

Marion County Public Schools

Eighth Street Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 7/11/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (68%) 2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	56%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/11/2022, Ryan Bennett

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Total number of students enrolled at the school

390

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

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

1

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	56	66	65	66	52	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	383	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	11	11	7	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	
One or more suspensions	3	1	0	1	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in ELA	2	11	9	5	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	
Course failure in Math	1	4	8	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	7	7	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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

Monday 7/11/2022

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	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	

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	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	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%	46%	56%				71%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	76%						68%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						56%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	83%	50%	50%				74%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	73%						78%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						68%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	53%	59%				75%	47%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	65%	44%	21%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	49%	17%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	75%	45%	30%	56%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	59%	49%	10%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	80%	45%	35%	60%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	72%	44%	28%	53%	19%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	31	38	30	44	46						
BLK	50	67	50	50	67	58	44				
HSP	100			100							
WHT	78	78	39	88	72	56	75				
FRL	50	66	50	54	66	53	31				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 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	55
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	100
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	69
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

There is a need for improvement in ELA with our lowest 25%, specifically with our Students with Disabilities population. The Student with Disabilities Subgroup was the only subgroup on the Federal Index below 41% (38%). A large number of students have two or more Early Warning indicators, with grades 2 and 4 being the highest. (13 and 18 respectively).

ELA and Math proficiency increased in third, fourth, and fifth grades from the 2021 FSA to the 2022 FSA. In addition, all grade levels increased proficiency from the AP1 iReady Diagnostic to the AP3 iReady Diagnostic in ELA and Math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the 2022 FSA data, our lowest 25% performed 32% below the school average of 75% in ELA and 25% lower than the school average of 83% in Math. The Students with Disabilities Subgroup did not make adequate Learning Gains in ELA or Math and was the only subgroup on the Federal Index below 41% (38%).

Also, additional focus needs to be on 1st grade ELA as well as Science proficiency for our 5th grade students.

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

Contributing factors may include the implementation of a new reading series and the lack of small group targeted instruction. One of our school's Area of Focus this year will be increasing effective Formative Assessment in the classroom, which will allow teachers the opportunity to assess student performance throughout lessons and units of study. Teachers will participate in ongoing Collaborative Planning to include a focus in this area. The consistent use of Formative Assessment will allow teachers to identify gaps in individual students' learning. Differentiated groups will be formed for reteaching and enrichment.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our kindergarten students had the most significant improvement in proficiency for ELA, rising from 15% to 84%, and Math, rising from 13% to 82%. Also, all grade levels increased proficiency from AP1 to AP3 in iReady ELA and Math. In addition, ELA and Math proficiency increased in third, fourth, and fifth grades from the 2021 FSA to the 2022 FSA.

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.

Teachers participated in targeted collaborative planning sessions weekly to look at standards, class performance, work samples, and upcoming lesson plans. In addition, our school's professional development focus for the past two years has been on increasing rigor through high level questioning and student discussion. There was a marked increase of the implementation of strategies learned related to this area of focus as measured by the Teacher Observation Tool.

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.

Focus on new B.E.S.T implementation and curriculum during targeted collaborative planning. Professional Development will focus on developing a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T standards, focused learning outcomes, and implementation of our new curriculum.

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.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Planning for differentiated instruction will be the focus for all students. According to our data through ESSA, our Students with Disabilities are significantly lagging behind their general education peers for the past two years in ELA and Math proficiency and learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Learning gains will increase by 5% in the area of ELA and Math for our Students with Disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly classroom walkthrough data with evidence of implementation being observed, as well as district and state assessment data (such as iReady diagnostic, iReady progress monitoring, F.A.S.T, and MTSS data) will be used to monitor learning gains for students with disabilities. IEP goals will be adjusted during meetings as needed, increasing students' goals that are achievable while raising expectations. ESE teachers will be scheduled to meet students' needs daily and exceed the minutes of assistance on their IEPs with additional paraprofessional support. In addition, classroom teachers will plan with the ESE teachers to ensure high-quality instruction is happening consistently.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

A proactive approach in the classroom through formative assessment will result in greater success for our ESSA Subgroup below 41% in reading. Creating a flexible grouping based on formative assessment will increase standards mastery in the classroom. Many of the students in this subgroup also receive intensive small group interventions from our intervention teacher.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Formative assessment provides opportunities for the teachers to make in the moment instructional decisions based on students' specific needs. In addition, targeted intensive intervention programs are researched based and address students' deficits.

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Teachers will identify and create appropriate formative assessments to determine student mastery of the standards during collaborative planning
2. Analyze student performance data to identify areas of greatest need (by grade level, subject, teacher, student, and subgroups).
3. Yearlong progress monitoring through Tier Talks (PMP/EWI) and Data Chats.

Person Responsible

Karen Howell (karen.howell@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

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:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective 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 F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

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:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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, and go on Learning Walks to future their expertise in this area.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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(21-212, and the 2022 FSA ELA Assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

Karen Howell (karen.howell@marion.k12.fl.us)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Parent/teacher organization meetings occur 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 highlighting the careers found in Marion County. Our goal is to open our students' eyes to careers they might not be aware exist in our community.

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

Administration
 Teachers
 Non-Instructional Staff
 Students
 Parents
 Business Partner