

Marion County Public Schools

Saddlewood Elementary School



2021-22 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	21
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	92%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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 in Third through Fifth grades and the B.E.S.T Standards in grades Kindergarten through Second grade 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lipira, Heather	Principal	The principal will be responsible for raising students achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. The principal provides feedback for teachers to improve instruction and tracks data weekly. She oversees the leadership team and delegates tasks such as coaching and modeling for teachers, data collection, collaboration meetings, etc.
Smithies, Lesa	Assistant Principal	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. Dr. Smithies will oversee all testing and ensure data is tracked, collected, and used for instruction. She will provide timely feedback for teachers in grades 3-5. .
Robledo, Natalia	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 academic interventions. Mrs. Robledo will be the lead in instructional materials for teachers and support teachers' growth by providing timely feedback in grades K-2 as she supports teachers learning the new BEST Standards and our new ELA textbook. She will be supporting our ESOL students by training and scheduling ESOL paraprofessionals effectively for the greatest impact for student learning.
Alvarez, Jennifer	Math Coach	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. Mrs. Alvarez will have a specific focus on math instruction and increasing learning gains and proficiency schoolwide. She will also provide support for science instruction and planning for hands on learning investigations. She will provide modeling and coaching for hands on learning in the area of math and science.
Cook, Jeffrey	Dean	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. Mr. Cook will support systems that support a safe and orderly environment where all students can learn safely. He will monitor discipline data, provide follow up mentoring for students, lead our PBIS team, and ensure students feel safe while ensuring they are learning lifelong lessons from discipline incidents that may occur.
Flanagan, Laura	School Counselor	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. Mrs. Flanagan focuses on 1st, 3rd, and 5th grade students and our ASD modified curriculum students. She provides small group, individual counseling, and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		tracks student data to ensure adequate progress is being made with her students.
Rasdall, Kimberly	School Counselor	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. Mrs. Rasdall focuses on K, 2nd, and 4th grade students and ESOL students assessments/eligibility. She provides small group and individual counseling and tracks student data to ensure adequate progress is being made with her students.
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 academic interventions. Mrs. Hallam will focus on ELA instruction in grade K-2 and supports our ESOL students population in K-5.
Bramlett, Jessica	Reading Coach	Modeling reading lessons for teachers, progress monitoring, provide professional development for teachers in the area of reading. Dr. Bramlett will provide support and modeling in grade 3-5 in ELA. In addition she will support interventions in these grades and supports our teachers in grades 3-5 with our students with disabilities being supported in the inclusion setting. Dr. Bramlett will help teachers plan for Universally Designed lessons so all students have access to the curriculum at the level of rigor to be successful.

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.*

10

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.*

55

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

70

Total number of students enrolled at the school

900

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

3

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

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	139	113	130	153	143	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	859
Attendance below 90 percent	39	36	34	30	40	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224
One or more suspensions	4	8	6	2	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA	18	23	61	27	29	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217
Course failure in Math	18	15	48	20	28	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	19	20	51	20	32	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207

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	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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

Tuesday 7/13/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	
	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	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	
	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				59%	47%	57%	61%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	56%	58%	60%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	52%	53%	49%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				70%	51%	63%	66%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				76%	58%	62%	56%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	49%	51%	36%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				47%	47%	53%	56%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	56%	44%	12%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	49%	15%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	63%	49%	14%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	82%	54%	28%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	45%	10%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	43%	44%	-1%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

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

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

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22 / 21%	33 / 30%	57 / 51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 12%	12 / 20%	22 / 35%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 5%	2 / 10%	5 / 24%
	English Language Learners	2 / 13%	5 / 33%	5 / 33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12 / 12%	23 / 21%	63 / 56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 5%	11 / 18%	32 / 52%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	2 / 10%	10 / 48%
	English Language Learners	1 / 7%	4 / 27%	4 / 27%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25 / 22%	24 / 19%	55 / 45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 15%	13 / 16%	28 / 35%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	2 / 13%	2 / 13%
	English Language Learners	1 / 7%	1 / 6%	1 / 6%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16 / 14%	19 / 15%	39 / 32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 10%	9 / 11%	23 / 30%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 14%	2 / 13%	3 / 21%
	English Language Learners	3 / 20%	2 / 13%	2 / 13%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66 / 49%	47 / 33%	68 / 47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37 / 49%	25 / 30%	39 / 46%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 21%	1 / 7%	1 / 7%
	English Language Learners	3 / 18%	3 / 16%	3 / 15%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17 / 13%	22 / 15%	62 / 43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 7%	9 / 11%	34 / 40%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	0 / 0%	2 / 14%
	English Language Learners	2 / 12%	2 / 11%	2 / 11%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47 / 35%	39 / 27%	55 / 39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18 / 25%	17 / 22%	24 / 32%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 6%	0 / 0%	1 / 5%
	English Language Learners	1 / 7%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28 / 21%	30 / 21%	60 / 43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16 / 22%	17 / 22%	25 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 6%	0 / 0%	3 / 16%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49 / 30%	45 / 26%	53 / 31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17 / 19%	17 / 18%	24 / 25%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 13%	1 / 6%	2 / 12%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51 / 31%	47 / 27%	74 / 43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20 / 22%	17 / 18%	30 / 32%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 13%	1 / 6%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	1 / 10%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	104 / 65%	101 / 60%	99 / 63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50 / 57%	48 / 51%	48 / 55%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 27%	4 / 25%	3 / 20%
	English Language Learners	3 / 30%	2 / 20%	3 / 30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15	28	27	26	41		24				
ELL	43	62		56	62		50				
ASN	77			80			53				
BLK	37	56		46	59		37				
HSP	47	46	62	61	54	43	54				
MUL	41			59							
WHT	67	63	40	74	65	58	72				
FRL	49	53	48	56	56	54	51				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Looking closely at the data, our scores on ELA proficiency have dropped from 2018 at 61% to 59% in 2019 overall.

Lowest Quartile gains in ELA were 61% in 2017 to 49% in 2018 and at 55% in 2019.

Drilling down to current 2021 data our 3rd grade ELA data is at 54%. This trend shows a decline in ELA proficiency overall and will affect our students as they continue to need good reading skills to read to learn in all subject areas.

In addition, our lowest quartile learning gains decreased from 62% in 2017 to 61% in 2018 to 55% in 2019.

Science proficiency has decreased over the last three years from 60% in 2017 to 56% in 2018 to 47% in 2019.

Math data has shown an overall increase. Our Math Proficiency in 2017 was 62% to 66% in 2018 to 70% in 2019. Learning gains in math went from 54% in 2016 to 63% in 2017 to 56% in 2019 to 76%

in 2019. Our lowest quartile learning gains in math was 38% in 2016 to 59% in 2017 to a drop in 2018 to 36% and an increase again in 2019 to 58%. This trend shows an upward trend overall in math.

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

Reading is an area of need when looking at our data since 2017. Each year proficiency has decreased which shows an area of improvement school-wide. Our ELA proficiency decreased in 2019 overall from 61% to 59%.

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

Tier I reading instruction and use of items specifications for planning were not being used to their full potential. New actions to be taken this year are two days of weekly collaborative planning sessions focusing on strong Tier I reading instruction planning with standards ensuring alignment to items specification in grade 3-5 and B.E.S.T standards-based planning in grade K-2. We will plan for small group instruction targeting fluency, phonics, and vocabulary instruction. Training will be provided in Close Reading strategies as well as guided reading school-wide. Teachers will utilize Close Reading in all grade levels to help students dissect text for better reading comprehension as students learn to read and read to learn.

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

We made progress in math in all subgroups and grades. Math proficiency was 70% on 2019 data.

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

Mighty math time in the master schedule with an additional 10-minute focus on math fluency. In addition, teachers utilized resources in planning within the Engage New York curriculum as they taught the standards to the item specifications.

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

Higher order questioning and writing across all subject areas where students have to read, think and write will help students think critically, therefore, providing more challenge to accelerate learning. Close Reading strategies taught in reading, math, and science will be expected of students to use in all subjects.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Training will be provided on Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to increase opportunities for students to access the curriculum. We will also provide vertical alignment professional development across grade levels so teachers can see the progression of the standards from one grade to the next. Next, we will conduct learning walks in classrooms with a specific focus on Tier I reading instruction. Lastly, we will train teachers in high-level questioning strategies in weekly collaboration meetings to plan questions together for instruction. Planning for Close Reading and Guided Reading will also be a focus in collaborative planning.

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

We will continue to focus on Tier I instruction looking at data to drive instruction. Collaboration meetings will be focused and targeted for the greatest impact for our teachers in reading and in math. The administration team will complete weekly walkthroughs looking for trends to continue to monitor improvement. Walkthrough forms will be kept in Google forms where leadership can assess trends by grade levels and see how teachers are progressing in their instructional practice. Targeted feedback is provided to teachers looking for high yield instructional strategies.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After reviewing data from the last three years on our district assessments, state assessment data, and classroom assessment data it is evident we need to work on planning for Tier I reading instruction with an emphasis on Close Reading and Guided Reading practice. When students can't read on grade level it affects students' ability to learn in all subject areas.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>On the 2021 ELA FSA, 55% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher. 57% of our 4th grade students scored a level 3 or higher. In 5th grade, 63% of our students scored a level 3 or higher. On the 2022 ELA FSA, our students' proficiency will increase by 5% in 3rd and 4th grade. Proficiency will increase to 60% in 3rd grade and 62% in 4th grade. In 5th grade, proficiency will increase by 2% from 63% to 65%.</p> <p>Learning gains in ELA in 5th grade will increase by 3% from 62% on the 2021 FSA to 65% on the 2022 FSA.</p> <p>Learning gains in the lowest quartile in 5th grade will increase from 50% in 2021 to 55% in 2022.</p>
Monitoring:	Weekly classroom walkthrough data, as well as district and state assessment data (such as iReady diagnostic, iReady progress monitoring, FSA, MTSS data, etc.), will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction. Teachers will utilize well-planned checks for understandings and other formative assessment data to provide targeted small group instruction with administration monitoring implementation weekly. The CAS and Instructional Coach will provide support and guidance on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment, and check for understanding.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development on student achievement (.51 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching & Learning Strategies). Teachers will plan collaboratively on standards based instruction.
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 subjects. We will use ELA textbook adopted curriculum SAVVAS, 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, research shows that planned, explicit, and rigorous tier 1 instruction, along with task alignment, increases student learning in the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development will be provided to all instructional staff and paraprofessionals focusing on close reading strategies. Planning for this will be embedded in collaborative planning twice per week.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Planning for differentiated instructional and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) guidelines 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 three years in learning gains and proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: Learning gains will increase by 5% in the area of ELA for our students with disabilities.

Monitoring: 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, FSA, MTSS data, etc.) 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: Heather Lipira (heather.lipira@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teaching learning strategies (.62 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching & Learning Strategies), building the capacity of our teachers in the realm of learning strategies will enable teachers to know which strategy to use and when to use it. Providing students with small group instruction and raising expectations will assist students in making learning gains. In addition, a focus on UDL design for guidelines in classrooms with students will help our students gain access to a higher-level curriculum and be more successful. Teachers will plan with coaches with UDL guidelines to give students a choice, voice, and different means of representation for students to learn standards to be successful in all classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows that students who have access to the curriculum in different ways through the guidelines in Universal Design for Learning raise achievement levels across all subject areas. We will use the district-adopted ELA curriculum, iReady Reading Workbooks and iReady Teacher Toolbox lessons, Top Score Writing curriculum, guided reading professional development, Interactive notebooks, differentiated instruction using check for understanding data, and multiple intervention resources to improve learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Teaching learning strategies through hands on learning opportunities and provide access to the curriculum through assistive technology programs.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

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 curriculum
- Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress;
- 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 to our families such as phone, email, USPS mailings, 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.

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

Teachers provide a positive learning environment where students feel safe to learn the standards while they teach students how to work socially with one another. Students can build positive life skills as they learn to work well with others and learn skills for their future. Our families provide their children with the tools

necessary for optimal learning, such as positive partnerships with the teacher and administrators. Parents partner in learning by attending school parent trainings and conferences, utilizing district resources like Skyward Family Access and the District Title I Parent Resource Center to support learning. Volunteers contribute by working directly with students and teachers supporting learning by helping in the classrooms. SAC members support the school goals by providing feedback and support to the school leadership team. Lastly, Saddlewood's business partner plays a key role in building positive school culture and environment by providing resources such as school supplies, help for our families in need, and volunteering at Career Day events and Teacher Appreciation events. All stakeholders know, understand, and follow the Big 3 to have a successful learning environment for all students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00