

Dixie District Schools

James M. Anderson Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

James M. Anderson Elementary School

815 SE 351 HWY, Cross City, FL 32628

<http://www.dixie.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Kristen Mccaskill

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2018

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-4 |
| 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) | 100% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (50%) |
| 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 Dixie 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 | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

James M. Anderson Elementary School

815 SE 351 HWY, Cross City, FL 32628

<http://www.dixie.k12.fl.us>

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-4 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 23% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | B | B | C |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dixie 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.

Mission Statement

The mission of Anderson Elementary School staff is to focus all students on academics, attendance, higher state mandated test scores, respect and values through positive student, parent and community involvement.

We are a caring and compassionate campus and make decisions based on the best interest of our students.

GOALS

- Ensure safety and security of all students.
- Results of all IOWA scores will be above the 49th% and state mandated test scores will be above the state average.
- To earn enough points on state assessments to achieve "A" school status.
- All bottom quartile students in grades 3-4 will show 75% growth.
- To increase knowledge of Florida Standards Mathematics and begin the implementation process.
- To provide our students with the knowledge of what appropriate school behavior looks like and to model this behavior.
- To teach our students the importance of neatness and taking pride in keeping our campus clean.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide all students rigorous, engaging, and standards based educational opportunities within a safe environment conducive to learning which will enable them to become thriving, successful and productive members of society.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| McCaskill, Kristen | Principal | To ensure safety for all students. To have an instructional focus for every student, making sure needs are addressed in all subject areas. As an instructional leader, my responsibilities include RTI, BEST standards implementation, goal setting, and progress monitoring. I also complete staff evaluations. |
| St. Laurent, Aimee | Reading Coach | To support classroom teachers through curriculum and resource materials to meet the needs of all students. Other responsibilities include weekly PLC meetings, PD, progress monitoring, RTI coordination, coaching new and struggling teachers, ELA and RTI curriculum planning. |
| Kreinbihl, John | School Counselor | To ensure classroom teachers have the necessary tools and training to meet the mental health needs of students. To train staff on look fors when dealing with mental health. Providing and setting up mental health counseling when appropriate. Support the Principal in testing and testing security. Other responsibilities include ELL and ESE support, IEP's and 504's. |
| O'Neal, Joshua | Assistant Principal | To maintain safety and security campus wide. To support the classroom teachers through a positive approach to discipline. To maintain order throughout the school day so students have the best learning environment possible. Assist the Principal with instructional models in math and science. Other responsibilities include threat assessment and student discipline. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/21/2018, Kristen Mccaskill

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.*

1

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

Total number of students enrolled at the school

425

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

5

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

2

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 | 58 | 62 | 57 | 74 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 325 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 11 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 17 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 8 | 8 | 14 | 16 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 12 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/21/2021

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 | 43 | 52 | 52 | 70 | 53 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 339 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 | 17 | 14 | 17 | 19 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 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 | 4 | 19 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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 | 43 | 52 | 52 | 70 | 53 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 339 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 | 17 | 14 | 17 | 19 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 17 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 17 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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 | 13 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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 | | | | 53% | 59% | 57% | 49% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 55% | 58% | 58% | 36% | 41% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43% | 51% | 53% | 33% | 38% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 61% | 70% | 63% | 52% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 69% | 72% | 62% | 43% | 50% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 61% | 66% | 51% | 25% | 36% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 49% | 60% | 53% | 66% | 72% | 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 | 60% | 62% | -2% | 58% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 58% | -4% | 58% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -60% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 66% | -8% | 62% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 73% | -3% | 64% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -58% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 10 | 29 | 61 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 5 | 26 | 55 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25 | 38 | 38 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 6 | 27 | 55 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 3 | 19 | 50 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25 | 63 | 50 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 6 | 27 | 55 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 16 | 42 | 66 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14 | 40 | 65 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 10 | 22 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 14 | 29 | 54 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 9 | 36 | 46 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 18 | 47 | 46 |
| | English Language Learners | 18 | 48 | 46 |
| | | | | |
| Grade 3 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 37 | 61 | 61 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23 | 51 | 56 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 19 | 24 | 29 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 13 | 35 | 54 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 11 | 25 | 44 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 12 | 35 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 34 | 31 | 44 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 32 | 24 | 37 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 17 | 31 | 56 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16 | 21 | 49 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |

| Grade | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 26 | 25 | 43 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 19 | 21 | 36 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 19 | 25 | 25 |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 27 | 38 | 65 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 19 | 21 | 38 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 19 | 25 | 25 |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |

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 | 30 | 31 | | 34 | 31 | | 40 | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | | | 28 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 53 | 36 | 61 | 48 | 47 | 61 | | | | |

| 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 |
| FRL | 47 | 59 | 43 | 52 | 50 | 38 | 67 | | | | |
| 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 | 40 | 31 | 19 | 54 | 79 | 85 | 24 | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | 57 | | 50 | 61 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 55 | 60 | | 73 | 90 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 58 | 70 | | 62 | 91 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 54 | 42 | 62 | 67 | 63 | 54 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 54 | 50 | 58 | 67 | 60 | 41 | | | | |
| 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 | 26 | 38 | 29 | 28 | 16 | 6 | 40 | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 35 | | 38 | 44 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 41 | 36 | | 39 | 27 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | 37 | 32 | 56 | 43 | 25 | 66 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 34 | 33 | 50 | 40 | 23 | 62 | | | | |

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 | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 350 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 33 |
| 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 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 27 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 51 |
| 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?

Our school showed growth across all areas except science achievement, where we had a loss of 17 points. Even with growth in the other areas, we only met state average in 2 areas, math learning gains and math lowest 25%.

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

Our greatest need for improvement will be ELA and science preparation since 5th grade has been relocated to our middle school.

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

Factors include lack of knowledge on the use of evidence based focus based strategies. Our ELA teachers will go through training on these strategies through our local consortium and Hatties model as well.

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

Our most improved area was math lowest 25% at 36 points of growth.

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

Contributing factors include PD on the math standards as well as math PLC's with an instructional coach. The teachers were required and held accountable for i-ready standards mastery assessments once per month, with a follow up with the coach/admin to go over results.

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

Our ELA teachers will utilize a supplement for writing that fits hand in hand with reading and comprehension strategies. This will not only aid in comprehension, but also build a foundation for essay writing.

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.

Teachers will be trained in Core Connections as a grade level. The training will be age/grade specific and will be meaningful and systematic.

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

To ensure sustainability, administrators and coach will have look for's while completing walk-through's as well as coaching. These look for's will be added to the walk through form and feedback will be given to teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

-Our greatest need for instructional improvement is 4th grade ELA proficiency. Our 4th grade ELA proficiency was 48%, below the minimum state requirement of 51%.
 -Last year our 3rd graders ELA proficiency was at 53%, while our early elementary students finished the 20-21 school year with 62% proficiency (per i-Ready EOY scores).
 -Last year our ELA bottom quartile learning gains dropped 6% points to 37%.

Description and Rationale:

We are concerned these K-2 students will continue to drop behind over time, ending up struggling learners in 4th grade. Should this happen, our 4th grade scores would once again drop below the minimum state requirement of 51%.

Our plan is to implement intense MTSS/RTI with fidelity, using evidence based materials and/or strategies, in an effort to combat this decline in proficiency over time and get our 4th grade ELA proficiency scores above 50%.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase 4th grade ELA proficiency from 48% to 51% proficiency on FSA (EOY 22) (per RAISE requirements).
 Increase ELA proficiency in grades K-3 from 62% proficiency (EOY 21) to 65% proficiency (EOY 22).
 Increase 3rd grade ELA proficiency from 53% to 56% proficiency on FSA (EOY 22).
 Increase ELA BQ LG from 37% to 51% (EOY 22)

Monitoring:

We will monitor data 3 times per year via i-Ready diagnostic assessments, monthly via standards mastery assessments (grades 2-4 via i-Ready; grades K-2 via ESGI). Student progress will be monitored via weekly and/or unit assessments within the ELA curriculum. MTSS/RTI students will have progress monitored approximately every 2-4 weeks, depending on their intervention tier. Administration, coaches and teachers will monitor data periodically, assessing student growth and progress, making changes as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Hatties visible learning strategies as follows:
 small group instruction- effect size .47
 phonics instruction- effect size .70
 RTI- effect size 1.29
 close reading (underlining and highlighting)- effect size .50
 scaffolding- effect size .82
 questioning- effect size .48
 summarizing- effect size .79
 Instructional materials as follows:
 Quick Reads grades 2-4 (strong evidence)
 Raz-Plus grades K-4 (strong evidence)
 Additional intervention materials as needed, based on data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

These strategies are supported by strong evidence to have a significant impact on student learning. They are also listed in our current comprehensive evidence-based reading plan.

Action Steps to Implement

Select and/or purchase evidence-based strategies and materials.

Person Responsible Aimee St. Laurent (aimeestlaurent@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Train teachers in the use of evidence-based strategies and materials.

Person Responsible Aimee St. Laurent (aimeestlaurent@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Implement MTSS/RTI w/fidelity schoolwide, incorporating evidence-based strategies and curriculum.

Person Responsible Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Principal does observations and fidelity walkthroughs. Reading coach does coaching walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Assess student progress periodically and evaluate data to assess growth. Make changes as needed.

Person Responsible Aimee St. Laurent (aimeestlaurent@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Utilize coaching and mentor teachers/classrooms as needed based on student data and principal observations.

Person Responsible Aimee St. Laurent (aimeestlaurent@dixie.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math was a weak area for AES on the 21 FSA math assessment as follows:
 -Overall proficiency dropped 3% points from 61% (19) to 58% (21).
 -Math learning gains dropped 22% points from 69% (19) to 47% (21).
 -Math learning gains of bottom quartile students dropped 17% points from 61% (19) to 44% (21).

Measurable Outcome: Our goal for FSA Math results (EOY 22) follows:
 -Increase Math proficiency from 58% to 61% (EOY 22).
 -Increase Math learning gains from 47% to 51% (EOY 22).
 -Increase Math learning gains of the bottom quartile from 44% to 51% (EOY 22).

Monitoring: We will monitor data 3 times per year via i-Ready diagnostic assessments, more frequently via standards mastery assessments (grades 2-4 via i-Ready). Student progress may also be monitored via weekly and/or unit assessments within the Math curriculum. Administration, coaches and teachers will monitor assessment data periodically, assessing student growth and progress towards school goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence-based strategies include small group instruction, questioning, collaborative learning techniques. Staff will teach problem solving strategies and higher order thinking concepts through delivery of differentiated mathematics Eureka lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: implementing math program with fidelity (Hattie's - .59)
 collaborative learning (Hattie's .34)
 small group instruction (Hattie's - .47)
 questioning (Hattie's - .59)
 scaffolding (Hattie's - .82)

Action Steps to Implement

Select and/or purchase evidence-based strategies and/or materials.

Person Responsible Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Train teachers in the use of evidence-based strategies and/or materials.

Person Responsible Aimee St. Laurent (aimeestlaurent@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Implement small group instruction, as needed, incorporating evidence-based strategies and/or curriculum.

Person Responsible Joshua O'Neal (joshuaoneal@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Principal and AP do frequent observations and fidelity walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Joshua O'Neal (joshuaoneal@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Assess student progress periodically and evaluate data. Make changes as needed to meet student needs.

Person Responsible Aimee St. Laurent (aimeestlaurent@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Utilize coaching and mentor teacher/classrooms as needed based on student data and principal/AP observations.

Person Responsible Joshua O'Neal (joshuaoneal@dixie.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.

According to data obtained from SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, James M. Anderson Elementary School has the following rankings:

- Ranked 998/1,395 elementary schools statewide for school behavioral incidents (High).**
- Ranked 992/1,395 for violent incidents (HIGH).**
- Ranked 1,092/1,395 for drug/public order incidents**
- Ranked 1,051/1,395 for total reported suspensions.**

Based on this data our primary focus will be to reduce violent incidents. These are the ones that typically lead to suspensions, so by decreasing violent incidents we will also be able to reduce suspensions. Our focus will be on maintaining clear and consistent classroom rules and procedures and delivering engaging content and lessons. With the incorporation of these things we believe our students will be less likely to misbehave. We will also more closely examine our disciplinary techniques/practices in the front office, and make an attempt to incorporate more counseling or consequences as appropriate (ex: time out, lunch detention, ISS, etc.) in lieu of suspensions.

Although discipline data is only part of the picture, important takeaways for school culture and environment can be gleaned using this information. For instance, a spike in a certain area of discipline may indicate to teachers and administrators that a cultural shift is taking place and interventions need to be made.

To help set the school wide vision, our theme this year is "I am a Champion". We use this inspiring theme daily to instruct students on appropriate behavior, both socially and academically, teaching them to always strive to do their best and be a champion. We also teach character education skills and select students who exemplify the monthly character focus trait for public recognition.

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.

AES educational philosophy is cemented in the foundation that all students can learn, grow, and progress regardless of sex, race, ethnic background, or socio-economic status. This philosophy materializes through positive relationship building and consistent communication between staff, students, parents, and other pertinent stakeholders. Additionally, school discipline is viewed as a teaching opportunity, and good behavior is praised and rewarded to promote a positive environment where kids feel happy and safe and are engaged in the learning process.

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

At AES, school leadership sets the tone for a positive culture and environment through themed initiatives and spearheads their implementation. Leadership is also responsible for providing necessary supports to faculty and staff to ensure efficient procurement and implementation of varied learning modalities and techniques.

Our faculty and staff nurtures the growth of positive relationships with all students to maximize the potential for both academic and social emotional growth.

Outside the campus, local businesses, parents and various community members are included via SAC, where they are involved and committed to helping make appropriate educational decisions that will lead to positive change and impact for both students and teachers within the school environment.

Other stakeholders might include lunchroom staff, custodians and bus drivers. All these workers contribute to a positive environment that meets the daily needs of students, ensuring they are at school on time, in a clean and safe environment, and have nutritious food, thereby allowing students to be their best.

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: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |