

Marion County Public Schools

Eighth Street Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

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: 7/12/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	49%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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. In addition, we strive to encourage continuous improvement for all while embracing a strong relationship with the community as part of our educational process.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our goal at Eighth Street Elementary School is success for all students. Therefore, we are committed to providing the kinds of experiences which will enable all students to grow emotionally, socially, and academically. In addition, 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	Position 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.
Howell, Karen	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in providing a shared 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 the implementation of interventions and necessary documentation; and assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. In addition, the assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel is serving in their specified areas.
Esquivel, Amanda	School Counselor	The guidance counselor participates in collecting, interpreting, and analyzing data; facilitates the development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; and facilitates data-based decision-making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students and communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Patton, Amanda	Dean	The student services manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative learning environment; provides resources, such as behavior contracts for at-risk students, are carefully considered and shared; coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students; 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; and acts as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/12/2021, 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

29

Total number of students enrolled at the school

385

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

2

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

3

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	63	62	61	55	77	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	377
Attendance below 90 percent	11	10	13	14	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	3	1	2	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	6	8	7	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	6	2	4	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	5	4	8	5	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Wednesday 6/30/2021

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	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

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	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

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				71%	47%	57%	69%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	56%	58%	59%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	52%	53%	44%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				74%	51%	63%	70%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				78%	58%	62%	73%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68%	49%	51%	61%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				75%	47%	53%	77%	51%	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%	44%	21%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	49%	17%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	75%	45%	30%	56%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	49%	10%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	80%	45%	35%	60%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	72%	44%	28%	53%	19%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:

- English Language Arts, Grades 1-5: I-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Mathematics, Grades 1-5: I-Ready Diagnostic-Math Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Science, Grade 5: Grade 5 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14 / 23%	28 / 44%	45 / 71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 17%	7 / 28%	13 / 52%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 20%	1 / 20%	3 / 60%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9 / 15%	24 / 38%	42 / 67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 4%	4 / 16%	14 / 56%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	2 / 40%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27 / 48%	30 / 51%	38 / 63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2 / 14%	3 / 20%	6 / 40%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 33%	3 / 60%	3 / 60%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12 / 21%	15 / 25%	35 / 58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0 / 0%	2 / 13%	5 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 50%	3 / 60%	4 / 80%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34 / 63%	22 / 41%	28 / 52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 44%	3 / 18%	6 / 35%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 14%	2 / 29%	1 / 14%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14 / 26%	9 / 17%	29 / 53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 6%	2 / 12%	5 / 28%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 14%
	English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35 / 49%	31 / 41%	38 / 51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2 / 13%	1 / 6%	3 / 18%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 50%	1 / 50%	1 / 50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21 / 29%	29 / 39%	46 / 61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0 / 0%	2 / 12%	4 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 50%	1 / 50%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17 / 30%	13 / 22%	11 / 19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 12%	3 / 11%	2 / 7%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 11%	1 / 10%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16 / 29%	5 / 9%	18 / 31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 24%	1 / 4%	4 / 15%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 22%	0 / 0%	1 / 10%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	35 / 63%	27 / 48%	24 / 43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13 / 52%	10 / 40%	6 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 22%	1 / 11%	1 / 11%
	English Language Learners	1 / 50%	0 / 0%	0/0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26			53							
BLK	36			36							
HSP	75			75			40				
WHT	78	83		90	83		58				
FRL	46	67		46	52		26				
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				

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	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	496
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
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	63
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	78
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	47
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?

ELA proficiency decreased in third, fourth, and fifth grade from AP1 to AP3 in I-Ready. When comparing proficiency rates of our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup in ELA, they are 21% lower compared to the student average of 41% proficient and 26% lower compared to all students that average 48% proficiency in Math.

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

Based on 2019 FSA data, our lowest 25% performed 15% below the school average of 71% in ELA and 6% lower than the school average of 78% in Math. Progress monitoring data shows that our Economically Disadvantaged students had the greatest decline in both ELA and Math. When comparing proficiency rates of our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup in ELA, they are 21% lower in comparison to all students and 26% lower in comparison to all students in Math.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Many of our Economically Disadvantaged students selected online learning for a portion of the 2020-2021 school year, which contributed to their loss of learning. In addition, historically our Economically Disadvantaged students are absent and/or tardy which causes missed instruction. Our home school liaison will be providing additional assistance as needed to ensure our Economically Disadvantaged students are attending school on a regular basis with targeted individual student needs to bridge academic deficiencies from loss of instructional time.

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

Our first grade students had the greatest improvement in proficiency for ELA, raising from 23% to 71%. Also, all grade levels showed increased proficiency from AP1 to AP3 in I-Ready Math.

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

There was a focus on understanding the Florida standards, using the item specs, aligning materials and resources to the Florida Standards, protecting instructional time, and common collaborative planning.

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

Planning to scaffold learning by utilizing grade-level content, planning for high-level questioning, and academic discourse opportunities. In addition, targeting specific students needs to bolster grade-level appropriate vocabulary and student comprehension to understand the standards better.

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.

Close reading professional development will occur throughout the school year so teachers can assist students in moving from passive readers to active readers while keeping their understanding of the

text they read. In addition, teachers will work with our content area specialist on level literacy, focused reading, and building vocabulary.

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

The addition of the Content Area Specialist will assist in the sustainability of improvement in the areas of ELA and Math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our I-Ready spring ELA proficiency, instructional practice in ELA has been identified as an Area of Focus. Instruction - Higher level questioning. Research has shown that high-level questioning supports critical thinking and problem-solving. This will lead to student engagement and an increase in higher-level thinking, ultimately leading to increased student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Eighth Street School teachers will incorporate higher-level questioning using the rigor and relevance frameworks into their academic instruction, and increase ELA proficiency by 3% (71%-74%) as measured by the 2022 FSA ELA Assessment.
Monitoring:	The area of focus of higher-level questioning will be monitored throughout the year by classroom walkthroughs, collaborative planning, district instructional walks, and their effectiveness measured by district and state assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ryan Bennett (ryan.bennett@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will meet twice a week to plan for higher-level questions with the assistance of our Intervention teacher/Content Area Specialist. Teachers will have opportunities to share best practices, participate in student work reviews, go on Learning Walks to future their expertise in this area.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows higher-level questioning requires purposeful planning of not only when to ask a question but that the expected student response will provide evidence of the targeted learning goal. Data utilized to make this determination was classroom observation data, iReady diagnostic data comparisons from AP1 to AP3(20-21), and the 2022 FSA ELA Assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will monitor teacher's use of higher-level questioning through classroom observations, walkthroughs, Collaboration meetings, and conversations.
2. Provide ongoing professional development on higher-level questioning 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:	Based on our I-iReady spring Math proficiency with our Economically Disadvantaged students, instructional practice in math has been identified as an Area of Focus: Instruction - Student Discussion. Research has shown that student discussion supports critical thinking and problem-solving. This will lead to student engagement and an increase in higher-level thinking, ultimately leading to increased student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Eighth Street Elementary teachers will incorporate student discussion using the rigor and relevance framework. As a result, our Economically Disadvantaged students' learning gains will increase from 79% to 82%, as measured by the 2022 FSA Math Assessment.
Monitoring:	The area of focus of student discussion will be monitored throughout the year by classroom walkthroughs, collaborative planning, district instructional walks, and their effectiveness measured by district and state assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ryan Bennett (ryan.bennett@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will meet twice a week to plan for student discussion with the assistance of our Intervention teacher/Content Area Specialist. Teachers will have opportunities to share best practices, participate in student work reviews, and go on Learning Walks to future their expertise in this area.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that students who have increased opportunities for student discussion will process and deepens student understanding of the standard. Data utilized to make this determination was classroom observation data, I-Ready diagnostic data comparisons from AP1 to AP3(20-21), and the 2022 FSA Math Assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will monitor teacher's use of student discussion through classroom observations, walkthroughs, Collaboration meetings, and conversations.
2. Provide ongoing professional development on student discussion.
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)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

N/A

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.

Parent/teacher organization meetings take place 7-10 times per school year where families, staff, and the community come together to create and implement an action plan addressing our students' academic and emotional needs. 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. In addition, Eighth Street will reach out to Osceola Middle School and Forest High School for student mentors and tutors.

Eighth Street follows the ten critical elements of the PBIS system. Counseling is also made available for students who are struggling with social issues. An anti-bullying initiative is put on through school counselors and the Student Services Manager. Students struggling with their daily behaviors are often placed on check-in/check-out systems overseen by the dean or 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. In addition, 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.

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

Administration
Teachers
Non-Instructional Staff
Students
Parents
Business Partner

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$29,611.91
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	510-Supplies	0191 - Eighth Street Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$1,993.42
			<i>Notes: iReady LAFS ELA Workbooks</i>			
	5100	590-Other Materials and Supplies	0191 - Eighth Street Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$10,791.00
			<i>Notes: Reading Intervention Program</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0191 - Eighth Street Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$3,443.17
			<i>Notes: Corrective Reading</i>			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0191 - Eighth Street Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$6,839.00
			<i>Notes: Reading Plus</i>			
	5100	530-Periodicals	0191 - Eighth Street Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$2,225.32
			<i>Notes: Scholastic News</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0191 - Eighth Street Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$4,320.00
			<i>Notes: Top Score Writing</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$6,288.42
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	510-Supplies	0191 - Eighth Street Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$1,993.42
			<i>Notes: iReady MAFS Math Workbooks</i>			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0191 - Eighth Street Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$3,295.00
			<i>Notes: Reflex Math</i>			
	6150	310-Professional and Technical Services	0191 - Eighth Street Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Explorations Stations - Discovery Science Center</i>			
Total:						\$35,900.33