, Suzette	Instructional Coach	<p>Support teachers and administrators in using data to improve instruction on all levels. professional development targeted topics and designs. Develop coaching plans for teachers to ensure student improvement. Utilize Adult Learning Theory to motivate adult learners to improve professional practice.</p>

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.

Each year parents, students and staff become involved in a survey process covering various topics (shared values, character development, academics, etc.) Results are used to create SMART goals and an improvement plan for the school. Survey results are shared with the Governing Board, staff, family, and the community. Our committees of the Six Measures of Excellence triangulate our data and evaluate the root causes of the low areas on the surveys and state assessment student results to create the Imagine SEP.

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))

The SIP is a fluid document that will be regularly monitored. Data chats occur at least once quarterly to evaluate individual student and class data of Reading and Math as well as science. Data is reviewed at the school level, grade level, classroom level, individual student and by subgroup. If adequate growth is not met, then students are assigned to either Tier 2 or Tier 3. Walkthrough and formal evaluations are conducted to ensure strategies are being implemented. The Academic Achievement Committee consisting of grade level Team Leads meet monthly to monitor progress.

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	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
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: A
	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
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	0	44	28	21	20	22	23	12	12	182
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	17
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	14	11	14	6	16	62
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	15	20	25	8	8	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 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	0	0	2	2	13	13	21	8	11	70

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	0	3	7	2	7	10	10	10	7	56
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	67	55	53	71	57	55	72		
ELA Learning Gains				63			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			41		
Math Achievement*	57	52	55	65	47	42	60		
Math Learning Gains				66			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			37		
Science Achievement*	53	50	52	50	52	54	61		
Social Studies Achievement*	78	68	68	78	64	59	87		
Middle School Acceleration	69	72	70	73	57	51	68		
Graduation Rate		68	74		50	50			
College and Career Acceleration		54	53		66	70			
ELP Progress	54	53	55	67	75	70	66		

** 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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	630
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	48			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	54			
HSP	64			
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	64			

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%
FRL	61			

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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	52			
HSP	64			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	63			

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	67			57			53	78	69			54
SWD	29			33			22	31			5	
ELL	49			47			35				5	54
AMI												
ASN	70			79			70	90	81		5	
BLK	60			36			48	64			5	
HSP	71			56			52	78	66		7	52
MUL	42			48							3	

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
PAC												
WHT	67			59			56	82	65		6	
FRL	63			48			47	74	59		7	53

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	71	63	41	65	66	56	50	78	73			67
SWD	39	44	29	40	51	45	33					
ELL	54	59	38	54	65	48	40	50				67
AMI												
ASN	82	84		79	72		68	90	83			
BLK	58	54	30	48	50	50	41	77	60			
HSP	71	64	43	65	65	53	48	80	79			70
MUL	46			62								
PAC												
WHT	73	60	48	68	71	63	51	74	64			
FRL	65	50		63	73							

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	72	62	41	60	48	37	61	87	68			66
SWD	34	38	35	29	42	41	21	60				
ELL	63	56	43	56	52	44	36	69				66
AMI												
ASN	84	72		81	59		81		60			
BLK	60	53	40	46	40	28	42	100	70			
HSP	74	65	46	61	53	47	59	82	73			62
MUL	62			54								
PAC												
WHT	69	58	21	58	41	39	63	88	62			
FRL												

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	68%	56%	12%	54%	14%
07	2023 - Spring	62%	49%	13%	47%	15%
08	2023 - Spring	57%	49%	8%	47%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	61%	15%	58%	18%
06	2023 - Spring	73%	50%	23%	47%	26%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	53%	11%	50%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	57%	54%	3%	54%	3%
07	2023 - Spring	73%	51%	22%	48%	25%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	62%	-3%	59%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	65%	-3%	61%	1%
08	2023 - Spring	42%	46%	-4%	55%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	58%	-6%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	51%	38%	13%	44%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	46%	7%	51%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	48%	19%	50%	17%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	46%	38%	48%	36%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	64%	12%	66%	10%

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.

Data from three assessments revealed low performance in upper grades. In Lexia, grades 6-8 showed low performance in word study and grammar. In grammar, 1% of 8th graders, 4% of 7th graders, and 7% of 6th graders scored in the advanced range. In Word study, only 2% of 8th graders, 13% of 7th graders, and 9% of 6th graders scored in the advanced range. Contributing factors included a new assessment (Lexia) & low usage of program. In STAR, 4th and 7th grades had the lowest performance. In grade 4 59% of students were on or above benchmark in Reading. In 7th, 52% of students were on or above benchmark. In Cambium, 57% of 8th graders scored on or above benchmark. In 7th, 61% of students were on or above benchmark. Contributing factors were a delayed start to instruction due to facility changes and late arrival of curriculum, new testing requirements, loss of instructional days due to weather, and a full week or internet outage during the testing period. Low performance in math compared to District and State were attributed to charter teachers not being allowed access to District LAB training for Envision over the summer, delay in delivery of curriculum, and new BEST Math standards.

For Students with Disabilities the low performance by strand:

Mathematics:

- Grade K Operations (24%)
- Grade 1 Number Sense and Operations (65%)
- Grade 2 Perimeter Area and Volume (26%)
- Grade 3 Geometric Concepts (42%)
- Grade 4 Data Analysis (19%)
- Grade 5 Fraction Operations (25%)
- Grade 6 Data Analysis (20%)
- Grade 7 Perimeter Area and Volume (18%)
- Grade 8 Probability (11%)

Reading:

- Grade K Author's Word Choice and Figurative Language (15%)
- Grade 1 Sequencing (43%)

Grade 2 Author's Purpose and Perspective (57%)
 Grade 3 Sequencing (56%)
 Grade 4 Argumentation (41%)
 Grade 5 Argumentation (54%)
 Grade 6 Conventions and Range of Reading (46%)
 Grade 7 Setting (40%)
 Grade 8 Summary and Connotation(41%)

Grades 2-8 Mathematics (not 5th grade), lowest skills are curriculum areas (Data and Measurement, Geometry) that occur late in instructional year. Instruction in these skills are rushed/incomplete as delays or interruptions to schedule (weather days, high absences Covid, slowing pace of instruction for challenging units) push curriculum into testing/review period. Later taught skills aren't spiraled throughout year. Intensive focus for small groups centers around basic operations and foundational skills, not geometry and data skills. Students as whole struggle with fraction concepts; when combined with gaps in foundational skills, fraction operations efficiency is impacted. Math standards changes with delays in receiving instructional materials have contributed to delays in later phases of instruction. In reading, author's word choice and figurative language are skills that kindergarten with no background knowledge/schema need to build on. Grades 1/4/8, sequencing, argumentation, and summary and connotation involve skills that apply to the text. Students with attention issues or reading deficits lack focus & labor to decode or comprehend text. Difficulties maintaining stamina to develop deeper concepts relating to the text as a whole. Progression to more complex texts, is affected in grade 6.

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

The greatest decline was evident in the STAR scores for 7th grade students. Scores dropped from 39% of students on or above benchmark in PM1 to 33% in PM3. Contributing factors include a demanding testing schedule, a week-long internet outage that interfered with testing and instruction, and general year-end apathy or low test stamina after a demanding testing schedule as this was the last assessment in a rigorous testing cycle. The school lost internet connectivity during the testing window due to external factor of AT&T fiber optic cables being cut at a construction site located near the school, causing a shorter testing window.

For the subgroup of Students with Disabilities the greatest decline was the following:
 Mathematics: Ratios and Proportional Relationship (all grades) from 49 down to 32
 Reading: Setting (all grades) from 76 down to 67

In mathematics, skills in ratios and proportional relationships are heavily dependent on mastered knowledge of integers, fractions, decimals, and multiplication and division operations. We are finding that gaps in required knowledge in foundational skills are greatly affecting the more complex processes of upper level math, especially for problems that require students to understand the multiplicative and additive comparisons and when to use them.

In reading in upper grades, students must explain how setting applies to plot. This may be difficult for many students as texts become more complex with multiple plots, various setting locations (real or imaginary) and time periods. Students with attention issues or reading deficiencies may have a hard time keeping track of the changes in setting and may struggle analyzing these changes as they apply to the plot line(s) of the text.

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 data were the STAR scores in 7th grade. Contributing factors include a demanding testing schedule, a week-long internet

outage that interfered with testing and instruction, and general year-end apathy or low test stamina after a demanding testing schedule as this was the last assessment in a rigorous testing cycle. In general, scores continued to rise in the Cambium assessments for all grades for each assessment period as students' exposure to and practice with standards increased. Gains in STAR were lower than we had seen in previous years, however, this is the first year of multiple tests throughout the year and STAR was the last assessment in the cycle. Students were fatigued with testing at the end of the year. Additionally, the percentage of students with attention/anxiety issues has risen steadily each year which contributes to learning losses and reduced test scores, along with chronic absenteeism.

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

The data component with the most improvement was 4th grade reading in the Cambium Assessment. In PM1, 67% of students were below benchmark with 23% on or above benchmark. In PM3, 24% of students were below benchmark, and 76% were on or above the benchmark. Last year we added a reading interventionist to work with the lowest tier of students. We adopted the Lexia progress monitoring program for all grades. We continued to use Read180 and System 44 for tier 2 and 3 instruction in the middle school grades. Teachers in the lower elementary also became more familiar with Benchmark Advance and the new standards as this was the second year using this curriculum.

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

6th grade students show a high number of students with 2 or more early warning signs (21 students). Specifically, these students were absent 10% or more days in the school year and had low state test scores in both ELA and Math (FAST - Level1).

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

The two priorities of school improvement for the 2023-2024 school year will focus on a positive school environment and at least 42% proficiency in core subjects of our students with disabilities subgroup.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

Area of Focus #1 Due to the lower attendance rates and decreased student engagement (based off of Imagine Schools Shared Values survey results of students finding lessons interesting), the focus area of improving a positive school culture and environment will be targeted.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Area of Focus #1 By June 2024, a score of 3 or greater for both Principle #6 (To provide meaningful and challenging academic curriculum that engages students, respects all stakeholders, and promotes performance values or critical thinking, work and social habits, and academic integrity) and Principle #5 (to improve character development with staff and students by providing opportunities to lead and participate in service projects) of character.org's 11 Principles Framework.

Monitoring:

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

Area of Focus #1 Self assessments will be conducted quarterly based off of the self assessment rubric from character.org, quarterly review of the committee check in sheet for service learning projects, and Observe4Success tool will be utilized for classroom walkthroughs by administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Cardona (melanie.cardona@imagineschoolatbroward.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.)

Service Learning professional development to staff on November 3 demonstrating the five stages of service learning, the difference between service learning, project based learning and community service; calendar developed for service learning project tasks. Daily implementation of of the Positivity Project evidence-based program with character strengths and restorative practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Imagine School at Broward uses Restorative Justice practices to build and maintain positive relationships for future success, practice social responsibility, respectfully collaborate with all community members, and communicate professionally. Through the use of the Positivity Project that we utilize daily first thing in the morning, all students in grades K-5, ESE, and ESOL, are provided with the words to articulate the Other People Matter mindset. They understand that they are not the only ones that matter but

other people do as well. Service learning opportunities develop critical thinking and problem solving skills, increases civic responsibility, improves communication and collaboration skills for students, and motivates students to learn.

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.

Staff and students will plan, create, and participate in 2 service-learning projects for the year - 1 grade-level and 1 school-wide; professional development delivered for service-learning

Person Responsible: Suzette Gaskins (suzette.gaskins@imagineschoolatbroward.org)

By When: Service learning professional development (11/3/23), school-wide project (2/14/24), and grade-level projects (5/1/23)

Daily implementation of Positivity Project program

Person Responsible: Debra Darling (debra.darling@imagineschoolatbroward.org)

By When: Implemented daily, with walk-throughs for monitoring, throughout the school year

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**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.

Area of Focus #2 Due to the schools Students with Disabilities not meeting the 40% proficiency rate for three years in a row based off of state mandated testing, the second focus area of increasing the proficiency rate for students with disabilities will be targeted.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Area of Focus #2 By June 2024, Students with Disabilities will score a 42% proficiency or greater on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking 2023-2024 ELA and Math results.

Monitoring:

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

Area of Focus #2 Data chats will be conducted quarterly based off of the STAR and FAST/Cambium data. Educators will participate in weekly common planning sessions supported by the Curriculum Coach and Team Lead to guide instructional practice in the targeted areas. Lesson plans will be monitored weekly by the Curriculum Coach to check for BEST standard alignment, utilization of approved curriculum, inclusion of ESE accommodations and differentiated small group instruction. A.P. will monitor implementation of IXL and Lexia.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzette Gaskins (suzette.gaskins@imagineschoolatbroward.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 teacher to utilize Benchmark Advance Interventions and Lexia in the classroom during small group Reading instruction. Classroom teachers utilize Envision Reteach and Intervention toolkit and IXL in the classroom during small group Math instruction. Reading Interventionist and ESE Teacher to utilize Foundations K-3 and Lexia Core K-5 Skill builders. Middle school intensive teachers to utilize HMH Read 180/System 44 in Intensive Reading class, and IXL in Intensive Math class. Additional ESE staff added to provide more pullout pushin minutes for ESE students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To provide consistent targeted instruction, the schoolwide, individualized instruction programs of Lexia and IXL will provide all students including Students with Disabilities targeted instruction in Reading Comprehension, Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary and Fluency which will aid in Reading proficiency as a whole. The use of more targeted instruction from Foundations and Benchmark interventions will allow for student growth.

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.

Assigned Paraprofessional to pull-out identified ESE students with low achievement for support and instruction using purchased resources targeted specifically for foundational ELA and math skills 2 times a week in addition to regularly scheduled ESE pull-outs. Staff will also implement engagement and critical thinking strategies during instruction. Professional development to be provided by the curriculum coach focused on implementing engagement and critical thinking activities through deeper dives into current Curriculum (Savvas Math Thinking and Reasoning Skills, using manipulatives, Benchmark Advance reader’s theater, role-playing, interactive vocabulary, etc.)

Person Responsible: Suzette Gaskins (suzette.gaskins@imagineschoolatbroward.org)

By When: Paraprofessional begins pull-outs October 25th 3 days a week. Professional development ongoing in weekly PLC meetings by grade level and ongoing walkthroughs for progress monitoring of teachers.

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).

The Economic Sustainability Committee meets monthly to review the school budget and identify needs of the school. The school’s Governing Board meets every other month to review the school budget and financials. Data chats occur quarterly reviewing the academic needs of the students. The school counselors review DESSA assessments of students’ social indicator. Administration meets daily with the school business manager to discuss needs and allocations to determine purchases. Monthly meetings with Team Leads occur to analyze the data and identify needs. Weekly leadership meetings occur to discuss needs and ensure resources are allocated based on needs.

Based off of the low performance subgroup of Students with Disabilities, additional funds were directed to the ESE Department. One part time ESE certified staff member and one part time ESE para professional position were added for the 2023-2024 school year. FUNdations, a structured literacy approach grounded in the Science of Reading was purchased as well as professional development. Students with Disabilities were invited to 2022-2023 summer program hosted by the school to provide additional support and learning over the summer with two ESE certified teachers. A full time Reading Interventionist was added for the 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 school years providing ESE services.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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.

No