

Marion County Public Schools

Saddlewood Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Saddlewood Elementary School

3700 SW 43RD CT, Ocala, FL 34474

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Heather Lip IR A

Start Date for this Principal: 10/16/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	87%
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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	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 that will prepare them for their future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lipira, Heather	Principal	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising students achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions.
Smithies, Lesa	Assistant Principal	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising students achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and interventions.
Cook, Jeffrey	Dean	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising students achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and interventions.
Rasdall, Kimberly	School Counselor	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising students achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and interventions.
Bramlett, Jessica	Instructional Coach	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising students achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and interventions.
Hallam, Zayda	Instructional Coach	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising students achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and interventions.
Flanagan, Laura	School Counselor	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising students achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and interventions.
Myrtill, Maureen	Psychologist	Dr. Myrtill serves on our the schools problem solving team when we have concerns for our students academic and/or behavioral needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 10/16/2016, Heather Lip IR A

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

11

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

36

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	122	135	145	160	182	170	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	914
Attendance below 90 percent	5	6	4	10	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	12	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Friday 8/14/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	130	135	137	160	173	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	892
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	6	12	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	1	3	0	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	32	12	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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

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

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		1	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	130	135	137	160	173	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	892
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	6	12	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	1	3	0	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	32	12	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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

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

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	1	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	47%	57%	62%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	56%	58%	63%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	52%	53%	61%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	51%	63%	62%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	76%	58%	62%	63%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	49%	51%	59%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	47%	53%	60%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	44%	12%	58%	-2%
	2018	71%	46%	25%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	49%	15%	58%	6%
	2018	50%	43%	7%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%
	2018	59%	46%	13%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	49%	14%	62%	1%
	2018	72%	48%	24%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	54%	28%	64%	18%
	2018	62%	47%	15%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	55%	45%	10%	60%	-5%
	2018	64%	50%	14%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	44%	-1%	53%	-10%
	2018	53%	49%	4%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	38	41	44	65	50	16				
ELL	67	57		83	81		70				
ASN	61	64		87	79						
BLK	39	63	54	51	71	55	13				
HSP	57	57	65	70	78	75	51				
MUL	57	46		52	46						
WHT	68	54	55	78	79	50	57				
FRL	49	54	53	64	72	52	33				

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				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
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	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	74
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	76
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	67
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	63
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Students with disabilities shows the lowest gains and proficiency. The contributing factors was we used dual certified teachers in our inclusion classes in 3rd grade instead having an added support facilitator to support our students with disabilities. In addition our 5th grade had a significant population of students with disabilities who were 2 or more grade levels below.

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

Our ELA data showed the most decline with proficiency and learning gains. The factor that we feel contributed to this was our MTSS block and interventions were not done to fidelity.

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.

Students with disabilities had the largest gap compared to the state average. We feel this is contributed from less support from ESE teacher throughout the school year.

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

We had an increase in Math proficiency school wide. We incorporated an additional fifteen minutes called "Mighty Math" at the beginning of the day where teachers pulled students to remediate from the data they had collected from district assessments and check for understandings.

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

Students with disabilities is an area of concern in the area of reading. An additional area of concern is students in 3rd grade that are not proficient in the area of ELA. Most of these students will be entering 4th grade significantly below grade level.

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

1. Reading learning gains
2. Math learning gains
3. Writing across all subject areas
4. Social Emotional needs of students
5. Gaps in skills with students being out of school

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Planning for Authentic Literacy through all subject areas: Our students who are proficient in reading and making learning gains is an area of concern so if we increase the time spent on reading, writing, and class discussions in all subject areas this area of weakness for our students should be reduced.

Measurable Outcome: If teachers plan and incorporate additional reading, writing, and class discussions in the classrooms and online distance learning, in all subject areas our learning gains in the area of ELA will increase from 57% to 62%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will increase students opportunities for writing, class discussions, and reading through all subject areas. Teachers will be sure to check for understanding through brief writing opportunities for students to explain their thinking and understanding in all subject areas. Through PLCs, collaboration meetings, and staff development opportunities teachers will learn how to increase students writing to explain their thinking and increase opportunities for students to initiate questions in class discussions. Online teachers will be provided trainings on how to increase student discussion and writing in the online setting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows that students who have increased opportunities for writing and reading in all areas, increase their overall abilities in all areas. We will use CKLA curriculum, iReady Reading Workbooks and iReady Teacher Toolbox lessons, Top Score Writing curriculum, Social Studies and Science Weeklys, interactive notebooks, differentiated instruction using check for understanding data, and multiple intervention resources to improve learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will continue to implement interactive notebooks in all subjects

Person Responsible Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Teachers will use Kagan structures in a digital way in Teams and Google classroom to stay within guidelines of the CDC

Person Responsible Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Guidance counselors will work with small groups of students to increase attendance as well as provide interventions

Person Responsible Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

4. Check for Understanding implemented in a virtual platform where students will be asked to write and explain their thinking for the standard.

Person Responsible Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus	Planning for Authentic Literacy through all subject areas: According to our data through ESSA, our students with disabilities are lagging behind their general education peers for the passed two years in learning gains and proficiency.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers increase students writing and class discussion opportunities then students with disabilities making learning gains will increase as measured by ELA FSA from 39% to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	According to research increasing opportunities for students to read, write and discuss in all subject areas will increase students reading comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that students who have increased opportunities for writing and reading in all areas, increase their overall abilities in all areas. We will use CKLA curriculum, iReady Reading Workbooks and iReady Teacher Toolbox lessons, Top Score Writing curriculum, Social Studies and Science Weeklys, interactive notebooks, differentiated instruction using check for understanding data, and multiple intervention resources to improve learning gains. In addition, and intervention teacher certified in ESE will work with students with disabilities in grades 3-5 as well as provide interventions for students in 2nd grade.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Inclusion training for all teachers and paraprofessionals on best practices

Person Responsible Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. UDL strategies will be implemented in our inclusion classes and a book study is optional

Person Responsible Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Interventions will be monitored for effectiveness monthly and adjustments made to meet the needs of all learners

Person Responsible Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

4. ESE teachers will be scheduled to meet students needs daily and exceed the minutes of assistance on their IEPs with additional paraprofessional support.

Person Responsible Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

5. Sanford Harmony morning meet ups will be the first 10 minutes of the class each day to help students understand stress and how to handle their emotional needs

Person Responsible Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

6. Guidance counselors will check in with students with IEPs weekly as a check in check out to build those positive relationships and provide them support

Person Responsible Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Process/Parent trainings with a Focus on Literacy: When the learning can continue in the home, then student achievement will improve.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>If we provide families with strategies, skills, and activities aligned with reading standards, then continued learning will occur in the home and will increase proficiency in ELA as measured by FSA.</p> <p>Grade 3- Baseline 58% with target of 60%</p> <p>Grade 4-Baseline 65% with target of 67%</p> <p>Grade 5-Baseline 49% with a target of 55%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zayda Hallam (zayda.hallam@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence shows students with engaged families perform better academically overall.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that families with parents who are engaged in their children's education improve academic achievement. Family Engagement Liaison will provide trainings with ESOL and ESE families on ways to help their children at home with reading.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Parent liaison will provide trainings for parents virtually this year on ways to build vocabulary with our ESOL families as well as our SWD subgroup

Person Responsible Zayda Hallam (zayda.hallam@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Capacity building activities and trainings can be found in our PFEP(Parent and Family Engagement plan)

Person Responsible Zayda Hallam (zayda.hallam@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Training opportunities will be provided by a lead online teacher on how to maximize online learning retention for students in the areas of reading and math

Person Responsible Zayda Hallam (zayda.hallam@marion.k12.fl.us)

4. Training opportunities are being provide on ways to support the social emotional needs of their children.

Person Responsible Zayda Hallam (zayda.hallam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our Master Schedule was designed to have the most instructional support in our inclusion classes who have our students with disabilities as well as having reading endorsed teachers with our Tier III students. Each inclusion classroom has a support facilitator support for our students with disabilities daily 50% of the day. In addition, a paraprofessional is assign to each inclusion classroom and will support those students when the support facilitator is not there to support. Interventions will be targeted and specific for all students and our SWD subgroup will get additional interventions as we try to bridge the gap and work towards students mastering the goals of their IEPs. For our online distance learners, ESE support will be individual through Microsoft Teams where the ESE teacher will meet with each online learner 2 times weekly to give targeted individual instruction to assist students in mastering the goals of the IEP.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, volunteers and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:

- A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
- Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
- Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
- Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;
- Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
- Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
- Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different modalities (online and paper based) of communication with to our families such as phone, email, Dojo and/ or Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal and school marquee.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00