

Brevard Public Schools

Imperial Estates Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
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: 1/5/2019

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2020-21 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%)
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	

* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
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

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Adams, Cynthia	Principal	Instructional leader 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	Instructional leader is essential in providing the vision for standards-aligned instruction through professional development, resources, collaboration, planning, observation & feedback, and coaching practices. Mr. Lawson is lead with science instruction, our Academic Support Program, provides weekly updates of encouragement for implementing Conscious Discipline, and responds to student misbehavior.
Toliver, Whitney	Instructional Coach	The team is essential in providing the vision for standards-aligned instruction through professional development, resources, collaboration, planning, observation & feedback, and coaching practices. Specifically leads interventions, team planning, ELA PD, data review, and MTSS. (T)
Field, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	The team is essential in providing the vision for standards-aligned instruction through professional development, resources, collaboration, planning, observation & feedback, and coaching practices. Specifically leads interventions and Title 1 compliance. (T)

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 1/5/2019, 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

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

615

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

8

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

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	86	99	71	96	82	70	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	5	11	8	13	9	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	2	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	4	9	11	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	5	16	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	6	21	30	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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	0	0	6	16	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	13	13	1	7	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/2/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	1	2	5	3	3	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
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	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				58%	62%	57%	50%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	60%	58%	47%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	57%	53%	42%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	63%	63%	55%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				74%	65%	62%	53%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	53%	51%	35%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	57%	53%	50%	57%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	61%	-5%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	60%	-9%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
06	2021					
	2019	49%	60%	-11%	54%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	56%	61%	-5%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	64%	1%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	60%	0%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
06	2021					
	2019	61%	67%	-6%	55%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Imperial uses iReady diagnostic assessments for each student in both reading and math, three times a year to monitor progress.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34stdts/35%	60stdts/61%	72stdts/73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22stdts/37%	35stdts/59%	44stdts/75%
	Students With Disabilities	1stdt/7%	4stdt/29%	6stdt/43%
	English Language Learners	0stdt/0%	1stdt/50%	0stdt/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30stdt/31%	31stdt/43%	39stdt/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16stdt/27%	23stdt/39%	38stdt/64%
	Students With Disabilities	1stdt/7%	1stdt/7%	4stdts/29%
	English Language Learners	0stdt/0%	0stdt/0%	0stdt/0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8 stdts/ 15%	17 stdts/ 33%	27 stdts/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2 stdts/ 6%	10 stdts/29%	16 stdts/46%
	Students With Disabilities	0 stdt/ 0%	1 stdt/13 %	1 stdt/13%
	English Language Learners	0 stdt/ 0%	1 stdt /100%	1 stdt /100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11 stdts/ 22%	18 stdts/35%	34 stdts/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 stdts/21%	8 stdts/24%	20 stdts/59%
	Students With Disabilities	1 stdt/ 13%	2 stdts/25%	4 stdts/50%
	English Language Learners	1 stdt /100%	0 stdt/ 0%	1 stdt /100%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19stds/24%	38stdt/48%	48stdt/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 stds/17%	19stdt/32%	27stdt/47%
	Students With Disabilities	1stdt/9%	1stdt/10%	2stdt/20%
	English Language Learners	0stdt/0%	0stdt/0%	1stdt/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9 stdt/11%	30 stdt/38%	50stdt/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3stdt/6%	15stdt/53%	30stdt/53%
	Students With Disabilities	0stdt/0%	0stdt/0%	2stdt/20%
	English Language Learners	0stdt/0%	0stdt/0%	1stdt/50%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42stdt/57%	55stdt/70%	63 stdt/80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19stdt/45%	27stdt/60%	32stdt/71%
	Students With Disabilities	2stdt/13%	6stdt/33%	8stdt/44%
	English Language Learners	0stdt/0%	1stdt/25%	1stdt/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14stdt/19%	37stdt/47%	50stdt/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4stdt/10%	17stdt/38%	23stdt/51%
	Students With Disabilities	0stdt/0%	3stdt/17%	7tdt/39%
	English Language Learners	0stdt/0%	1stdt/25%	2stdt/50%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18stdt/29%	26stdt/40%	31stdt/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13stdt/26%	19stdt/37%	23stdt/43%
	Students With Disabilities	1stdt/7%	1stdt/7%	2stdt/14%
	English Language Learners	0stdt/0%	0stdt/0%	0stdt/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12stdt/19%	23stdt/36%	26stdt/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7stdt/14%	16stdt/31%	19stdt/36%
	Students With Disabilities	0stdt/0%	1stdt/7%	1stdt/7%
	English Language Learners	0stdt/0%	NA	0stdt/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27stdt/36%	38stdt/49%	36stdt/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17stdt/33%	22stdt/39%	19stdt/33%
	Students With Disabilities	4stdt/20%	7stdt/33%	6stdt/30%
	English Language Learners	0stdt/0%	0stdt/0%	0stdt/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14stdt/19%	26stdt/33%	38stdt/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8stdt/15%	12stdt/21%	22stdt/39%
	Students With Disabilities	2stdt/10%	5stdt/24%	8stdt/40%
	English Language Learners	0stdt/0%	0stdt/0%	0stdt/0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	19	20	9	13	23	21	27				
ELL	33			38							
BLK	24	33	23	27	20						
HSP	36	35		35	37	30	18				
MUL	59	54		43	38						
WHT	62	51	25	58	49	43	57				
FRL	36	39	22	33	35	21	25				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	324

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	25
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	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	49
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	30
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our 20-21 iReady progress monitoring data points in both reading and math show continuous growth from one assessment to the next for ALL students and economically disadvantaged students. However, minimal increase in proficiency is observed across the year with our students who are ESE or ELL.

84% of our black students in grades 3-6 increased their iReady ELA & Math score from Diagnostic #1 to Diagnostic #3 during the 20-21 school year.

Our state assessment data indicates that our tier 1 instruction (50% ELA and 47% math) is on the pathway to a school grade of C or better, but it is our learning gains that need to improve in order to improvement our school grade.

Our students with disabilities and our Black/African American students' test scores are lowered compared to other subgroups. (ESSA subgroups)

RAISE: The FSA ELA test scores of our students in 4th during the 20-21 school year show that only 33% are at proficiency and our 5th grade students in the 20-21 school year show them as 43% proficient.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

20-21 data shows our lowest 25% of student data learning gains in both reading and math are our greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors to this needed improvement include a lack of consistency instruction due to teacher and student absences within the challenging year of COVID with face-to-face, eLearning, and hybrid models as well as our strained attention to intervention services.

New actions will include matching student data needs for the right intervention assigning the right teacher using high-quality materials, and monitoring the interventions through the MTSS process.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

20-21 data shows 2nd grade math iReady proficiency with the greatest amount of growth from the Fall to the Spring of last school year.

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

Fidelity to math curriculum and grade level common planning.

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

Diagnosing essential missed learning: provide targeted instruction to bridge the gaps of missed concepts/skills.

This can occur during in-school intervention blocks, and after school (ASP).

Implementation of new high-quality ELA curriculum and support with scaffolding and small group instruction.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Job embedded PD sessions will be needed for grade level teachers specific to understanding the targeted skill instruction with materials, progress monitoring assessments, and record keeping as well as data interpretation.

PD with new ELA curriculum and multi-tiered system of supports. PD with new materials to include evidence-based reading.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

A. Increased practice of using data to drive instruction and decisions

B. Template to identify which students need intervention, in which skill, who will provide the instruction, what materials will be used for the instruction, and what the on-going progress monitoring tool will be.

C. Use of schedule (MTSS), preplanned, as to when the intervention will occur.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>In reviewing our state assessment and progress monitoring data from last school year 20-21, it is evident that we need to increase the amount of students who are making learning gains in ELA and math, especially within our bottom quartile.</p> <p>ELA Learning Gains: from 46% to 50%</p> <p>Math Learning Gains: from 41% to 50%</p> <p>Lowest 25% Learning Gains ELA: from 24% to 50%</p> <p>Lowest 25% Learning Gain Math: from 24% to 50%</p> <p>In grades K-3 last year, we identified 14 students to be substantially deficit in reading. We will be sure these student receive intervention through the MTSS framework.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>By using the school grade predictor calculator, if we increase our learning gains to 50% in reading and math for all learners, as well as our bottom quartile, we will increase our school grade to a C. (assuming our tier 1 data remains exactly the same from one year to the next)</p> <p>ELA Learning Gains: from 46% to 50%</p> <p>Math Learning Gains: from 41% to 50%</p> <p>Lowest 25% Learning Gains ELA: from 24% to 50%</p> <p>Lowest 25% Learning Gain Math: from 24% to 50%</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Our Leadership Team will walk into classrooms during the intervention times to monitor and inspect this practice. Our Leadership Team will also be active participants when reviewing the data and planning for intervention with our teachers. By adding this strategy, it will make an impact on our student iReady data.</p> <p>Effective intervention progress will be monitored through the MTSS process.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Fidelity to Intervention block (tier 2 and tier 3) MTSS with explicit instruction in phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension.</p> <p>Response to Intervention and Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Intervention Practices. Effect size: Response to Intervention – 1.29, Interventions for Learning Needs .77, Phonics Instruction: .70, Feedback .70, Scaffolding .82, Repeated Readings .75, Rehearsal and Memorization .73, Vocabulary Programs .62, Direct Instruction .60</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Diagnosing essential missed learning: provide targeted instruction to bridge the gaps of missed concepts/skills.</p> <p>13% of our students have skill gaps in foundational reading skills and are in Tier 2/3 intervention. 95 Percent Group instructional materials are uniquely designed to provide targeted instruction on specific skills. The diagnostic screeners are aligned with the instructional materials and a continuum of skills allowing teachers to begin instruction at a student's lowest skill deficit. Struggling readers are able to master simple concepts before moving onto more difficult skills. actual students</p>

Action Steps to Implement

ELA

1. Teachers, interventionists, and our Literacy Coach will use student achievement data to determine which students need small group instruction, which skills need to be addressed, which teaching materials to use, and which progress monitoring assessments to complete outside tier 1 instruction. (T)
2. Teachers, interventionists, and administrators will collaborate with district-based reading content specialist to understand student data, and use data to plan content for intervention (assisting with action

step #1).

3. PD needs will be identified as grade level teams of teachers meet in action step #1 specific to material that will be utilized during tier 2 and 3 intervention, as well as the ongoing progress monitoring tool. Our literacy coach will provide the needed PD such as 95% Group, Read Naturally, Lexia, and Renaissance. (T)

4. Teachers will create Progress Monitoring Plans for students who receive tier 2 & 3 instruction. PD will be provide by our literacy coach and administration if guidance is needed to complete this task. (T)

5. Teachers will use IPST Form 7 to track students" progress within tiered instruction and will review at MTSS meetings.

6. Every 6 weeks, teacher teams will meet to collaborate with leadership team to revise the plan.

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

Math

1. Teachers and interventionist will use student achievement data to determine which students need small group instruction, which skills need to be addressed during tier 2 instruction. (T)

2. Teachers, interventionist, and administrators will collaborate with iReady representative to understand student data, and use data to plan content for front loading standards-aligned prerequisite math skills at the just right time prior to tier 1 on-grade level tier 1 instruction. (T)

3. Teachers, interventionist, and administrators will collaborate with district-based math content specialist to understand student data, and use data to plan content for intervention (assisting with action step #2). (T)

District-based math content specialist will work with grade level teams to provide PD on pacing and framing intervention, based on data, with a focus on learning gains for all students with an emphasis on the lowest 25%

4. Teachers will meet with students individually to review their iReady performance data, how it guides their learning path, and set goals regarding their stretch growth; data chats with parents and support for parents to help their children.

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

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus	After reviewing the results of our stakeholders input from the Youth Truth Survey, the Teacher Insight Survey, and the BPS Parent Survey, all data reveals that improvement is needed regarding student relationships/student behavior.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	On our January 2021 Youth Truth survey, our school/class culture score was ranked at the 22nd percentile. On the January 2022 survey, we would like to increase our ranking to the 44th percentile or higher.
Monitoring:	Quarterly surveys will be provided to our students in grades 3-6 on two specific questions to determine our present level and growth throughout the year. Do students behave well in your class? Do students in your class treat the teacher with respect?
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Conscious Discipline
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Results of Conscious Discipline, a proven leader in social emotional learning (SEL) and classroom management, have been published in the peer-reviewed Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning (JRIT&L). Conscious Discipline is unique among social emotional learning curricula in focusing first on adult skills and learning as a pathway to fostering social emotional competencies and well-being in children. These results provide preliminary evidence that addressing the social emotional needs of adults is a viable step toward helping children improve their social skills and emotional regulation, which have been linked to academic and life success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will participate in PD modules throughout the school year focused on the the elements of Conscious Discipline and are expected to implement the new learning within their classrooms.
2. Administration will provide weekly bite-size resources to support teachers' use of Conscious Discipline.
3. Using Title 1 funds, two teacher interventionists will be hired to support SEL, vocabulary, and reading comprehension skills during the activity block for students in grades K-6. These two teachers will also support teachers with implementing Conscious Discipline, as well as work with students individually or in small groups regarding SEL topics. (T)
4. Our PBiS school-level team will revise our character pledge, school-wide expectations and non-negotiables, our quarterly character awards, and our Dolphin Dollar SPARK rewards and incentives.
5. Our PBiS team will meet monthly to review student discipline data and use problem solving strategies to improve behavior.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus In reviewing the 20-21 FSA ELA data:
Description 33% of our 4th grade students scored a level 3 or higher
 43% of our 5th grade students scored a level 3 or higher
Rationale: Therefore, tier 1 ELA instruction is a critical need .

Measurable Outcome: In reviewing our state assessment from last school year 20-21, it is evident that we need to maintain or increase our tier 1 proficiency data to be on track for a school grade of a C or better.
 ELA Achievement from 50% level 3 or higher to 50% or greater.

Monitoring: iReady K-6 Diagnostic 1, 2, 3
 Standards Mastery each quarter

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-aligned instruction tier 1 curriculum.
 Tier 1 (Core) Curriculum is on the 2021 approved Florida Instructional Materials Adoption list.
 Florida Benchmark Advance 2022 (K-5) ©2022, Florida Edition
 myPerspectives Florida English Language Arts Grade 6, ©2022, 1st Edition

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS implementation
 50% of students at Imperial are proficient in ELA based on 21 FSA ELA Achievement data. Implementation of high quality ELA instructional materials with fidelity will support the explicit instruction of vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency and comprehension. High-quality reading instruction requires that teachers understand more than simply what to teach. Collaborative planning for instruction and use of high quality instructional materials will support teachers to understand how to identify their students' instructional needs, select appropriate materials, organize instruction to maximize learning, and differentiate instruction to meet individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will set clear expectations for tiered instruction levels 1-3 in ELA, will monitor, and provide feedback.
2. Teachers and the reading leadership team (which includes our literacy coach and interventionists) will support improved student reading outcomes by leading or participating in PD on evidence-based strategies, assisting with implementing data-informed instruction, monitoring the use of high quality instructional materials, and the use of multi-tiered system of supports. (T)
3. Teachers will implement Benchmark Advance / myPerspectives high quality instructional material.
4. Administration will walk through classrooms to observe and provide feedback regarding tier 1 instruction; aids in fidelity.
5. District literacy teacher will support training on K-2 ELA grant resources: 95% Group (blending, multisyllabic) videos are available for PA and PLL lessons (phonemic awareness & phonics), Lexia (additional licenses purchased with T1\$\$), Read Naturally, Visualizing and Verbalizing (Tier 3). (T)

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

After reviewing the 19-20 data, Imperial's primary area of concern is to decrease our number of total suspensions to fall from a very high rating to a very low rating. We will do this by:

- 1. Teachers will participate in PD modules throughout the school year focused on the the elements of Conscious Discipline and are expected to implement the new learning within their classrooms.**
 - 2. Administration will provide weekly bite-size resources to support teachers' use of Conscious Discipline.**
 - 3. Using Title 1 funds, two teachers will be hired to support SEL, vocabulary, and reading comprehension skills during the activity block for students in grades K-6. These two teachers will also support teachers with implementing Conscious Discipline, as well as work with students individually or in small groups regarding SEL topics. (T)**
 - 4. Our PBiS school-level team will revise our character pledge, school-wide expectations and non-negotiables, our quarterly character awards, and our Dolphin Dollar SPARK rewards and incentives.**
 - 5. Our PBiS team will meet monthly to review student discipline data and use problem solving strategies to improve behavior.**
 - 6. Our administration team will utilize alternatives consequences rather than suspensions, when possible.**
 - 7. Administrators will review risk ratio suspension data throughout the school year.**
 - 8. Quarterly surveys will be provided to our students in grades 3-6 on two specific questions to determine our present level and growth throughout the year.**
- Do students behave well in your class?**
Do students in your class treat the teacher with respect?

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.

Parent Survey Results:

Parents indicated they are pleased with our health/safety protocols and response, that our staff is professional, enthusiastic, caring and patient. They are pleased with our Title 1 informative nights and when

they are kept informed and communicated with.

Parents indicated as a school we could do a better job of communicating with them, provide tutoring or extra instruction, and address student discipline.

As a result of this information, we have made a commitment to acknowledge that parents and students need connection; and communication is a way to build it.

Teacher Survey Results:

In January 2021, teachers completed a survey and identified School Operations, specifically keeping a clean and well-maintained building was the greatest need.

In response, our head custodian will personally visit and talk with our classroom teachers to determine what their specific needs and ways to support them/meet their expectations.

In January 2021, our students in grades 3-6 completed an anonymous online survey called Youth Truth. We received feedback from 292 of our students. This is their voice, their perception.

As a result from our last survey, and a current focus of our school improvement plan, let's celebrate that the areas of Relationships and Culture are on the rise.

A portion of the survey allowed students to type a free response to the following questions:

What do you like most about your school?

What do you dislike most about your school?

Students provided approximately 550 responses. After reading all responses the overall theme was:

Students feel that their teachers care about them/want them to do well in school and they like coming to school to see their friends

Students would like to receive help in class when they are struggling academically. Students feel that it is rude for classmates to talk when the teacher is talking, constantly talking and interrupting the lesson / being disrespectful to the teacher and the rest of the class / wasting class time.

As a result of this data, as an instructional staff we met together to come to consensus on school-wide non-negotiable expectations for student behavior.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Engaging ALL Stakeholders

The school engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations as well as high-quality instruction.

Teachers communicate high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material").

Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in and out-of-school suspension and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and what needs to be done. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students.

Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example: •Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data. The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and actively makes themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicits staff feedback on school-wide procedures and creates opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in successful ability to provide services to students with disabilities.

Staff will come to a consensus on school-wide expectations and non-negotiables. Such as, establishing

specific strategies, but attainable for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches.

SAC - The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, and offer translation).