

Seminole County Public Schools

Eastbrook Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	18
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Eastbrook Elementary School

5525 TANGERINE AVE, Winter Park, FL 32792

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0531>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission at Eastbrook Elementary is to encourage students to be safe, respectful, honest, and ready. This mission guides and supports all students to reach their highest potential and become lifelong learners contributing to society. In order to accomplish this, our school provides a staff that works cooperatively with students, parents and the community. Also, we aim to achieve all of five of the Elementary level commitments:

1. Build Positive Relationships and Culture 2. Ensure rigorous instruction 3. Demonstrating a Growth Mindset 4. Cultivate purposeful PLCs 5. Monitor with Feedback.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Eastbrook Elementary will provide an enriched environment to all students so they could acquire the necessary skills and knowledge to achieve their personal best and become life-long learners in this global economy. Our goal is to meet the district-wide initiative/goal and strive for achieving: One year's growth in one year's time for all Eastbrook students. Our school environment is one in which all learners grow and succeed. We value and celebrate diversity. We support our learners because they are capable, and we believe in them.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Herndon, Martina	Principal	Oversee total school operation
Williams, Tracey	Assistant Principal	Assist principal in overseeing total school operation
Hill, Inga	Behavior Specialist	Support students' behaviors
Calegan, Kristy	Instructional Coach	Coaching, MTSS, Curriculum Implementation, and Reading PLCs
Hajek, Susan	Instructional Coach	Coaching, MTSS, Curriculum Implementation, and Math and Science PLCs
Shearer, Karen	Instructional Coach	MTSS, reading support for lowest quartile

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Eastbrook Elementary School has an active School Advisory Council and PTA, each of which gives input to the team that develops the SIP. The staff and community have worked together through school and district surveys (Snapshot, 5Essentials, School Messenger, Survey Monkey, PTA, SAC) to determine the academic goals, behavior support, and safety needs for our students. Priorities have been agreed upon by all parties. Any student who is not working on grade level is identified and an initial parent conference is held. Throughout the year, additional parent conferences are held to review student progress. Lastly, Eastbrook also sends home a monthly newsletter and uses social media: we have an active Facebook page to share school information and highlight events.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation at the beginning of the second semester. This will involve all stakeholders and will take place at SAC, PTA, and staff meetings. Upon input from the stakeholders and data monitoring, the plan will be revised to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	65%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	65%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2020-21: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C

	2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	7	24	23	16	20	22	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	7	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	1	3	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	14	19	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	19	29	0	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	14	12	11	9	12	0	0	0	0	61

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	2	11	7	3	17	23	0	0	0	0	63

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	3	3	5	5	3	5	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	2	2	4	2	0	3	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	12	24	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	22	17	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	6	4	7	2	8	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	5	17	2	4	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	3	3	5	5	3	5	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	2	2	4	2	0	3	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	12	24	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	22	17	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	6	4	7	2	8	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	5	17	2	4	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	54			60			59		
ELA Learning Gains	54			52			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50			56			37		
Math Achievement*	58			57			63		
Math Learning Gains	71			44			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49			30			49		
Science Achievement*	54			54			47		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	74			64			79		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	3	
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	56			
MUL	41			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	55			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	54	54	50	58	71	49	54					74
SWD	13	44	48	19	45	43	13					62

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
ELL	41	56	58	47	71	67	56					74
AMI												
ASN	61			71								
BLK	34	56	60	27	44	30	20					
HSP	55	53	42	53	69	53	50					69
MUL	33	50		40	40							
PAC												
WHT	59	56	62	71	82	60	70					
FRL	46	54	53	51	69	49	49					71

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	60	52	56	57	44	30	54					64
SWD	29	52	53	29	38	21	38					63
ELL	32	36		43	29		15					64
AMI												
ASN	75			75								
BLK	38	36		32	30							
HSP	54	53	38	48	38	15	45					71
MUL	50	50		55	60							
PAC												
WHT	70	55	90	67	46	38	61					
FRL	51	43	48	46	37	19	43					64

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	59	49	37	63	58	49	47					79
SWD	13	24	26	20	30	39	14					
ELL	37	43	37	48	62	61	22					79
AMI												
ASN	80			79								

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
BLK	49	50		46	52							
HSP	51	48	44	58	62	64	47					76
MUL	50	30		50	20							
PAC												
WHT	65	51	41	70	56	37	49					
FRL	50	43	31	55	55	49	38					79

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

According to the data, math is an area of concern and demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.
 -FAST PM3 reading proficiency increased from 54% to 56%.
 -FAST PM3 math proficiency decreased from 58% to 56%.
 -Statewide Science Assessment increased from 54% to 61%.

Two of the contributing factors for this need for improvement are a new math coach and new math teachers, who were unfamiliar with the content. Our plan for this year, is the retention of the staff which includes the building of their depth of knowledge through PLCs, data analysis, professional developments, coach's feedback, and administrative feedback.

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

According to the data, math is an area of concern and demonstrates the greatest need for improvement. Our FAST PM3 math proficiency reflects a 2% decline school-wide, where proficiency decreased from 58% to 56%. Two of the contributing factors for this decline are a new math coach and new math teachers, who were unfamiliar with the content. Our plan for this year, is the retention of the staff which includes the building of their depth of knowledge through PLCs, data analysis, professional developments, coach's feedback, and administrative feedback.

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.

4th grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include the low performance of students in multiple sub groups.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was science. Statewide Science Assessment increased from 54% to 61%.

The contributing factors were implementing a different team structure for the 5th grade team in which teachers departmentalized and only taught single subjects such as science only, science PLCs facilitated by our math/science coach, a school-wide Science Day, district science personnel support, and science standards mastery monitoring.

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

Student attendance and on-grade level performance in ELA and Math

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

- 1st- Improve Math Proficiency
- 2nd-Improve Reading Proficiency with SWD (ESSA finding)
- 3rd-Improve Reading Proficiency with ethnic groups (black students) (ESSA finding)
- 4th- Improve Reading Proficiency
- 5th- Improve Science Proficiency

Area of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities and Black/African American students. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities and Black/African American students.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Martina Herndon (martina_herndon@scps.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention, iReady or iStation, Success for All – FastTrack Phonics (at Title 1 schools), Reading Mastery, FastForward, Corrective Reading, Quick Reads and Elements of Reading.

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, DreamBox, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum.

All of the listed interventions have been approved by Just Read, Florida through the vetting process for the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

What do we want all students to do?

We would like for our lowest quartile students to make learning gains by achieving proficiency results, mastering grade level standards, demonstrating passing scores on grade level assignments and assessments. Additionally, we would like for our lowest quartile students to demonstrate mastery, proficiency, or growth on iReady, FAST, STAR, district or state assessments, and progress monitoring.

How will we know if they learn it?

We will know they have learned it by listening to them articulate their thinking, observe their collaborations, observe them work independently, and demonstrate mastery of grade level content. Additionally, through progress monitoring through STAR, FAST, iReady, and classroom assessments. Our reading interventionist will provide individualized instructional support and monitor our lowest quartile students' data.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

We will respond when they do not learn by reviewing their data during our MTSS meetings. Teachers, Curriculum Project Coach, coaches, administration, guidance, and the reading interventionist discuss strategies, increase interventions, and provide recommendations for the teachers to implement with the students. We will continue to actively monitor and provide support systems in place to support the students.

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?

SWD and ethnic subgroups will be monitored through data meetings, Curriculum Project meetings, and MTSS meetings. The evidence will be notes taken at the meetings.

Person Responsible: Martina Herndon (martina_herndon@scps.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students succeed when conditions for learning are optimized. A focus on campus safety, development of a culture where student voice and belonging are valued and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

5 Essentials Survey indicators for trust, collective responsibility and academic personalism will increase to or remain Well Organized.

Monitoring:

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk through, PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Martina Herndon (martina_herndon@scps.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The strategy that we will implement to address Trusted Adults & Discipline and Student Behavior is our Eagle Buddy Program. The Eagle Buddy Program is a mentoring program in which our guidance counselor connects an at-risk student to a trusted adult/staff member.

Collect Responsibility will be addressed through PLCs, PDs, MTSS, and staff meetings. We are all collectively responsible for student achievement, so team planning, small group instruction, and school-wide ownership of our student progress is essential.

Person Responsible: Martina Herndon (martina_herndon@scps.k12.fl.us)

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Eastbrook Elementary School has an active School Advisory Council and PTA, each of which gives input to the team that develops the SIP. The staff and community have worked together through school and district surveys (Snapshot, 5Essentials, School Messenger, Survey Monkey, PTA, SAC) to determine the academic goals, behavior support, and safety needs for our students. Priorities have been agreed upon by all parties. Any student who is not working on grade level is identified and an initial parent conference is held. Throughout the year, additional parent conferences are held to review student progress. Lastly, Eastbrook also sends home a monthly newsletter and uses social media: we have an active Facebook page to share school information and highlight events.

<https://sim.scps.k12.fl.us/school/info/0531>

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Eastbrook Elementary School recognizes the importance of building positive relationships on a daily basis, as well as realizing and appreciating cultural differences. This expectation is conveyed to teachers and monitored in accordance with the SCPS Instructional Model. Eastbrook Elementary School also

welcomes parents to many events (academic and community building) in order to promote positive relationships in the community. All teachers are required to hold a parent/teacher conferences within the first semester of the school year. Teachers and administrators use multiple strategies to contact families, including but not limited to, (1) contacting families prior to the start of school to welcome the students to the new school year, (2) inviting families to curriculum nights and open house meetings to meet teachers and school staff and to learn about the curriculum, (3) providing access to school grades, progress monitoring data and other relevant achievement information through the SCPS Skyward Family Access Portal, (4) ensuring students show evidence of “owning their data” (5) inviting families to participate in SAC and PTA Boards, (6) inviting families to attend PTA meetings and participate in school-related events, (7) using multiple platforms of social networking and newsletters to families on a regular basis, (8) advertising events on school marquees, (9) and numerous other out-reach strategies developed by school staff. Skyward e-mail blasts, School Messenger informational text alerts from the administration regarding curriculum updates, upcoming events, and involvement opportunities. Also, updated posts on school webpage.

<https://eastbrook.scps.k12.fl.us/>

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Eastbrook Elementary School has been identified as a title I school; therefore, many measures have been established and created to determine the needs of our students and families. Using the 5 Essentials data and our Title I Plan, we focused on providing high interest family engagement activities in order to empower and educate our parents and engage our students. Additionally, we have planned to use title I funds to hire additional staff to support our lowest quartile and tier 2 and tier 3 students. Finally, we have tailored our professional developments and PLCs to provide enrichment lessons, to plan an accelerated curriculum using the district-adopted curriculum and instructional plans, and to address strategies to increase learning time and student achievement.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

During the planning phase of Title I school-wide plans, which typically begins late February or early March for the upcoming school year, leadership from the Department of Teaching and Learning (Title II, Part A), ESOL World Languages and Student Access (Title III, Part A), Families in Need (Title IX, Part A), Student Support Services (IDEA), Student Assignment and Program Access (magnet programs), Alternative Program (Title I, Part D), and Early Learning (Pre-K/VPK) are invited to participate in collaborative planning sessions. At these collaborative planning sessions, school leadership teams begin developing their Title I, Part A plans for the upcoming school year, with support and guidance from these various district-level grant and/or program managers. For instance, the Director of ESOL/World Languages and Student Access would share with Title I school leadership teams relevant updates to those programs for the upcoming school year, which may lead them to leverage their Title I, Part A funds to supplement such initiatives.