

Marion County Public Schools

Saddlewood Elementary School



2022-23 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (60%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	97%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

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

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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 Pre-K through 5th.
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 Pre-K through Fifth grade as she supports teachers learning the new BEST Standards and our ELA textbook and new math textbooks. She will be supporting our ESOL students by training and scheduling ESOL paraprofessionals effectively for the greatest impact for student learning.
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 tracks student data to ensure adequate progress is being made with her students.
Bennett, Arnishia	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 1st, 3rd, and 5th grade students and ESOL students assessments/eligibility. She provides small group and individual counseling

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and tracks student data to ensure adequate progress is being made with her students.
Ramage, Danielle	Reading Coach	Modeling reading lessons for teachers, progress monitoring, provide professional development for teachers in the area of reading. Mrs. Ramage will provide support and modeling best practices in grade K-5 in ELA. In addition she will support interventions in these grades and supports our teachers in grades K-5 with our students with disabilities being supported in the inclusion setting. Mrs. Ramage will help teachers plan for Universally Designed lessons so all students have access to the curriculum at the level of rigor to be successful. Mrs Ramage will also be supporting the implementation of UFLI phonics curriculum in K-2 classrooms.
Rasdall, Kimberly	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. Rasdall will focus on ELA and phonics instruction in grade K-5 and supports our ESOL students population in K-5. In addition, Mrs. Rasdall is a certified ESE teacher and will be supporting teachers in our inclusion classrooms as well as ASD units to increase proficiency.
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 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 10/16/2016, Heather Lip IR A

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

22

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

30

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

900

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

2

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

1

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	151	159	151	154	142	178	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	935
Attendance below 90 percent	42	40	39	37	31	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	235
One or more suspensions	10	10	3	9	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA	28	38	59	36	9	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	211
Course failure in Math	24	17	56	27	11	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	50	27	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	33	25	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	2	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	27	23	53	34	10	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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 8/23/2022

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

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

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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	56%	46%	56%				59%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	65%						57%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						55%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	67%	50%	50%				70%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%						76%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						58%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	53%	59%				47%	47%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	56%	44%	12%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	49%	15%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	63%	49%	14%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	82%	54%	28%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	55%	45%	10%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	44%	-1%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	27	38	38	36	50	38	24				
ELL	44	60	56	54	74	56	6				
ASN	77	90		90	95		67				
BLK	38	49	57	56	65	45	26				
HSP	55	68	59	64	74	50	52				
MUL	63	68		69	74						
WHT	61	67	50	72	76	53	63				
FRL	48	58	49	59	69	55	38				
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				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	52
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	84
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	48
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	61
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	69
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

Looking closely at the data, our scores on ELA proficiency have dropped from 2021 at 53% to 47% in 2022 in 3rd grade, 57% increased to 60% in 4th grade, and decreased by 2% in 5th grade from a 56% to a 52%.

Lowest Quartile gains in ELA in 2019 were 55% and this increased to 63% in 2022.

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% to 2021 at 65% learning gains in math. This continues to be a trend school wide.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 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 over several years which is why our area of focus will be formative assessments in the area of ELA.

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

We noticed in our data and classroom walkthroughs that formative assessments were not being utilized to drive in the moment instructional decisions. If we change how formative assessments are done school wide, students will get the small group instruction they need to meet their individual needs whether that is enrichment or remediation.

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

We made progress in math in all subgroups and grades. Math proficiency was 69% overall with learning gains in math were at 75%.

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

Teachers utilized resources in planning within the Engage New York curriculum as they taught the standards to the item specifications as well as the addition of a math coach added to the staffing plan has helped increase our students math proficiency and learning gains .

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. Lastly, teaching teachers ways to use formative assessments to provide project based enrichment activities to students who need acceleration.

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.

Provide vertical alignment professional development across grade levels so teachers can see the progression of the BEST Benchmarks from one grade to the next. Next, we will conduct learning walks in classrooms with a specific focus on Tier I reading instruction and formative assessment practices. Lastly, we will train teachers in high-level questioning strategies in weekly collaboration meetings to plan questions together for instruction. Formative assessments trainings will be infused within collaborations meetings and how to use this data to drive small group instruction for students.

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. In addition, the leadership team will be doing scheduled walkthroughs in the teachers UFLI block on the master schedule and providing support by coaches and district program specialists. Lastly, sharing formative assessment best practices collecting formative assessment data within the Tier I lesson will be a focus throughout the year in faculty meetings and collaboration.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and**

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

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 collecting formative assessment data to plan for small group instruction. When teachers get in the moment data from students while teaching a lesson, students will get feedback that will help them clear up misunderstandings. In addition, teachers are able to know where students are at and drive their instruction for remediation or enrichment needs.

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

On the 2022 ELA FSA, 50% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher. 60% of our 4th grade students scored a level 3 or higher. In 5th grade, 57% of our students scored a level 3 or higher.

On the new state assessment we would like to see the number of students proficient increase by 5% in each grade level.

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

Weekly classroom walkthrough data, as well as district and state assessment data (such as iReady diagnostic, iReady progress monitoring, FAST data three times per year, classroom assessment data, IXL data, MTSS intervention data.), will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction as well as teachers will utilize well-planned formative checks 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 help plan for formative assessments throughout instruction. In addition, coaches will assist and model small group instruction using the data collected.

Person**responsible****for****monitoring****outcome:**

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

Evidence-based**Strategy:****Describe the****evidence-****based****strategy****being****implemented**

Providing Formative evaluations have an effect size of .9 which from Hattie's High Effect size. When teachers are required to use data and evidence of learning, students learn at a higher level.

**for this Area
of Focus.**

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based**

Strategy:

**Explain the
rationale for
selecting
this specific
strategy.**

Research shows that students who have increased opportunities to get feedback and clear up misunderstanding while learning with the use of formative assessment data being collected by the teacher, those students learn at a higher rate and achievement is higher. Research from John Hattie: Visible Learning

**Describe the
resources/
criteria used
for selecting
this strategy.**

Action Steps to Implement

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

Professional development will be provided to all instructional staff and paraprofessionals focusing on formative assessment and how to use this data within the lesson as well as small group instruction. Planning for this will be embedded in collaborative planning twice per week. Instructional coaches will provide modeling to teachers as well as give feedback along with administration

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:**

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

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:

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

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

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

Weekly classroom walkthrough data with evidence of implementation being observed, as well as district and state assessment data (such as iReady diagnostic, iReady progress monitoring, 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: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented

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 using formative assessment data and raising expectations will assist students in becoming proficient. 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.

**for this Area
of Focus.**

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based**

Strategy:

**Explain the
rationale for
selecting this
specific
strategy.**

**Describe the
resources/
criteria used
for selecting
this 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, guided reading professional development, differentiated instruction using check for understanding data, and multiple intervention resources to increase students proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Kimberly Rasdall, Instructional Coach, is a former ESE self-contained teacher as well as taught inclusion. She will be modeling strategies with teachers, planning for instruction to scaffold instruction, and plan for formative assessments with teachers. In addition, Elizabeth Rockey a lead teacher will provide modeling on best practices using UDL practices in the classroom.

Person

Responsible

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

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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 school culture and environment.

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.