

Dixie District Schools

James M. Anderson Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	17
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

James M. Anderson Elementary School

815 SE 351 HWY, Cross City, FL 32628

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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 65%
- To earn enough points to maintain our “A” school status.
- Black subgroup increase to 50%
- Students with disabilities subgroup increase to 55%
- 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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McCaskill, Kristen	Principal	To ensure the safety and well being of students at AES. To properly and effectively implement explicit, systematic instruction as well as intervention and RTI to our struggling students.
Kreinbihl, John	School Counselor	
Thomas, Jill	Reading Coach	
Locke, Delana	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders at our school include the SAC committee, our school leadership team, and our school literacy team.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored through RTI meetings (3 times a year) as well as monitoring data through teacher data chats.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	22%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	27	31	25	17	21	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	30	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	14	0	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	15	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	21	35	22	33	27	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	5	10	3	14	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	7	17	16	0	0	0	0	48

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	5	6	17	0	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	7	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	21	35	22	33	27	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	5	10	3	14	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	7	17	16	0	0	0	0	48

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	5	6	17	0	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	7	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48	56	53	52	60	56	53		
ELA Learning Gains				63			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			37		
Math Achievement*	59	69	59	68	64	50	58		
Math Learning Gains				79			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			44		
Science Achievement*			54		74	59	58		
Social Studies Achievement*					72	64			
Middle School Acceleration					68	52			
Graduation Rate						50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		64	59						

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	153
Total Components for the Federal Index	3

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP				
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	50			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP				
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	60			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	48			59								
SWD	21			35							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19			56							2	
HSP												
MUL	54			54							2	
PAC												
WHT	52			58							3	
FRL	43			58							3	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	52	63	65	68	79	65						
SWD	27	77		41	56							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	31		52	57							
HSP												
MUL	60			50								
PAC												
WHT	57	76		73	84							
FRL	46	54	57	62	79	60						

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	53	53	37	58	47	44	58					
SWD	30	31		34	31		40					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			28								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57	53	36	61	48	47	61					
FRL	47	59	43	52	50	38	67					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2023 - Spring	53%	60%	-7%	58%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	51%	-10%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	53%	61%	-8%	59%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	79%	-6%	61%	12%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The data component in 3rd grade PM 1 for FAST ELA was 4% at or above grade level, with 59% at urgent intervention. Each year in third grade, we have an influx of students in 3rd grade, this year being 20 new students. These students come to us without the rigor that we expose our students to. We urgently identify these students immediately and begin interventions.

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

ELA scores in 3rd grade declined from 54% to 40%. Students came in without background knowledge and sufficient reading skills. Teachers worked diligently to close the gap, incorporating after school tutoring and intensive small groups.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap from state to school was in third grade ELA. State average was 50% and grade average was 40%. We determined through our leadership team that the rigor must be increased in 2nd grade to help bridge the gap between 2nd and 3rd.

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

Fourth grade math was 11 points above the state average. Fourth grade is departmentalized; teachers are well versed in the subject and are veteran teachers. They participate in summer PD and plan accordingly.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance and suspensions are two potential areas of concern. We are working proactively on attendance with rewards etc. We are also implementing a positive behavior model school wide.

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

We are focusing our efforts in 3rd and 4th ELA. We reconfigured our intervention team to a much more effective and data driven method. The team has been trained in specific areas of student needs and PD is planned throughout the year.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Spring 2023 FAST math data indicated the following proficiency rates:

K- 27%
1st- 83%
2nd- 70%
3rd- 53%
4th-72%

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the proficiency rate on the Spring 2024 FAST math assessment as follows:

K-51%
1st- 88%
2nd- 80%
3rd- 63%
4th- 78%

Monitoring:

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

PM data will be monitored 3 times per year to ensure students are growing and mastering grade level benchmarks.

Admin will do classroom walkthroughs weekly to monitor delivery of instruction and transfer from common planning with instructional coach.

Leadership team will meet monthly to review trends noticed during walkthroughs and adjust as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Delana Locke (delanalocke@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Big Ideas curriculum is in place in grades K-4. In addition, our teachers receive training in explicit and systematic instruction, differentiated, scaffolding and corrective feedback which are all evidence based practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Big Ideas is a high quality, rigorous math program built on the most current and widely accepted educational research. The 5 instructional practices are all evidence based.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Admin will provide focused, in depth professional learning during PLC's throughout the school year of explicit instruction and systematic instruction.

Person Responsible: Delana Locke (delanalocke@dixie.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing

Admin will monitor teacher use and application of data.

Person Responsible: Delana Locke (delanalocke@dixie.k12.fl.us)

By When: on going

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

N/A

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Scores for K-2 were as follows:

K- 40% of students were below the 40 percentile.

1st- 57% of students were below the 40 percentile.

2nd- 47% of students were below the 40 percentile.

In grades K-2, we are focusing on phonics instruction (using SAXON) as well as the area of need that was identified through testing. This individual area of focus will be met with specific intervention methods that use multisensory a systematic approach. The intervention team is also well versed with the SAXON

program so those paras use the same delivery method and verbiage as what the students are accustomed to hearing.

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

Scores for 3,4 were as follows:

3rd- 58% of students scored a level 1 or 2 on FSA ELA.

4th- 48% of students scored a level 1 or 2 on FSA ELA.

In grades 3 and 4, we are focusing on comprehension strategies as well as the area of need that was identified through testing. This individual area of focus will be met with specific intervention methods that use multisensory a systematic approach. The intervention team has been trained in how to use higher order questioning relating to the passage teaching students how to use context clues.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

The measurable outcome for grades K-2 is as follows:

K- reduce the current 40% to 30% of students scoring below proficiency.

1st- reduce the current 57% to 30% of students scoring below proficiency.

2nd- reduce the current 47% to 30% of students scoring below proficiency.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The measurable outcome for grades 3-4 is as follows:

3rd- reduce the current 58% to 30% of students scoring below proficiency.

4th- reduce the current 48% to 30% of students scoring below proficiency.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Monitoring will take place through RTI meetings and RTI data will be monitored and assessed monthly yo endure students are making appropriate learning gains.

Admin will do classroom walk throughs weekly to monitor delivery of instruction and transfer from common planning to instructional coach.

Leadership team will meet monthly to review trends noticed during walkthroughs and adjust as needed.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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. §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?

AES core instruction utilizes Benchmark Advance which has promising evidence, which does meet Florida’s definition of evidence based instruction. AES also utilizes SAXON phonics which has strong evidence. Evidence based practices in place include explicit instruction, systematic instruction, scaffolded instruction, corrective feedback and differentiated instruction and are monitored weekly through walk throughs.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The above listed programs are all evidence based and meet the identified needs of our students. Benchmark Education features evidence-based reading instruction and curriculum resources informed by the Science of Reading to assist teachers' curriculums. Saxon's approach to teaching phonics and spelling concepts is based on foundational research in the science of reading and cognitive science.

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
Instructional coaches with admin will facilitate weekly grade level planning and provide support on how to develop benchmark aligned lessons.	McCaskill, Kristen, kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us
Provide PLC's to assist teachers in implementation of high leverage instructional practices.	Thomas, Jill, jillthomas@dixie.k12.fl.us
School leadership team will walk classrooms in all grade levels weekly to monitor the delivery of instruction and transfer common planning.	McCaskill, Kristen, kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us
Coaches will work with teachers during planning to support the inclusion of explicit instruction and systematic instruction.	Thomas, Jill, jillthomas@dixie.k12.fl.us
Coaches/admin will complete a novel study on high leverage instructional practices with instructional staff members.	McCaskill, Kristen, kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

SAC Committee
 SIP availability in front office
 school website

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
 List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Open house
 SAC
 VIP lunches (parents are encouraged to attend as VIP's on their designated day)
 Christmas programs

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Our intervention is comprised of 4 paras and 1 certified teacher. Together, they all go into a grade level at a time to address needs of struggling, identified students.

We also compartmentalized our 3rd grade into ELA/Math. This allows a teacher to focus on one subject area, become familiar with it, and focus on mastery of those standards.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

VPK

Title 1 funds

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

AES uses Monique Burr (child safety matter and mental health matters)

The Guidance Counselor provides Tier 1 and tier 2 counseling services

Tier 3 counseling services are provided by contracted licensed counselors.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Career exposure for our students is address through the Benchmark curriculum throughout the year. We also incorporate "special readers" during Literacy Week such as the county judge. The readers tell about their job and qualifications.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

AES is proactive. We award those students who portray the monthly characteristic trait with a visit to the "prize cart" on Fridays. Teachers are trained to manage problematic behaviors with positive reinforcement. We have behavior plans in place for children with problematic behaviors. We are also very thorough in teaching procedures and expectations at the beginning of the school year.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Full day of PD in September for all staff, weekly PLC's, book study, instructional technology PD once a month as well as behavioral and instructional training for our paras.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

We have open house each year as well as sending home pertinent parent info. Our PreK is housed on our campus for an easier transition.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No