
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

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: 6/5/2020

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)	64%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Building positive relationships.

Provide the school's vision statement

Imperial Estates strengthens academic success and develops compassionate community leaders.

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 professional development, resources, collaboration, planning, observation & feedback, and coaching practices.
Arieux, Dorothy	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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/5/2020, 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 (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)	64%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	

* 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/5/2020

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%	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%

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%
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	11	22	29	32	33	11	15				
ASN	85	82		85	91						

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
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

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
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	
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
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
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 factors were weak 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, 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. 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.

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.

Measureable Outcome:

Grade K-2 goal: 80% of the students will score Tier 1 on the Spring 2021 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%.

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:

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: nonCaucasian, economically disadvantaged, ELL, and students with disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will use i-Ready Diagnostic 1 data from August 2020 to create an intervention plan for Walk to Intervention.
2. Teachers will utilize online iReady instruction for all students in grades K-6. (Title 1 funds)
3. Teachers will utilize LAFS Ready books with students Grades 2-6. (Title 1 funds)
4. Instructional assistants will provide LLI (Leveled Literacy Intervention) Tier 2 instruction for selected students in grades K - 3. (Title 1 funds)
5. 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. An instructional calendar will be created. (Title 1 funds pay for substitute teachers)
6. Teachers will utilize standards focus boards for standards aligned instruction.
7. The leadership team will use data to determine students in grades 2-6 who need supplemental reading instruction during the Academic Support Program. (ASP funds)

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 factors were weak fidelity to our math curriculum.

Measureable Outcome: 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: Dorothy Arieux (arieux.dorothy@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 Steps to Implement

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. These steps will be monitored by the leadership team through observation/ feedback & coaching cycles.

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.

Measureable 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 resent 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. 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)

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 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: 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.

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.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00