

Brevard Public Schools

Imperial Estates Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Imperial Estates Elementary School

900 IMPERIAL ESTATES LN, Titusville, FL 32780

<http://www.imperial.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Adams L

Start Date for this Principal: 1/6/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: B (57%)
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	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Imperial Estates Elementary School

900 IMPERIAL ESTATES LN, Titusville, FL 32780

<http://www.imperial.brevard.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-6</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">64%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">44%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	C	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To serve every student with excellence as the standard.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As an inclusive community, we are committed to improving student achievement, growing student character, and developing life-long learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Adams, Cynthia	Principal	The team is essential in providing the vision for standards-aligned instruction through professional development, resources, collaboration, planning, and observation, feedback, & coaching practices.
Sizemore, Magi	Teacher, K-12	
Lawson, Rodrick	Assistant Principal	
Blaile, Roxanne	Instructional Coach	
Ardjewski, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	64	86	87	92	84	98	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	608
Attendance below 90 percent	7	13	15	9	11	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	0	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	2	0	5	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	3	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

51

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/24/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
-----------	-------------	-------

Attendance below 90 percent

One or more suspensions

Course failure in ELA or Math

Level 1 on statewide assessment

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
-----------	-------------	-------

Students with two or more indicators

Prior Year - Updated

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

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

Attendance below 90 percent	50	40	42	39	47	34	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	288
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

One or more suspensions	2	2	3	4	10	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	22	37	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	20	8	2	12	32	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
--------------------------------------	----	---	---	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	58%	62%	57%	57%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	60%	58%	57%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	57%	53%	41%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	63%	63%	56%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	65%	62%	52%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	53%	51%	26%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	57%	53%	48%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	64 (0)	86 (0)	87 (0)	92 (0)	84 (0)	98 (0)	97 (0)	608 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 ()	13 ()	15 ()	9 ()	11 ()	12 ()	9 ()	76 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	3 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	4 (0)	19 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	71%	64%	7%	58%	13%
	2018	53%	63%	-10%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	61%	-5%	58%	-2%
	2018	41%	57%	-16%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	51%	60%	-9%	56%	-5%
	2018	44%	54%	-10%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		10%				
06	2019	49%	60%	-11%	54%	-5%
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	52%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	61%	-5%	62%	-6%
	2018	57%	62%	-5%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	64%	1%	64%	1%
	2018	42%	59%	-17%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	60%	60%	0%	60%	0%
	2018	40%	58%	-18%	61%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
06	2019	61%	67%	-6%	55%	6%
	2018	72%	68%	4%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%
	2018	47%	57%	-10%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	43	38	22	44	38	33				
ELL	64	77		57	85						
BLK	29	40	38	40	62	42	18				
HSP	54	55	70	51	71		38				

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
MUL	48	44		57	56						
WHT	66	69	63	69	78	46	64				
FRL	50	61	56	54	68	40	45				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	11	22	29	32	33	11	15				
ASN	85	82		85	91						
BLK	36	43	43	39	50	45	44				
HSP	52	50	50	59	58	50	40				
MUL	60	53		70	59						
WHT	51	45	42	57	50	25	46				
FRL	44	45	42	47	50	37	46				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	18	34	28	21	23	12	24				
ASN	88	79		88	67						
BLK	31	37	36	30	24	13	11				
HSP	58	61		55	54						
MUL	72	69		72	62						
WHT	61	61	39	60	59	34	57				
FRL	47	52	38	45	47	21	35				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	71
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	51
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

In looking at our Spring 2019 FSA data, our 4th through 6th grade students ELA proficiency averages were below both our district and our state. In addition, the following subgroups also have an ELA proficiency below our district and state: white, black, Hispanic, multi-racial, ESE, and female. The contributing factors are a misalignment between our core instruction and the grade level standards.

In looking at our Spring 2019 FSA math scores, our 3rd grade and 6th grade performed below our district and state in proficiency. The subgroups scoring below our district and state were ESE, females, multi-racial, and Hispanic. The contributing factors were weak fidelity to our math curriculum.

In looking at our Spring 2019 SSA science data, our 5th graders performed below the district and state in proficiency averages. The subgroup data shows that we are below the district and state in total students, black, white, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, male, and female. The contributing factor was lack of hands-on science instruction.

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

Although our data is not where we want it to be, we actually increased in all areas. We did not experience any declines; when we compare the same group of students across the years diagonally.

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.

We have a 10% achievement gap in our black ELA proficiency level when compared to the state average. We also have a 10% gap in our Math ESE proficiency level compared to the state, and we have a 20% gap in our black Science proficiency level. The factors that contributed to this are a lack of a strong core in reading and a fidelity in Eureka math, and a lack of hands-on science experiences. The trends that we see are that we are failing our black population in these areas.

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

Our 3rd grade reading was thirteen percentage points higher than the state average. Our 3rd grade teachers worked with our literacy coach for their core instruction and had a deliberate focus for Tier 2 instruction as well.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

In reflecting on the EWS data, concerns for Imperial Estates are attendance and ISS/OSS.

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

1. ELA
2. Science
3. Math
4. Attendance
5. Social-emotional instruction

Looking at our trend data and contributing factors, we have determined that the above areas are our highest priorities.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA
Rationale	In looking at our Spring 2019 FSA data, our 4th through 6th grade students' ELA proficiency averages were below both our district and our state. In addition, the following subgroups also have an ELA proficiency below our district and state: white, black, Hispanic, multi-racial, ESE, and female. The contributing factors are a misalignment between our core instruction and the grade level standards.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Grades K-2 goal: 80% of the students will score Tier 1 on the Spring 2020 iReady Diagnostic 3. Grades 3-6 goal: ELA 3+ proficiency will increase from 56% to 60%. ELA learning gains will increase from 61% to 65% and ELA L25% will increase from 60% to 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use of Title 1 funds to access iReady online instruction for grades K - 6 and LAFS Ready books for grades 2 - 6. Monitoring method: iReady pass rate of 70% or greater. Quarterly ELA lesson planning and usage of the LAFS Ready texts during core instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	ERIA research indicates that there is a .83 correlation between iReady Diagnostics and FSA, with .70 considered to be a strong correlation. Additionally, ANCOVA research indicates the instruction utilizing Ready books meets ESSA Level 3 criteria for students in the following subgroups: non-Caucasian, economically disadvantaged, ELL, and students with disabilities.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will utilize online iReady instruction for all students in grades K - 6. (Title 1 funds) 2. Teachers will utilize LAFS Ready books with students grades 2 - 6. (Title 1 funds) 3. Instructional assistants will provide LLI (Leveled Literacy Intervention) Tier 2 instruction for selected students in grades K - 3. (Title 1 funds) 4. Teachers will collaboratively participate in quarterly full day planning sessions with grade level teams, the literacy coach, and district resources such as standards focus documents. They will create an instructional focus calendar for each grading period. (Title 1 funds pay for substitute teachers) 5. Teachers will utilize standards focus boards for standards aligned instruction, including professional development. 6. The leadership team will use data to determine students in grades 2-6 who need supplemental reading instruction during the Academic Support Program ASP. (ASP funds) <p>These steps will be monitored by the leadership team through observation/feedback & coaching cycles.</p>
Person Responsible	Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Science
Rationale	In looking at our Spring 2019 SSA science data, our 5th graders performed below the district and state in proficiency averages. The subgroup data shows that we are below the district and state in total students, black, white, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, male, and female. The contributing factor was lack of hands-on science instruction.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	56% of students in grade 5 will score Level 3 proficiency on the 2020 SSA Science assessment. Previously our school achieved 49% proficiency. 56% was chosen because this is Brevard's recent district average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michelle Ardjewski (ardjewski.michelle@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Of the nationally researched 5E model, we will be focusing on the "engage" and "explore" parts. This will be evaluated through formative and summative standards-based assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The use of this instructional, research-based model helps students learn science concepts. It originated from the Bybee research at the Office of Science Education, National Institutes of Health.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will attend grade level specific science PD with the district elementary science resource teacher. 2. Leadership team will allocate a science lab teacher, utilizing Title 1 funds, to deliver additional hands-on science instruction to students in grades 3 - 6 weekly and to support K - 2 science instruction in the classroom. 3. The leadership team will plan & host two science nights: a parent science and engineering fair information night, and a Hands On Science Night. 4. Our instructional staff will maintain contact with the district science resource teacher and serve as a science coach for our classroom teachers.
Person Responsible	Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Math
Rationale	In looking at our Spring 2019 FSA math scores, our 3rd grade and 6th grade performed below our district and state in proficiency. The subgroups scoring below our district and state were ESE, females, multi-racial, and Hispanic. The contributing factors were weak fidelity to our math curriculum.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math3+ proficiency will increase from 60% to 65%. Math learning gains will increase from 73% to 75% and Math L25% will increase from 48% to 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Magi Sizemore (sizemore.magi@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use of Eureka Math for grades K - 5 daily with fidelity. Grade 6 will use the Big Ideas middle school curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to edreports.org, Eureka math meets or exceeds standards in every category (focus, coherence, rigor, and mathematical practices) for K - 5 students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will provide standards-based instruction through Eureka math lessons. 2. Teachers will collaboratively participate in quarterly full day planning sessions with grade level teams, our math coach, and district resources such as pacing guides. (Title 1 funds support the substitute teacher and our math coach) 3. Teachers will utilize standards focus boards for standards aligned instruction; receive professional development. <p>These steps will be monitored by the leadership team through observation/feedback & coaching cycles.</p>
Person Responsible	Magi Sizemore (sizemore.magi@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Imperial Estates will hire an additional full-time guidance counselor utilizing Title 1 funds, to provide social-emotional instruction to K - 2 students on the activity wheel, to monitor student attendance, and to counsel students experiencing emotional and behavioral issues.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

On the district parent survey, parents indicated that they would like information nights, convenient meeting times, and more communication. As a result, we are planning ELA, math, science, social media/ bullying, mental health awareness and middle school information night. These meetings will alternate nights, now be at 6 pm to accommodate working parents and sometimes repeated at 8:15 am the following day, and our communication has expanded to include an updated website, a new Facebook page, Blackboard Connect messages via email, text, and voice, newsletters, flyers, and district apps, such as PeachJar and BPS Mobile App.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Through the use of Title I funds, we have hired an additional guidance counselor to work with K - 2 students on the activity wheel, monitor attendance, and be available to counsel students in crisis.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

For students transitioning to kindergarten from preschool, we host a parent information night in April, ensuring that students from local day cares and preschools are invited. We then hosted "A Taste of Kindergarten" in July for students to experience a couple of hours of Kindergarten type activities with our Kindergarten and activity teachers. For the 6th graders, we are hosting a middle school information night for students and parents. These students also take a field trip to Jackson Middle School and attend information nights at Jackson.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The leadership team (principal, assistant principal, literacy coach and math coach) analyzes the school data and the insight surveys. The teachers participated in identifying strengths and areas of improvement. We set up priority goals and allocated Title I funds for our goals. Our planned PDs are in response to our data. This is monitored monthly through classroom observations, SAC meetings, and Title I compliance items. Title I equipment is maintained on a subsidiary inventory by the Title I coordinator and the property inventory is administered by the tech specialist.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

We have invited community leaders to take an active part in our school, including the fire department, police department and city council members. Additionally, we have speakers come in for various grade level topics, such as the former KSC director for 6th grade and space week, Jim Sawgrass for FL Native Americans with 4th grade history, and Junior Achievement in selected grades.