

Marion County Public Schools

Eighth Street Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Eighth Street Elementary School

513 SE 8TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation 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.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The SIP was developed in partnership with the PTO and SAC committee and feedback from stakeholders which was shared at mid-year and end of the year. Feedback was gathered through a survey and aligned with necessary data supporting areas of need. Additionally, input has been gathered through the year via committee meetings and parent input (PTO) to better support our students. The team involved in the SIP creation included teachers, the leadership team, and parents.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school leadership team will disseminate information regarding the SIP with all school based stakeholders, and at meetings such as SAC and PTO. The school's professional learning plan has been created with the needs of the student population in mind, and will revisit these goals at least 3x yearly during data reviews.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	56%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	5	2	4	7	2	4	0	0	0	24	
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	10	13	5	9	6	0	0	0	47	
Course failure in Math	6	4	10	7	4	5	0	0	0	36	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	6	7	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	4	6	0	0	0	21	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	4	3	10	3	6	0	0	0	29	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	8	9	10	4	0	0	0	38

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

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	12	11	11	7	16	15	0	0	0	72	
One or more suspensions	3	1	0	1	1	10	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in ELA	2	11	9	5	3	4	0	0	0	34	
Course failure in Math	1	4	8	1	2	3	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	3	11	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	2	11	0	0	0	17	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	7	7	1	3	3	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	12	11	11	7	16	15	0	0	0	72	
One or more suspensions	3	1	0	1	1	10	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in ELA	2	11	9	5	3	4	0	0	0	34	
Course failure in Math	1	4	8	1	2	3	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	3	11	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	2	11	0	0	0	17	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	7	7	1	3	3	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	71	44	53	75	46	56	70		
ELA Learning Gains				76			78		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			73		
Math Achievement*	83	50	59	83	50	50	78		
Math Learning Gains				73			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			79		
Science Achievement*	79	46	54	69	53	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					49	52			
Graduation Rate					41	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		57	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	297
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	82			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	53			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	100			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	71			83			79					
SWD	27			40							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			42							3	
HSP	71			92							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76			89			82				4	
FRL	49			62			58				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	75	76	43	83	73	58	69					
SWD	31	38	30	44	46							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	50	67	50	50	67	58	44					
HSP	100			100								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	78	78	39	88	72	56	75					
FRL	50	66	50	54	66	53	31					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	70	78	73	78	71	79	47					
SWD	26			53								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			36								
HSP	75			75			40					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	78	83		90	83		58					
FRL	46	67		46	52		26					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	49%	21%	54%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	48%	34%	58%	24%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	61%	39%	22%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	74%	48%	26%	59%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	90%	53%	37%	61%	29%
05	2023 - Spring	85%	50%	35%	55%	30%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	43%	32%	51%	24%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

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).

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.

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

Based on the 2022 FSA data, our lowest 25% performed 32% below the school average of 73% in ELA and 25% lower than the school average of 85% in Math.

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.

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 only data component that had a gap compared to the state average was our Students with Disabilities. The Student with Disabilities Subgroup was the only subgroup on the Federal Index below 41% (38%).

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.

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

ELA proficiency increased in fourth and fifth grades from the 2022 FSA to the 2023 FAST. Math proficiency increased in third, fourth, and fifth grade from the 2022 FSA to the 2023 FAST. Science proficiency increase from 69% to 75% on the state assessment.

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.

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.

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

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.

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

Level of Intellectual Work
Task Alignment to Grade Level Benchmarks
Higher Order Questioning
Student Centered Learning
Formative Assessment throughout the lesson

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Planning for differentiated instruction and task aligned to the grade level benchmarks 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.

If teachers differentiated instruction and aligned task to grade level benchmarks, then based on the 2024 data, proficiencies 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:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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)

By When:

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the state (2019-2022) and local data, instructional practice in ELA has been identified as an Area of Focus. 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.

If teachers incorporate higher-level questioning using the rigor and relevance frameworks into their academic instruction then ELA proficiency will increase by 3% (73%-76%) 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:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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 and the 2023 F.A.S.T ELA Assessment data.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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)

By When:

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the attendance data, ESE has 25 students that were absent 10% or more days in the 2022-2023 school year. Therefore there must be a concerted effort to monitor and intervene with these students to ensure that they are receiving the maximum number of instructional minutes that supports their academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If school stakeholders implement a social-emotional learning initiative, the number of K-5 students that were absent 10% or more days will decrease from 24 to 14.

Monitoring:

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

Daily student attendance reports (tardies, absences, and early check-outs), Individualized attendance plan, and Child Study Team Meetings with collaboration with our school Attendance Specialist.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

All classroom teachers will implement Caring School Community curriculum in the classroom with support and monitoring by our Guidance Counselor. Our students that were absent 10% or more will be assigned a mentor from our Leadership Meet to check-in with the student on a weekly basis.

Daily phone calls home, PBIS incentives, Weekly check-in, Rewards from our Guidance Counselor

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Development of high expectations for each student (1.44 effect size on Hattie's Index of Teaching) and involving students in setting goals for themselves to improve their weekly attendance goal. Teachers will provide opportunities for students to be involved in their goal setting.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Provide professional development for all staff focused on improving student attendance of our students that are absent 10% or more during the school year.

2. The Attendance Specialist will work closely with the Guidance Counselor to implement attendance incentive plan to support students and their families.

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

By When:

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Eighth Street Elementary is not a Title I school, therefore we do not receive funding.

Since we do not receive funding, Eighth Street relies on our SAC and PTO to help supplement funds. We meet with our SAC and PTO to review what resources our teachers would like and what resources will benefit our students' needs. Once the resources are reviewed, our PTO will allocate funds to us so that we can purchase the resources. Here are the resources purchased: iReady LAFS and MAFS workbooks, Scholastic News, AR, and SmartyAnts (intervention for struggling readers in 1st and 2nd grade).

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Monitoring**Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

n/a

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

n/a

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

n/a

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

n/a

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

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

n/a

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

n/a

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

n/a

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

n/a

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

n/a

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

n/a

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

n/a

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

n/a

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

n/a