Eastbrook Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Eastbrook Elementary School

5525 TANGERINE AVE, Winter Park, FL 32792

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

Demographics

Principal: Martina Herndon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Seminole 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

Eastbrook Elementary School

5525 TANGERINE AVE, Winter Park, FL 32792

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

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 PK-5	No	59%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole 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.

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

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
Herndon, Martina	Principal	Supervise all Eastbrook staff; teacher/staff evaluations; monitor PLCs and MTSS; analyze school and student data; administrative rep for PTA and SAC; work with District TOAs; Professional Development; monitor formal assessments; State testing prep and administration.
Williams, Tracey	Assistant Principal	Supervise all Eastbrook staff; teacher/staff evaluations; monitor PLCs; analyze school and student data; Frontline PD; BPIE; PBIS; Tutorial; State testing prep and administration.
Calegan, Kristy	Instructional Coach	Oversees SOAR reading intervention planning/teaching; coaching & mentoring new teachers; i-Ready support and data analysis; Fountas & Pinnell/REL support for grade K-2 teachers; MTSS lead and Tier support with administration and teachers; oversees reading parapros and their lesson prep
McGuire, Genevieve	School Counselor	Counseling students & families; small groups (behavior, grief, divorced parents, etc.); MTSS; SST meeting lead.
Espinosa, Moraima	Behavior Specialist	Support for daily student discipline issues; PBIS; Bully reporting system; Hope scholarship; Eagles Excellence program.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Martina Herndon

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.*
1

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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
50

Total number of students enrolled at the school
666

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
1

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	105	102	100	112	125	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	667
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	6	3	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	1	3	5	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	28	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	7	5	5	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	99	120	102	140	123	148	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	733
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	1	3	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	1	1	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2	8	2	11	12	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
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	99	120	102	140	123	148	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	733
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	1	3	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	1	1	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
					Grade Level									
Retained Students: Current Year	2	8	2	11	12	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				59%	67%	57%	55%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	61%	58%	48%	58%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	51%	53%	39%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				63%	70%	63%	63%	68%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	66%	62%	61%	62%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	50%	51%	45%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				47%	62%	53%	59%	66%	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	65%	67%	-2%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	65%	-9%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	64%	-19%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	66%	71%	-5%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	70%	72%	-2%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	65%	-18%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	45%	62%	-17%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Diagnostic Assessments were utilized to progress monitor*:
• ELA – Grades 1-5
• Mathematics – Grades 1-5
In Grade 5 Science, teacher based formative assessments were used for progress monitoring. Data is unavailable for these assessments.
*Reported data is based upon having 10 or more students in the subgroup. Less than 10 students will be reported as 0.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30/32%	44/41%	59/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/25%	22/31%	34/48%
	Students With Disabilities	2/14%	4/24%	6/38%
	English Language Learners	2/20%	2/15%	3/21%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30/33%	47/48%	69/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/27%	28/42%	44/59%
	Students With Disabilities	6/46%	4/27%	9/53%
	English Language Learners	2/20%	3/25%	6/40%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32/43%	42/45%	51/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/30%	20/34%	25/42%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	1/7%
	English Language Learners	1/8%	6/40%	6/40%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/23%	32/36%	41/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/12%	12/21%	19/34%
	Students With Disabilities	1/7%	0	0
	English Language Learners	1/7%	4/29%	5/33%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31/29%	44/37%	68/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/21%	20/26%	33/39%
	Students With Disabilities	3/14%	3/14%	5/23%
	English Language Learners	3/20%	2/11%	4/21%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36/35%	64/54%	80/62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/26%	33/44%	41/50%
	Students With Disabilities	3/15%	6/29%	7/33%
	English Language Learners	3/21%	6/33%	5/25%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	49/52%	61/59%	66/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/43%	30/49%	33/52%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11%	4/22%	3/17%
	English Language Learners	3/30%	3/27%	4/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	39/43%	49/49%	66/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/35%	22/37%	33/58%
	Students With Disabilities	3/17%	5/28%	6/40%
	English Language Learners	1/11%	4/33%	5/45%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	52/44%	75/56%	79/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/38%	38/48%	41/51%
	Students With Disabilities	1/7%	2/13%	3/18%
	English Language Learners	1/13%	0	3/30%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	66/59%	83/61%	97/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36/54%	43/54%	54/67%
	Students With Disabilities	4/33%	4/24%	6/38%
	English Language Learners	0	2/20%	1/10%
	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

Subgroup Data Review

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	29	52	53	29	38	21	38				
ELL	32	36		43	29		15				
ASN	75			75							
BLK	38	36		32	30						
HSP	54	53	38	48	38	15	45				
MUL	50	50		55	60						
WHT	70	55	90	67	46	38	61				
FRL	51	43	48	46	37	19	43				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	13	24	26	20	30	39	14				
ELL	37	43	37	48	62	61	22				
ASN	80			79							
BLK	49	50		46	52						
HSP	51	48	44	58	62	64	47				
MUL	50	30		50	20						
WHT	65	51	41	70	56	37	49				
FRL	50	43	31	55	55	49	38				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	13	28	31	28	47	41	21				
ELL	27	35	25	35	45	36					
ASN	75			67							
BLK	36	39		55	64	58	60				
HSP	50	48	38	52	59	39	37				
MUL	50	23		56	62						
WHT	62	51	36	72	63	50	66				
FRL	49	45	37	53	57	48	56				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	37
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	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
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	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

The performance of multiracial students and students with disabilities across all grade levels and content areas is a concerning trend.

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

The achievement and learning gains of multiracial students and students with disabilities demonstrates the 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?

Factors contributing to the low performance of multiracial students and students with disabilities in ELA and Math proficiency and learning gains include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills. Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need.

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

Progress monitoring data reflects improvement for ELA and mathematics at all grade levels.

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

Deliberate monitoring of specific student groups contributed to this improvement. Actions included focus on the monitoring of the lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students along with standards-based tutoring.

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

Acceleration strategies will include strategic monitoring of lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students, more frequent common formative assessment to gather progress monitoring data and highly structured professional learning community discussions using this data to collaborate on strategies to accelerate student learning.

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.

Professional development will be focused on the development of highly effective professional learning communities and how school-based leaders can foster the growth and development of teacher collaboration for student success.

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

Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include social emotional learning support for students and families, data driven tutoring and acceleration support; and expanded use of SCPS early warning tracking and MTSS based support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing academic achievement of multiracial students and students with disabilities. 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:	Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.
Monitoring:	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 Strategy:	Lessons aligned to Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity with ongoing feedback loops between leadership and teachers, students and teachers and student with students and PLCs focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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.

Action Steps to Implement

Student owned progress monitoring
Low 30% Monitoring
High Level 1 and High Level 2 Monitoring
Low Level 3 Acceleration
Collaborative Data Driven PLCs
Tutoring
See SCPS School Improvement Plan for additional details
High School

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

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.

Eastbrook Elementary School builds a positive school culture and environment. There are many initiatives in place to promote positivity for students and staff with PBIS being one of them. For the staff we have Eagle Shout Outs, Wacky Wednesdays, PTA Educator of the Month, Class of the Week, Celebrations during National Teacher Day, American Education Week, and Staff Appreciation Week. Additionally we plan Social Committee activities and events. For students we have Eagle Excellence Awards, Eagle Buddies, Class of the Week, Lunchroom Clean and Green, Key of Character Kids, Multiplication Fact Fluency Class/ Students, and awarded students eat with the principal

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

SAC and PTA members are very supportive of Eastbrook and promote a positive culture and environment. SAC meets monthly to discuss business and make decisions as it pertains to the betterment of Eastbrook. PTA meets monthly to support the school, teachers, and students.