

Dixie District Schools

James M. Anderson Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 9/23/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (65%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	22%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		B	B

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.
- 3rd grade math increase to 62% (3 point increase)
- To earn enough points to maintain our "A" school status.
- Black subgroup increase to 45% (2 point increase)
- Students with disabilities subgroup increase to 52% (2 point increase)
- 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

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
McCaskill, Kristen	Principal	To over see the implementation of SIP goals.
St. Laurent, Aimee	Reading Coach	To over see the implementation of SIP goals as they relate to RTI.
Kreinbihl, John	School Counselor	To oversee and implement SIP goals.
Sanchez, LaTashia	Teacher, K-12	Push in teacher for grades K-4, ESE certified, and SAC Chair.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 9/23/2022, Kristen Mccaskill

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.*

10

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

19

Total number of students enrolled at the school

372

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

0

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

0

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	57	55	53	72	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	310
Attendance below 90 percent	21	35	22	33	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	5	10	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	7	7	17	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	0	2	5	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	7	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/18/2022

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	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

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	58	62	57	74	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325
Attendance below 90 percent	33	27	22	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	0	3	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	12	1	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	52%	60%	56%				53%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						55%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						43%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	68%	64%	50%				61%	70%	63%
Math Learning Gains	79%						69%	72%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						61%	66%	51%
Science Achievement		74%	59%				49%	60%	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	60%	62%	-2%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	58%	-4%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

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	58%	66%	-8%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	70%	73%	-3%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State 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	77		41	56						
BLK	30	31		52	57						
MUL	60			50							
WHT	57	76		73	84						
FRL	46	54	57	62	79	60					

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				
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				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	73
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	60
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?

We saw an increase in all areas of state testing with majority close to state average. Grades with less absences and check outs have plans in place to increase attendance.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our greatest need for improvement is ELA proficiency. Within this goal we are focusing on our black subgroup (increase to 45%; a 2 point increase) and our students with disabilities subgroup (Increase to 52%; a 2 point increase).

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

Attendance. This year we are offering attendance incentives- schoolwide, grade level wide, and individual classroom as well.

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

Our most improved area is math learning gains with an increase of 32 points.

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

With the help of push in teacher, paras, and small group, intensive instruction.

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

Students read connected text everyday to support reading accuracy, fluency and comprehension. Model for students how to code words (blending, sounding out, etc.)

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.

Through PLC's, teachers will practice to read orally, model strategies scaffold and provide feedback to support accurate and efficient word identification.

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

Continue with intentional, small group tutoring both during the school day and after. Monitor data to make decision and serve needs within our subgroups with biggest gaps. Continue to reach out to parents to strengthen community ties and support.

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 ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Anderson Elementary School will strive to increase rigor and student engagement through the emphasis and use of HIGH LEVERAGE, EVIDENCE-BASED STRATEGIES in tier 1 instruction in order to increase the % of students demonstrating proficiency on FAST PM assessment 3. We will monitor school data to determine our progress toward increasing proficiency. We selected high leverage, evidence-based strategies as there is considerable research indicating their use is tied to significant learning gains among students.

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

Our goal is to increase 2022-2023 i-ready diagnostic 1 ELA proficiency from 28% to 60% by PM 3.

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

During PLC's, teachers will monitor ongoing PM data for change and improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Provide professional learning on high leverage, evidenced based strategies during PLC's. Teachers will reflect on their curriculum and instructional practices, noting use of evidence-based strategies and working to eliminate practices and curriculum that do not incorporate them.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

High leverage evidence based practices are backed by rigorous, high standard research, and when incorporated have proven to lead to an increase in positive student learning gains.

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.

Address the data

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

Offer professional learning during PLC's for high leverage, evidenced based instructional strategies.

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

Teachers will plan and implement instruction using high leverage, evidenced based strategies.

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

Admin will do walk throughs.

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

Use RTI time to address student learning deficiencies incorporating high leverage evidence based strategies.

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

Monitor data to look for progress towards goals. Continue to offer professional learning, planning support, and coaching, making changes as needed.

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

ELA/lead mentor teacher and literacy coach offer guidance and support as needed based on student data. Use learning walks for additional support.

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

Purchase instructional tools and resources as needed to support this action step throughout the school year.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Anderson Elementary School will strive to increase rigor and student engagement through the emphasis and use of HIGH LEVERAGE, EVIDENCE-BASED STRATEGIES in tier 1 instruction in order to increase proficiency in math on FAST math assessment PM 3. We will monitor school data to determine our progress toward meeting our school goal.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase 2022-2023 i-ready diagnostic 1 Math proficiency from 16% to 60% by PM 3.

Monitoring:

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

During PLC's, teachers will monitor ongoing PM data for change and improvement as a result of incorporating high leverage, evidence-based instructional practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Provide professional learning on high leverage evidenced based strategies during PLC's. Teachers will then incorporate these evidence-based strategies into their instructional practice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

High leverage evidence based practices are backed by rigorous, high standard research, and when implemented, have proven to lead to an increase in positive student learning gains.

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.

Address data with grade level teams.

Person Responsible

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

Offer professional learning during PLC's on high leverage, evidenced based instructional strategies.

Person Responsible

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

Teachers will plan and implement instruction using high leverage, evidence-based instructional strategies.

Person Responsible

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

Admin conducts walk throughs to monitor fidelity of instruction.

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

Use small group instruction time to address student learning deficiencies, incorporating high leverage, evidenced-based strategies.

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

Monitor data to look for progress towards goals. Continue to offer professional learning, planning support, and coaching, making changes as needed.

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

Lead/mentor teacher and literacy coach offer guidance and support as needed based on student data. Use learning walks for additional support.

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

Purchase instructional materials, tools and resources as needed to support this action step throughout the school year.

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Anderson Elementary School will strive to increase rigor and student engagement through the use of high leverage, evidence based learning strategies in tier 1 instruction as a means to increase overall student proficiency on FAST assessment PM 3. We will monitor grade level data to determine our progress toward meeting this goal.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Anderson Elementary School will strive to increase rigor and student engagement through the use of high leverage, evidence based learning strategies in tier 1 instruction as a means to increase overall

student proficiency on FAST assessment PM 3. We will monitor grade level data to determine our progress toward meeting this goal.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Anderson Elementary School will strive to increase rigor and student engagement through the use of high leverage, evidence based learning strategies in tier 1 instruction as a means to increase overall student proficiency on FAST assessment PM 3. We will monitor grade level data to determine our progress toward meeting this proficiency goal as follows:

K- 6% PM 1 to 75% PM 3

1st- 7% PM 1 to 75% PM 3

2nd- 11% PM 1 to 75% PM 3

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Anderson Elementary School will strive to increase rigor and student engagement through the use of high leverage, evidence based learning strategies in tier 1 instruction as a means to increase overall student proficiency on FAST assessment PM 3. We will monitor grade level data to determine our progress toward meeting this goal proficiency as follows:

3rd- 54% proficient at end of 2022 to 60% proficient at end of 2023.

4th- 50% proficient at end of 2022 to 60% proficient at end of 2023.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

ELA achievement will be monitored through i-Ready diagnostic data and FAST assessment data. Ongoing monitoring will take place per the following timeline with final evaluation on FAST PM 3 at the end of the school year.

September- FAST PM 1

October i-Ready diagnostic #1

December FAST PM 2

April I-Ready PM 2

May FAST PM 3

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

McCaskill, Kristen, kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Anderson Elementary School will offer professional learning on the following high leverage evidenced based instructional practices/strategies in Tier 1 instruction. These high leverage evidenced based instructional strategies will come from a variety of sources as follows:

- Hattie Visible Learning Strategies
- IES Practice Guide- Reading Interventions for Students Grades 4-9
- IES Practice Guide- Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Grade K-3
- Marzano's High Yield Instructional Strategies
- FDOE Practice Profiles for Grades PK-12 Literacy Instruction
- Evidence-Based High Leverage Practices for SWD from the Progress Center at AIR for Research

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Each of these practices meets Florida's definition for evidenced based (leads to significant student learning gains) and aligns to the BEST ELA standards as well as the District K-12 CERP.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Address the data with school teams.	McCaskill, Kristen, kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us
Offer professional learning during PLC's for high leverage evidenced based strategies.	St. Laurent, Aimee, aimeestlaurent@dixie.k12.fl.us
Teachers will plan and implement instruction using high leverage evidenced based instructional strategies.	St. Laurent, Aimee, aimeestlaurent@dixie.k12.fl.us
Admin conducts walk throughs to monitor implementation of high leverage evidenced based instructional strategies.	McCaskill, Kristen, kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us
Use RTI time to address student learning deficiencies incorporating high leverage evidence based strategies.	St. Laurent, Aimee, aimeestlaurent@dixie.k12.fl.us
Monitor data to look for progress toward goals. Continue to offer professional learning, lesson planning support, and coaching, making changes as needed.	McCaskill, Kristen, kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us
ELA lead/mentor teacher and literacy coach offer guidance and support as needed based on student data. Use learning walks for additional support.	St. Laurent, Aimee, aimeestlaurent@dixie.k12.fl.us
Purchase instructional tools and resources as needed to support this action step throughout the school year.	McCaskill, Kristen, kristenmccaskill@dixie.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.

Through Title 1 and parent involvement plan, our school wide focus is to involve parents through the decision making process as it relates to their child's education. We take appropriate steps with parents (parent meetings, make and take's, how-to meetings and reading nights) to ensure we are partnered to give their child the best education possible.

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

Admin and teachers work together to set the tone of welcomeness and togetherness of our school campus. Through our SAC meetings, we ask parents for feedback and ways to better serve them. A needs assessment survey is also sent out yearly. We incorporate the community through a sponsorship program where they are invited in the classroom to demonstrate their line of work and increase interest if need be.