

Marion County Public Schools

Eighth Street Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Eighth Street Elementary School

513 SE 8TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ryan Bennett

Start Date for this Principal: 8/7/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 56% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (68%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * 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 Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Eighth Street Elementary School

513 SE 8TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School KG-5 | Yes | 46% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 31% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A | A | A | A |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

The mission of Eighth Street Elementary School is to provide a safe, positive and enriching learning, environment for all students, staff and parents. We strive to encourage continuous improvement for all, while embracing a strong relationship with the community as part of educational process.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our goal at Eighth Street Elementary School is success for all students. We are committed to providing the kinds of experiences which will enable all students to grow emotionally, socially, and academically. We will provide an educationally rich environment where each individual of the school community is valued, respected, and encouraged to reach his and/or her potential as a productive citizen.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Bennett, Ryan | Principal | The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. He provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure; conducts assessment of the skills of school staff; ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support and documentation; provides adequate professional learning opportunities; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff; ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need; and communicates with parents as necessary. |
| Esquivel, Amanda | School Counselor | The Guidance Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. |
| Howell, Karen | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas. |
| Patton, Amanda | Dean | The Student Services Manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. She coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. She also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, facilitates PST meetings for discipline, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. Models and supports teachers with classroom management as well as doing threat risk referrals. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/7/2020, Ryan Bennett

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.*

2

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 56% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (68%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 47 | 51 | 60 | 51 | 84 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 361 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/7/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 63 | 55 | 75 | 69 | 76 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 407 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 11 | 10 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| One or more suspensions | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

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 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 63 | 55 | 75 | 69 | 76 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 407 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 11 | 10 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| One or more suspensions | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

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 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 71% | 47% | 57% | 73% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 68% | 56% | 58% | 68% | 57% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 56% | 52% | 53% | 50% | 53% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 74% | 51% | 63% | 73% | 52% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 78% | 58% | 62% | 61% | 54% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 68% | 49% | 51% | 50% | 43% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 75% | 47% | 53% | 74% | 51% | 51% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 65% | 44% | 21% | 58% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 60% | 46% | 14% | 57% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 66% | 49% | 17% | 58% | 8% |
| | 2018 | 72% | 43% | 29% | 56% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 75% | 45% | 30% | 56% | 19% |
| | 2018 | 69% | 46% | 23% | 55% | 14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 59% | 49% | 10% | 62% | -3% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 54% | 48% | 6% | 62% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 72% | 54% | 18% | 64% | 8% |
| | 2018 | 71% | 47% | 24% | 62% | 9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 18% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 80% | 45% | 35% | 60% | 20% |
| | 2018 | 77% | 50% | 27% | 61% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 72% | 44% | 28% | 53% | 19% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 49% | 29% | 55% | 23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 59 | 53 | | 59 | 73 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | 50 | 38 | 54 | 63 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 70 | 76 | | 67 | 82 | | 50 | | | | |
| WHT | 75 | 72 | 61 | 79 | 80 | 72 | 82 | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 63 | 57 | 62 | 78 | 68 | 61 | | | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 46 | 47 | 38 | 38 | 47 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 42 | 36 | 42 | 68 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 58 | 73 | | 65 | 75 | 64 | 71 | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 58 | 43 | 76 | 74 | 70 | 84 | | | | |
| FRL | 54 | 48 | 44 | 56 | 71 | 60 | 67 | | | | |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 35 | 53 | 42 | 43 | 47 | | | | | | |

| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| BLK | 47 | 63 | 64 | 43 | 37 | | 36 | | | | |
| HSP | 71 | 67 | | 70 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | 65 | 38 | 81 | 65 | 53 | 77 | | | | |
| FRL | 55 | 64 | 62 | 62 | 51 | 57 | 59 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 70 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 490 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 61 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |

| Asian Students | |
|--|-----|
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 51 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 69 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 74 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 64 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The third grade scores showed the lowest performance in the content area of Math. The contributing factors could be the lack of understanding of the standards, item specification, high-level questioning and academic discussion that supports critical thinking and problem-solving and hands-on activities.

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

The fourth grade scores showed the greatest decline in the content area of ELA. The contributing factors could be the lack of understanding of the standards, item specification, reading comprehension and hands-on activities.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state average is again, our fourth grade scores in the content of ELA.

The contributing factors could be the lack of understanding of the standards, item specification, reading comprehension, and hands-on activities.

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

The fifth grade scores showed the most improvement in the content area of ELA. There was a focus on understanding the Florida Standards using the item specs, using materials and resources that are aligned to the Florida Standards, protecting instructional time and common collaborative planning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

We have two areas of concern with our students. Attendance in grades KG-5th with students missing more than 10 days of school. The second concern are suspensions in grades 2nd-5th grades.

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

1. Delivering quality instruction with materials and resources aligned to the Florida Standards will continue to be a priority.
2. Support all students with MTSS and differentiated instruction with interventions and enrichment to improve performance.
3. Decrease the percentage of students missing 10 or more days of school

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Instruction - Higher level questioning and academic discussion. Research has shown that high-level questioning and academic discussion support critical thinking and problem-solving. This will lead to student engagement and an increase of higher-level thinking, ultimately leading to increased student achievement. |
| Measurable Outcome: | If all core teachers incorporate higher level questioning, student discussion using the rigor and relevance framework, and increase opportunities for writing, into their academic instruction, then ELA proficiency will increase from 71% to 74% as measured by the 2020-2021 FSA assessment. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Ryan Bennett (ryan.bennett@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Rigor and Relevance framework focusing on high-level questioning and academic discussion. Teachers will increase students opportunities for writing, class discussions, and reading through all subject areas. Through collaboration meetings teachers will learn how to increase students writing to explain their thinking and increase opportunities for students to initiate questions in class discussions. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Research shows that students who have increased opportunities for writing and reading in all areas and class discussion, increase their overall abilities in all areas. We will use CKLA curriculum, iReady Reading Workbooks and iReady Teacher Toolbox lessons, Top Score Writing curriculum, and Social Studies Weekly, differentiated instruction using check for understanding data, and multiple intervention resources to improve all student achievement. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will monitor teachers use of higher-level questioning through classroom observations, walkthroughs, Collaboration meetings and conversations.
2. Provide ongoing professional development on higher-level questioning and classroom discussion strategies.
3. Analyze student performance data to identify areas of greatest need (by grade level, subject, teacher, student, and subgroups).
4. Yearlong progress monitoring through Tier Talks (PMP/EWI) and Data Chats.

Person Responsible Ryan Bennett (ryan.bennett@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Instruction - Higher level questioning and academic discussion. Research has shown that high-level questioning and academic discussion support critical thinking and problem-solving. This will lead to student engagement and an increase of higher-level thinking, ultimately leading to increased student achievement. |
| Measurable Outcome: | If all core teachers incorporate higher level questioning, student discussion using the rigor and relevance framework, and increase differentiate math instruction through centers, then Math proficiency will increase from 74% to 77% as measured by the 2020-2021 FSA assessment. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Ryan Bennett (ryan.bennett@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Rigor and Relevance framework focusing on high-level questioning and academic discussion. Teachers will increase students opportunities for class discussions, critical thinking, and problem-solving during math instruction. Through collaboration meetings teachers will learn how to explain students thinking and increase opportunities for students to initiate questions in class discussions. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Research shows that students who have increased opportunities for writing and reading in all areas, class discussion, critical thinking, and problem-solving, increase their overall abilities in all areas. We will use Go Math curriculum, iReady Math Workbooks and iReady Teacher Toolbox lessons, Acaletics Quik Piks, differentiated instruction using check for understanding data, and multiple intervention resources to improve all student achievement. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will monitor teachers use of higher-level questioning through classroom observations, walkthroughs, Collaboration meetings and conversations.
2. Provide ongoing professional development on higher-level questioning and classroom discussion strategies.
3. Analyze student performance data to identify areas of greatest need (by grade level, subject, teacher, student, and subgroups).
4. Yearlong progress monitoring through Tier Talks (PMP/EWI) and Data Chats.

Person Responsible Ryan Bennett (ryan.bennett@marion.k12.fl.us)

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Social-emotional learning will be a school-wide area of focus. When social-emotional learning is addressed in school, students learn to build positive relationships with peers and staff, reduce conflict, and achieve academic excellence. With the promotion of school safety and mental health and in compliance with Senate Bills 7026 and 7030, social-emotional learning will allow teachers and staff to build safer and more positive classroom environments. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Decrease in ODRs throughout the school year, improvement in number of students struggling with social-emotional learning topics as identified through BESS and teacher and parent/community referrals. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Amanda Esquivel (amanda.esquivel@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Sanford Harmony is a PreK-6th grade social emotional learning program that will be used daily in all classrooms. The Sanford Harmony curriculum can be accessed through the Harmony teacher kits as well as the Sanford Harmony online learning portal. The program is set up to include a series of lessons, activities, stories and games that address the five program themes: Diversity & Inclusion, Empathy & Critical Thinking, Communication, Problem Solving, and Peer Relationships. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | This program is being used throughout all Marion County Public elementary schools and has been recognized by the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning as a CASEL Select Program. Through the CASEL framework, Sanford Harmony addresses research-based practices by improving peer relationships and allowing students to understand school culture and policies. |

Action Steps to Implement

All teachers will participate in Sanford Harmony daily. School support staff (counselors, social workers, school psychologists) will provide more intensive instruction for those students identified through data mentioned above. School administration and school counselor will monitor required instruction and give support when needed.

Person Responsible Amanda Esquivel (amanda.esquivel@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

There is a need to decrease behavior incidences in 2nd - 5th grade students identified in the Early Warning Systems. We will address this concern by providing interventions and tracking progress of our students. An increase in higher-level questioning and student discussion will result in increased student engagement, which will increase proficiency and decrease behavior incidences.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Parent/teacher organization meetings are held 7-10 times per school year where families, staff, and the community come together to create and implement an action plan addressing academic and emotional needs of our students. The school will also hold quarterly SAC meetings for families, staff, and the community to learn about the school's vision, mission, goals, and progress throughout the year.

Parents will be invited and encouraged to participate in Family events such as Fall Festival, Camp Days, Bike Rodeo, Pastries with Parents, Spaghetti Dinner Art Show, Parent Conference Nights, and Open House for parents. Eighth Street will reach out to Osceola Middle School and Forest High School for student mentors and tutors.

Eighth Street follows the 10 critical elements of the PBIS system. Counseling is also made available for students who are struggling through social issues. An anti-bullying initiative is put on through school counselors and the Student Services Manager. Students who are struggling with their daily behaviors are often placed on check in/check out systems overseen by the dean or by another administrator. Character education words are reviewed and discussed by administrators daily on the morning show.

Eighth Street Elementary School partners with Glover Law Firm to provide our students with an enriching education that allows them to perform at their highest potential. Glover Law Firm provides support through mentor programs and reading readiness programs. Each year our guidance department provides our students with a career day that highlights the careers found in Marion County. Our goal is to open our students' eyes to careers that they might not be aware exist in our community.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |