

Seminole County Public Schools

EASTBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 2
 - A. School Mission and Vision 2
 - B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2
 - C. Demographic Data..... 5
 - D. Early Warning Systems 6
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 9
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 10
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 11
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 12
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 13
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 16
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 17
- IV. Positive Learning Environment 26
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 30
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 33
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 34

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on Board Approved on 10/7.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. 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 who contribute to society. In order to accomplish this, our staff works collaboratively with students, parents and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement

Eastbrook Elementary will provide an enriched environment to all students so they can acquire the necessary skills and knowledge to achieve their personal best and become life-long learners. Our goal is to meet the district-wide goals and strive for achievement. Our school environment is one in which all learners grow and succeed. We value and celebrate diversity and support our learners because they are capable, and we believe in them.

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Martina Herndon

martina_herndon@scps.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

-oversee total school operation

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Tracey Williams

tracey_williams@scps.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists the principal with implementing schoolwide goals. Works with the school principal as an instructional leader of the building staff to ensure student achievement, learning, and growth. Assists in the day-to-day operations of the school.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Inga Hill

inga_hill@scps.us

Position Title

School Administration Manager

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist with administrative duties, student behaviors, and facilities operations

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Kristy Calegan

kristy_calegan@scps.us

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Coaching, MTSS, Curriculum Implementation, Monitoring Student Data, and Reading PLCs

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Susan Hajek

susan_hajek@scps.us

Position Title

Math Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Coaching, MTSS, Curriculum Implementation, Monitoring Student Data, and Math/Science PLCs

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 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, 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.

3. 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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 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 revisited to ensure continuous improvement.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY PK-5
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	YES
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	62.8%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	CSI
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)* ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2024-25: B 2023-24: C 2022-23: B 2021-22: B 2020-21:

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 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
School Enrollment	69	99	96	93	100	104				561
Absent 10% or more school days	8	21	11	13	14	12				79
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	0	1	3				9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	11	10	6	3	7				39
Course failure in Math	2	12	13	4	1	8				40
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	4	13	25	10	16				68
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	4	12	17	8	20				61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	1	19	21	24						65
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	1	22	8	12	0					43

Current Year 2025-26

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	21	20	24	15	20				102

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	2	5	1	3	0	0				11
Students retained two or more times										0

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last 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 school days	2	18	22	15	14	23				94
One or more suspensions		6	3	2	2	3				16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	13	2			1				18
Course failure in Math	2	10	8			2				22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					17	19				36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					11	21				32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	13	9	27	23						72
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	15	6	14	13	9					57

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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	1	15	5	3	18	25				67

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year		6	1	3						10
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	65	68	59	58	66	57	56	61	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	70	71	59	64	69	58	59	62	53
ELA Learning Gains	63	63	60	57	62	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64	56	56	51	55	57			
Math Achievement*	64	69	64	58	67	62	54	64	59
Math Learning Gains	63	65	63	55	64	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47	47	51	30	43	52			
Science Achievement	47	68	58	54	68	57	66	65	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	81	73	63	75	75	61	39	77	59

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	63%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	564
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
63%	56%	59%	58%	52%		55%

* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

** Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 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%
Students With Disabilities	40%	Yes	6	
English Language Learners	57%	No		
Black/African American Students	46%	No		
Hispanic Students	62%	No		
Multiracial Students	68%	No		
White Students	65%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	59%	No		

D. 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.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	65%	70%	63%	64%	64%	63%	47%	47%					81%
Students With Disabilities	26%	26%	45%	52%	37%	47%	42%	19%					67%
English Language Learners	58%	56%	59%	60%	56%	59%	44%	43%					81%
Black/African American Students	44%		75%		41%	45%		25%					
Hispanic Students	62%	68%	59%	63%	62%	63%	45%	50%					82%
Multiracial Students	67%	70%			67%								
White Students	72%	76%	62%	50%	70%	70%		53%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	59%	63%	63%	62%	56%	58%	46%	43%					80%

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	58%	64%	57%	51%	58%	55%	30%	54%					75%
Students With Disabilities	29%	36%	45%	42%	33%	40%	30%	14%					80%
English Language Learners	49%	40%	68%	67%	47%	49%	30%	28%					75%
Asian Students	64%				82%								
Black/African American Students	39%		57%		29%	33%	27%						
Hispanic Students	59%	62%	57%	38%	56%	52%	16%	47%					72%
Multiracial Students	46%				46%								
White Students	64%	67%	55%	69%	68%	66%	47%	71%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	49%	57%	55%	49%	45%	47%	28%	42%					77%

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2021-22	C&C ACCEL 2021-22	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	56%	59%			54%			66%					39%
Students With Disabilities	26%	36%			23%			29%					67%
English Language Learners	38%	23%			48%			25%					61%
Asian Students	62%				69%								
Black/African American Students	29%	45%			26%			27%					
Hispanic Students	57%	54%			57%			63%					58%
Multiracial Students	35%				53%								
White Students	64%	72%			57%			81%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	46%	54%			43%			52%					60%

E. 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.

SUBJECT	GRADE	2024-25 SPRING				
		SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	70%	69%	1%	57%	13%
ELA	4	62%	67%	-5%	56%	6%
ELA	5	59%	64%	-5%	56%	3%
Math	3	67%	70%	-3%	63%	4%
Math	4	64%	69%	-5%	62%	2%
Math	5	33%	46%	-13%	57%	-24%
Math	6	100%	71%	29%	60%	40%
Science	5	48%	66%	-18%	55%	-7%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is math lowest quartile, which increased from 30% in 2024 to 47% in 2025. Small group targeted instruction based on data, use of strategic materials, and intervention assisted to meet the needs of the students. Our school team benefited from ongoing professional development, grade-level collaboration, PLC collaboration, and analyzing data for individual students.

Lowest Performance

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is Science, which is 47%. One of the contributing factors is time to build content knowledge and instructional capacity. Targeted intervention and scaffolding instruction will need to be a priority.

Greatest Decline

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

The data component which showed the greatest decline was the Science proficiency in fifth grade which declined from 54% proficient in 2024 to 47% proficient in 2025. Factors contributing to this decline was the need to implement tiered layers of instructional support and interventions aligned to the State Science standards.

Greatest Gap

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 5th Grade Mathematics- Non RAMP students at 52%. Most of these students were more than 1 year behind grade level in Mathematics and were unable to close the gap.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

1. Targeted math practices to best support lowest quartile, Non RAMP students, and students with disabilities.
2. Focus on math interventions and small group instruction for foundational skills and scaffolding to support targeted lowest quartile fourth and fifth grades.
3. Monitoring data to determine teacher effectiveness and student learning outcomes based on grade level standards.

Highest Priorities

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

1. Continuing to support the teachers and staff in an effort to continue to improve morale, instructional content knowledge, and school grade.
2. Focusing on targeted instruction, strengthening pedagogical practices, strategies in PLCs for planning and data analysis, including the ESE support facilitators and resource teachers.
3. Continue to focus on K-5 teachers' collaborative planning sessions, which focus on target task alignment, and targeted walkthroughs with specific feedback, which focus on target task alignment, to increase purposeful core instruction and differentiation for all students.
4. Targeted math small group instruction to support
5. Targeted science instruction to support

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

We endeavor to increase academic achievement of students with disabilities and our lowest quartile. 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

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

1. Our ESSA measurable outcome is to increase the FPPI for our SWD subgroup from 40% to 43%.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

We will utilize the SCPS Instructional Priorities Tool to monitor for implementation and desired outcome. The SCPS Instructional Priorities we will focus on are the Benchmark-Aligned Instruction and Monitor for Learning. Administration and Instructional Coaches will monitor that ESE and Regular Ed teachers:

- utilize the grade level-frameworks and lessons that are district-adopted
- ensure tasks are aligned to the grade level benchmark
- check students' understanding throughout the lesson
- provide timely and specific feedback to improve student understanding
- ensure students routinely monitor their own learning progress

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Martina Herndon, Tracey Williams, ESE teachers, Regular Ed teachers, and Instructional Coaches

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Magnetic Reading (promising evidence), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS) (moderate evidence), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention (state approved adopted materials), iReady (moderate evidence) FastForward (promising evidence), and Quick Reads (strong evidence). For students with disabilities who are served in separate classroom environments for the majority of the instructional day, additional curriculum has been included to address reading deficits as needed: Reading Mastery (promising evidence) and Corrective Reading (strong evidence). English Language Learners may also utilize Imagine Learning Language and Literacy (promising evidence) and Imagine Learning Espanol (promising evidence). The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Ready Florida BEST Math Instruction, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale:

ELA: 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 included in the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan. Math: All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Progress Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Martina Herndon and Tracey Williams

By When/Frequency:

May 2026/Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

-Admin, Instructional Coaches, and District ESE personnel will meet to ensure strategies, expectations, and high-quality teaching and learning are occurring -Admin will conduct walkthroughs and provide teacher feedback to our ESE for growth and development -Admin will ensure ESE teachers' schedules are better aligned with areas of pedagogical strength to ensure maximum support -PLCs will include both ESE and Gen Ed teachers to collaborate and strategize on best practices for ESE student growth -Monthly data meeting to track and monitor ESE student growth

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Our ELA Instructional Priorities are aligned with the SCPS Instructional Priorities and with this alignment, we endeavor to increase reading proficiency in all grade levels. This is a high priority need and focusing on literacy will reduce achievement gaps in reading and prepare our students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

1. Our measurable outcome is to increase ELA achievement from 65% in 2025 to 70% in 2026.
2. Our measurable outcome is to increase 3rd Grade ELA achievement from 70% in 2025 to 75% in 2026.
3. Our measurable outcome is to increase ELA Learning Gains from 63% in 2025 to 68% in 2026.
4. Our measurable outcome is to increase ELA Lowest Quartile from 64% in 2025 to 69% in 2026.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

We will utilize the SCPS Instructional Priorities Tool to monitor for implementation and desired outcome. The SCPS Instructional Priorities we will focus on are the Benchmark-Aligned Instruction and Monitor for Learning. Administration and Instructional Coaches will monitor that teachers:

- utilize the ELA grade level-frameworks and lessons that are district-adopted
- Implement differentiated small group instruction in fluency, decoding, and comprehension
- ensure ELA tasks are aligned to the grade level benchmark
- check students' understanding throughout the ELA lesson
- provide timely and specific feedback to improve student understanding
- ensure students routinely monitor their own learning progress

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Martina Herndon, Tracey Williams, ESE teachers, Regular Ed teachers, and Instructional Coaches

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Magnetic Reading (promising evidence), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS) (moderate evidence), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention (state approved adopted materials), iReady (moderate evidence) FastForward (promising evidence), and Quick Reads (strong evidence). For students with disabilities who are served in separate classroom environments for the majority of the instructional day, additional curriculum has been included to address reading deficits as needed: Reading Mastery (promising evidence) and Corrective Reading (strong evidence). English Language Learners may also utilize Imagine Learning Language and Literacy (promising evidence) and Imagine Learning Espanol (promising evidence).

Rationale:

ELA: 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 included in the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Progress Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Martina Herndon and Tracey Williams

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

-Admin, Instructional Coaches, and District Instructional personnel will meet to ensure best practices, strategies, expectations, and high-quality teaching and learning are occurring -Admin will conduct walkthroughs and provide teacher feedback in ELA to ensure growth and development -ELA PLCs will allow for collaboration for best practices -Monthly data meetings to track and monitor student growth in ELA

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Our Math Instructional Priorities are aligned with the SCPS Instructional Priorities and with this alignment, we endeavor to increase math proficiency and fluency in all grade levels. This is a high priority need and focusing on numeracy will reduce achievement gaps in math and prepare our students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

1. Our measurable outcome is to increase Math achievement from 64% in 2025 to 69% in 2026.
2. Our measurable outcome is to increase Math Learning Gains from 64% in 2025 to 69% in 2026.
3. Our measurable outcome is to increase Math Lowest Quartile from 47% in 2025 to 55% in 2026.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

We will utilize the SCPS Instructional Priorities Tool to monitor for implementation and desired outcome. The SCPS Instructional Priorities we will focus on are the Benchmark-Aligned Instruction and Monitor for Learning. Administration and Instructional Coaches will monitor that teachers:

- utilize the math grade level-frameworks and lessons that are district-adopted
- implement differentiated small group instruction
- ensure math tasks are aligned to the grade level benchmark
- check students' understanding throughout the math lesson
- provide timely and specific feedback to improve student understanding of math concepts
- ensure students routinely monitor their own learning progress in math

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Martina Herndon and Tracey Williams

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored

for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

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

Rationale:

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Progress Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Martina Herndon and Tracey Williams

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

-Admin, Math Coach, and District Instructional personnel will meet to ensure best practices, strategies, expectations, and high-quality teaching and learning are occurring -Admin will conduct walkthroughs and provide teacher feedback in math to ensure growth and development -Math PLCs will allow for collaboration for best practices -Monthly data meetings to track and monitor student growth in Math

Area of Focus #4

Address the school’s highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Our Science Instructional Priorities are aligned with the SCPS Instructional Priorities and with this alignment, we endeavor to increase Science proficiency in all grade levels. This is a high priority need and focusing on science will reduce achievement gaps in science and prepare our students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Our measurable outcome is to increase Science achievement from 47% in 2025 to 60% in 2026.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

We will utilize the SCPS Instructional Priorities Tool to monitor for implementation and desired outcome. The SCPS Instructional Priorities we will focus on are the Benchmark-Aligned Instruction and Monitor for Learning. Administration and Instructional Coaches will monitor that teachers:

- utilize the science grade level-frameworks and lessons that are district-adopted
- ensure science tasks are aligned to the grade level benchmark
- check students' understanding throughout the science lesson
- provide timely and specific feedback to improve student understanding of science standards
- ensure students routinely monitor their own learning progress in science

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Martina Herndon and Tracey Williams

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Progress Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Martina Herndon and Tracey Williams

By When/Frequency:

2026

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

-Admin, Math and Science Coach, and District Instructional personnel will meet to ensure best practices, strategies, expectations, and high-quality teaching and learning are occurring -Admin will conduct walkthroughs and provide teacher feedback in science to ensure growth and development -Science PLCs will allow for collaboration for best practices -Monthly data meetings to track and monitor student growth in Science

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Student achievement occurs when conditions for learning are optimal and teachers feel confident and have a sense of belonging in their current school. Focusing on campus safety, developing a culture where teacher voice and belonging are valued, and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Eastbrook's School Climate reflected teacher responses on the 5 Essentials survey resulted collaborative culture is demonstrated by the high rating of 80, Very Strong, up 6 points from last year, for the 5Essentials indicator Teacher-Principal Trust. The goal for 2025-26 will be to raise each area on the survey by 1%.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Monitored by:

- Professional Developments
- Bi-annual individual admin-staff meetings to review goals and needed support

-Sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students will increase student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Martina Herndon and Tracey Williams

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

n/a

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Building Connections

Person Monitoring:

Martina Herndon and Tracey Williams

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

We endeavor to make building connections a priority for teachers and students by identifying the specific causes of individual challenges in the classroom or other areas within the school and sincerely commit to addressing challenges proactively as a school community. We also meet with each teacher one-on-one to discuss their short term and long term goals in order to help them achieve them. Striving to be supportive is a way to retain teachers.

Area of Focus #2

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

It is important to ensure that students are present at school each day. Research shows a direct correlation to student achievement and student attendance. Focusing on student attendance can provide a a culture of accountability where teachers, parents and students share a collective

responsibility to ensure the success of all students by increasing student achievement.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

The goal for 2025-2026 will be to decrease absences by 10% per grade level.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Teachers will continue to contact parents when the students are absent. Further, our truancy team, which consists of our school social worker, school counselor, coaches, and administration will meet frequently to monitor attendance. Our Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process team will continue to monitor attendance and meet every 6 weeks to strategize and implement strategies for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

MTSS and teachers

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Monitor Student Attendance

Person Monitoring:

MTSS team and teachers

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action

step:

-Teachers will continue to contact parents after 3 days absent. -Truancy team meet every 6 weeks to strategize and implement strategies for improvement. These steps will make an impact on student attendance as it is a shared responsibility.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

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

No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed

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 this Act, 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) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections

1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

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.

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

ELA - In the area of literacy, performance data from FAST and iReady in elementary schools or benchmark assessments in secondary schools are used to progress monitor whether core instruction is meeting the needs of students. A benchmark of 80% of students being at or above the 26 th percentile is used to monitor whether further supports are needed. This data along with the data from district leadership walkthroughs in ELA classrooms are used by assistant superintendents to help school leaders problem solve after the administration of these assessments.

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00