

Marion County Public Schools

# Saddlewood Elementary School



## 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>11</b>

## Saddlewood Elementary School

3700 SW 43RD CT, Ocala, FL 34474

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

### School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	B	B	C	B*

### 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.

Our mission at Saddlewood is to provide all students with the opportunity to achieve their personal best, to build good character, to learn respect for themselves and others, to accept responsibility for their actions, while developing a love of learning as they become lifelong learners.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The faculty and staff of Saddlewood Elementary School are committed to providing our students with quality educational experiences, integrating curriculum content with real world experiences, to ensure an understanding of the Florida Standards.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title
Lipira, Heather	Principal
Smithies, Lesa	Assistant Principal
Winkler, Rebekah	Instructional Coach
Bailey, Kristyne	Teacher, K-12
Cook, Jeffrey	Dean

#### Duties

##### Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Mrs. Heather Lipira, as the principal, is in charge of all areas at the school level.

Dr. Lesa Smithies is in charge of curriculum, professional development and collaboration meetings.

Rebekah Winkler is in charge of reading and writing coaching, professional development for phonics instruction as well as Top Score Writing.

Kristyne Bailey is in charge of math and science professional development, coaching and modeling for teachers. She will also be in charge of ensuring our students are scheduled correctly into the MTSS block and getting the interventions they need and that those interventions change as needed.

Jeff Cook is in charge of social emotional and behavior needs for our students.

### Early Warning Systems

#### Year 2017-18

##### 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	8	7	7	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	2	4	2	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	19	28	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	14	14	13	9	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

**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	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**Date this data was collected**

Tuesday 7/24/2018

#### Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	17	13	10	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	12	8	2	16	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	15	23	17	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	43	35	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	23	21	24	34	14	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161

#### Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	17	13	10	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	12	8	2	16	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	15	23	17	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	43	35	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	23	21	24	34	14	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

#### Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

FSA math for our lowest quartile was the lowest performing area. 56% of our students overall were proficient in math which is a decrease from 59%. Our lowest quartile in math was 36% which is a decrease from 59% the prior year. This is not a trend with our lowest quartile historically.

#### Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Math in our lowest quartile learning gains was the most significant decrease at 36% compared to last year it was 59%.

#### Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The biggest gap was in math with our lowest quartile compared to the state. The state average was 47% compared to our data at 36%.

#### Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Math in 3rd grade showed the greatest improvement from the previous year increasing from 56% to 72% in overall math proficiency. This is not a trend over the past three year.

#### Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

We use a program called Engage New York to teach the math standards in 3rd grade. This significantly helped our students gain a better understanding of the standards. Teachers all bought into the program and implemented with fidelity

### School Data

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

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	61%	46%	56%	57%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	44%	55%	56%	49%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	37%	48%	49%	47%	46%
Math Achievement	66%	49%	62%	63%	48%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%	46%	59%	54%	47%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	35%	47%	38%	40%	46%
Science Achievement	56%	51%	55%	52%	49%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	14 (14)	8 (17)	7 (13)	7 (10)	6 (6)	6 (10)	48 (70)
One or more suspensions	2 (12)	4 (8)	2 (2)	3 (16)	3 (4)	5 (18)	19 (60)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (11)	0 (15)	0 (23)	0 (17)	0 (9)	0 (20)	0 (95)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	19 (43)	28 (35)	27 (34)	74 (112)

### Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	71%	46%	25%	57%	14%
	2017	61%	50%	11%	58%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	50%	43%	7%	56%	-6%
	2017	60%	52%	8%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2018	59%	46%	13%	55%	4%
	2017	59%	47%	12%	53%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	72%	48%	24%	62%	10%
	2017	55%	48%	7%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2018	62%	47%	15%	62%	0%
	2017	70%	55%	15%	64%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2018	64%	50%	14%	61%	3%
	2017	52%	45%	7%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	53%	49%	4%	55%	-2%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

### Subgroup Data

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	16	45	46	28	45	37	18				
ELL	49	70	62	53	53	44	38				
ASN	72	67		92	56		83				
BLK	44	52	47	47	44	36	39				
HSP	52	61	54	54	51	32	42				
MUL	50	27		50	55						
WHT	74	66	50	82	66	39	71				
FRL	53	58	50	58	52	37	44				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	30	66	71	30	59	63	55				
ELL	47	61	71	51	63	85	56				
ASN	68	53		76	84						
BLK	64	64	50	49	52	58	38				
HSP	55	64	66	55	52	55	60				
MUL	53	50		78	91						
WHT	67	66	63	68	70	63	63				
FRL	53	60	64	55	56	52	53				

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

#### Areas of Focus:

##### Activity #1

<b>Title</b>	Instructional activities and strategies to serve all types of learners.
<b>Rationale</b>	If we focus on small group differentiated standards based instruction targeting students weakest areas in math and in ELA then proficiency rates and learning gains will improve overall.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	If our students in our lowest quartile get intensive interventions and differentiated small group instruction then learning gains will improve 15% from 36% to 51% in math across grades 4-5 as measured by end of year FSA math assessments and our learners ELA learning gains will increase from 49% to 60%. We will increase proficiency in ELA from 61% to 65% and in math from 66% to 70% by providing enrichment opportunities in small groups during the MTSS block and Mighty Math time.
<b>Point Person</b>	Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	An additional math block was built into Saddlewood's Master Schedule called Mighty Math where all students K-5 will have 15 minutes of math practice first thing in the morning. In addition, math interventions will be occurring in this MTSS block using data from iReady using iReady Teacher Toolbox as a resource for teachers to use as well as targeted standards based instruction using the iReady area of difficulty report. Students will have access to online math IXL at school and at home as well as iReady Math online instruction at school. Acaletics was purchased for 4-5 grade to have the standards taught in a spiral review and formative assessment data will be collected by the teacher from each Quik pic students complete. Lastly, we will have a school wide focus on learning basic math facts and students will use FastMath in the Math MTSS block and as a resource at home. The ELA MTSS block is thirty minutes in length daily and will focus on small group, differentiated instruction using district approved intervention programs with students using the data obtained from iReady as well as prior year assessment data.. A school wide focus on reading nightly for a minimum of twenty minutes will ensure students are getting additional practice in reading. MyOn and Accelerated Reader will be utilized to increase students interest in reading.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

##### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

<b>Description</b>	iReady AP1, AP2 and AP3 data will be used, progress monitoring data from iReady monthly, area of difficulty report used weekly by teachers and content area specialists, district math assessments showing quarterly improvement, formative assessment data used daily, and teacher observation will be used to monitor progress. Teacher observation feedback will focus on instructional strategies, differentiation techniques, and true student engagement.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

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

#### **Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

We are a Title I school and plan to engage our families in the educational process through family engagement events Thursday evenings throughout the school year. We will advertise such events in newsletters, call outs, flyers, and school website. Parents are encouraged to volunteer at the school, have lunch with their children, attend parent conferences, and be involved in curriculum events on campus. Three family engagement events will occur this school year once in October, December, and April where parents will be actively engaged with the activities and learning with their children.

#### **PFEP Link**

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

#### **Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

Our school ensures the social-emotional needs of our students are met through the use of our guidance counselor who provides counseling and mentoring as needed. Additionally, our teachers maintain regular communication with parents when concerns arise with a student. School and district resources are provided to families who require additional supports or services.

#### **Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

Saddlewood currently has one Pre-School ESE program based at the school of which several of the students feed into the regular Kindergarten program as well as a VPK classroom. Incoming kindergarten students who have not participated in a Voluntary Prekindergarten Program are encouraged to attend the summer VPK program. Efforts are made in the spring to facilitate early kindergarten registration so that incoming kindergarten students can take advantage of the summer VPK program. Flyers are sent home and the school marquee encourages early Kindergarten registration.

During the first week of school, our district uses the "Stagger Start" procedure where kindergarten students are assigned just one day of attendance during those first three days. On each of these days, the kindergarten teacher has a small group of students that can be oriented to the school, as well as, individually assessed.

Our kindergarten parents also attend our Open House that occurs during the first few weeks of school.

Additionally, as students transition from one grade level to another, parents are invited to Parent Information Nights. These opportunities allow for a better understanding of grade level expectations. 5th grade students meet with our two feeder middle schools in April to assist those students with the transition from elementary school to middle school.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

The school based team identifies areas in need of improvement and sets annual goals that are articulated in the CIM. An action plan is then created and the team then meets periodically to set individual goals for students and to progress monitor student growth. Teachers are included in conversations of student growth and their professional growth needs are identified and prioritized through these conversations and results of team meetings. The school based leadership team will consistently monitor student achievement data and provide intervention or enrichment opportunities to students as needed. Progress will be monitored and interventions adjusted based on student growth data. iReady will be utilized to monitor progress on a monthly basis for all Tier II and Tier III students. Progress Monitoring Meetings will be held quarterly and Student Assistance Team meetings will be held on Tier III students when students are not making adequate progress.

MTSS block is thirty minutes per day focusing on Reading interventions. Teachers will work in small groups with students identified as Tier II and Tier III students. Teachers will use iReady Teacher Toolbox to target specific standards with students and use district approved intervention programs. Tier I students will be provided learning opportunities on standards as well as enrichment opportunities.

Saddlewood has incorporated a fifteen minutes Math MTSS block every morning from 7:45-8:00 where teachers work with Tier II-Tier III students on specific math interventions while the Tier I students are working on morning math such as Acaletics, math practice activities, or iReady math online instruction.

Title I Inventory is scanned into Destiny and checked out by teachers and monitored by Media Specialist as well as the administration. Technology purchased by Title I funds are utilized in classrooms daily and available to all students and used by teachers for instructional purposes.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

Marion County Public Schools implements standards provided by the state that are set to prepare students for success and make them competitive in the global workplace. Each Florida Standard provides clear expectations for the knowledge and skills students need to master in each grade (K-12) and subject so they will be prepared to succeed in college, careers and life.

## Part V: Budget

Total:	\$279,368.00
--------	--------------