**Brevard Public Schools**

# Imperial Estates Elementary School

# 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# 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: 1/7/2019

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>KG-6 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 93% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (58%)<br><br>2017-18: C (47%)<br><br>2016-17: C (48%)<br><br>2015-16: B (56%) |
| **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.](http://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

# Imperial Estates Elementary School

## 900 IMPERIAL ESTATES LN, Titusville, FL 32780

## http://www.imperial.brevard.k12.fl.us

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2019-20 Title I School** | **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School KG-6 | Yes | 89% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 47% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | B | B | C | C |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Building positive relationships. (During the 2019-2020 school year our faculty began working on a new mission statement to reflect our current needs and goals. It was finalized in June 2020.)

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Imperial Estates strengthens academic success and develops compassionate community leaders. (During the 2019-2020 school year our faculty began working on a new vision statement to reflect our current needs and goals. It was finalized in June 2020.)

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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, observation & feedback, and coaching practices. |
| Lawson, Rodrick | Assistant Principal | The team is essential in providing the vision for standards-aligned instruction through professional development, resources, collaboration, planning, observation & feedback, and coaching practices. |
| Blaile, Roxanne | Instructional Coach | The team is essential in providing the vision for standards-aligned instruction through ELA professional development, ELA resources, ELA collaboration, ELA lesson planning, and ELA coaching practices. |
| Arieux, Dorothy | Teacher, K-12 | The team is essential in providing the vision for standards-aligned instruction through math professional development, math resources, math collaboration, math lesson planning, and math coaching practices. |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Monday 1/7/2019, Cynthia Adams L

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
4

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
48

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>KG-6 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 93% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (58%)<br><br>2017-18: C (47%)<br><br>2016-17: C (48%)<br><br>2015-16: B (56%) |
| **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. | |

## 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 | 90 | 72 | 82 | 85 | 83 | 78 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 583 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 10 | 10 | 17 | 11 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |

**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 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

**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 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 10/27/2020

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

**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 | |
| 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 |

## 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% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| 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 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (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.**

| 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% | | | | |
| 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% |

| MATH | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison | |
| 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 | | | | |
| 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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **Native American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Asian Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 38 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 57 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Multiracial Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 51 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| White Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - White Students | 65 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 53 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## 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 district and state. In addition, the following subgroups also have an ELA proficiency below: white, black, Hispanic, multi-racial, ESE, and female. The contributing factors are a misalignment between our core instruction and the grade level standards.

Reflecting upon our ELA progression during the 19-20 school year, using i-Ready data, 47% of our students were still scoring in Tier 2 and below.

In looking at our Spring 2019 FSA math scores, our 3rd grade and 6th grade performed below district and state in proficiency. The subgroups scoring below were ESE, females, multi-racial, and Hispanic. The contributing factor was potentially not having fidelity to our math curriculum.

Reflecting upon our Math progression during the 19-20 school year, using i-Ready data, 56% of our students were still scoring in Tier 2 and below.

In looking at our Spring 2019 SSA science data, our 5th graders performed below 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.

Reflecting upon limited science specific-standard data from the 5th grade 19-20 school year data, Grade 5 Review Part 1 scores ranged from 6%-59% skill proficiency. Grade 5 Review Part 2 scores ranged from 6%-66% skill proficiency. These scores indicate a continued need for increased proficiency within science.

**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. In the 19-20 school year, we continued to see no decline in all areas.

**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.

When looking at our i-Ready data for the 19-20 school year, we noticed that the trends were still indicating that we were underserving our black population.

**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.

During the 19-20 school year, our literacy coach and all teachers worked together each quarter to

create standards-aligned instructional plans in ELA. Grades 2-6 also used the Ready Instructional Books to create a greater focus on the core instruction.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

In reflecting on the EWS data, a concern for Imperial Estates is student attendance.

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

1. ELA
2. Math
3. Science
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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and 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.<br><br>With our 19-20 school year, we used the i-Ready Diagnostic 2 scores and the i-Ready Crosswalk to identify this area of focus. While we did see improvement, we are still not reaching our goal of having 80% of our students on Tier 1/Level 3 on ELA FSA. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Grade K-2 goal: 80% of the students will score Tier 1 on the Spring 2021 iReady Diagnostic 3.<br>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%.<br><br>For the 19-20 school year, we do not have FSA data to create a measurable outcome. We will still be using our goal from our previous year. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Literacy Coach (partial Title 1 funds) to support iReady online instruction grades K - 6 and utilization of Ready books for grades 2 - 6. Monitoring method: iReady percentage weekly usage, iReady pass rate of 70% or greater, Standards Mastery proficiency. 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: nonCaucasian, economically disadvantaged, ELL, and students with disabilities. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Instructional staff will utilize i-Ready Diagnostic 1 data from August to create an intervention plan (Tier 2 instruction) and determine Academic Support Program (ASP) groups for students grades 1-6. (ASP funds and T)
2. Instructional staff will incorporate online iReady weekly instruction K-6 and Ready books grades 2-6. (T-books)
3. Instruction Assistants (IAs) will provide Tier 2 instruction for selected students. (T)
4. K-6 teachers will participate in quarterly planning sessions with grade level teams, math teacher and literacy coach to create standards-aligned lesson plans.
5. K-6 teachers will utilize standards focus boards for standards aligned instruction. These steps will be monitored by the leadership team through observation/ feedback & coaching cycles.
6. K-6 teachers will use Write Score lessons for instruction and ongoing progress monitoring. (T)
7. Instructional staff will provide families with make-and-take kits to support the virtual reading night for students in grades K-6. (T)
8. Imperial will purchase Lenovo laptops and supplies for students to utilize iReady and myON programs. (T)
9. Gr. 2-6 teachers will administer two Standards Mastery assessments per quarter and provide scaffolded resources for students not passing Standards Mastery assessments.

10. Instructional staff will review subgroup data (specifically for our black and ESE subgroups) after Diagnostic 2 to determine which students have made at least 50% growth.

**Person Responsible**  Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math |
| --- |

| **Area of Focus Description and 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 factor was potentially weak fidelity to our math curriculum. |
| --- | --- |
| | Grade K-2 goal: 80% of the students will score Tier 1 on the Spring 2021 iReady Diagnostic 3. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Grades 3-6 goal: 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%.<br><br>For the 19-20 school year, we do not have FSA data to create a measurable outcome. We will still be using our goal from our previous year. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Dorothy Arieux (arieux.dorothy@brevardschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Use of Eureka Math for grades K - 5 daily with fidelity. Grade 6 will provide standards-aligned lessons. |
| **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 Steps to Implement |
| --- |

1. K-5 teachers will provide standards-aligned instruction through Eureka math lessons utilizing Eureka workbooks and lessons. (T-Eureka workbooks)
2. K-6 teachers will utilize online iReady weekly instruction for students.
3. K-6 teachers will participate in quarterly planning sessions with grade level teams, math teacher and literacy coach to ensure standards aligned instruction.
4. K-6 teachers will utilize standards focus boards for standards aligned instruction. These steps will be monitored by the leadership team through observation/ feedback & coaching cycles.
5. Title 1 will provide families with make-n-take kits to support the virtual math night for students in grades K-6. (T)
6. School will purchase Lenovo laptops and supplies for students to utilize iReady. (T)
7. Title 1 math teacher will push into classrooms to provide additional support to students. (T)

**Person Responsible**  Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org)

| **#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and 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. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 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 Steps to Implement

1. Science lab teacher, utilizing Title 1 funds, will deliver additional hands-on science instruction to students in grades 3 - 6 weekly and to support K - 2 science instruction in the classroom. (T)
2. K-6 teachers will have access to district science resources including Science Chats with district resource teacher, Michelle Ferro.
3. Science Teacher will push-in to support grades 4 & 5 science instruction in the classroom. (T)
4. K-6 teachers will be provided science materials, hands-on resources, and equipment to support instruction for all students K-6. (T)
5. The leadership team will plan & host two science nights: a parent Science and Engineering Fair info night and a Hands-On Science Night. (T)
6. Teachers will utilize the district science assessments.
Our science lab teacher is using the 5th grade Review part 1 Summative Assessment (SA 1 assessment) to review 3rd and 4th grade Standards in Science Activity. She has analyzed the data and chose standards to reteach if more than 50% of 5th grade students missed the standard on the assessment. This is to help 5th grade students taking the Statewide Science Assessment which measures student achievement of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.
Classroom teachers will use the formative and summative science assessments in Unify to drive their science instruction.

| **Person Responsible** | Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Imperial Estates will hire a teacher to support Social Emotional Learning, utilizing Title 1 funds, to provide social-emotional instruction to K - 2 students on the activity wheel, to monitor student attendance, to counsel students experiencing emotional and behavioral issues, and to collaborate with teachers to develop success plans for students. The SEL teacher will collaborate with teachers to ensure successful behavior modification strategies are being utilized within the classroom. They will be available to support needs that arise due to trauma, stress, tragedy for all students K-6.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

When reviewing our district parent survey, parents indicated that an area of improvement is within our relationships and the friendliness of our staff. In addition, parents would like information nights, convenient meeting times, and more communication. Parents indicated interest in Family Fun Nights, and events focused on ELA, math, and science. Due to COVID, we will host virtual meetings alternate nights of the week. Meetings will begin 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, our Facebook page, Blackboard Connect messages via email, text, and voice, newsletters, flyers, and district apps, such as PeachJar and BPS Mobile App. Many classroom teachers use the Class Dojo app as well.

When reviewing data from teachers on the Insight Survey, teachers value their grade level planning time. Areas teachers indicate improvement is needed: support with student discipline, a clean campus, and building positive relationships.

When reviewing the student Youth Truth survey data, students indicate a mix in the data. Some students indicate this as a positive, while other students see it as an area for improvement: Relationships; how our students talk and act toward their fellow students, how students talk and act towards their teachers, how teachers talk and act towards students.

Action steps for improvement: Conscious Discipline grades PreK-2, Restorative Practices grades 3-6, Trauma Informed Classrooms grades K-6, PBiS grades K-6, and the work our behavior support specialist and social emotional learning teacher is focused on daily.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.