

Dixie District Schools

James M. Anderson Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	16

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: 10/2/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: C 2013-14: C
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

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.

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 39th% 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 3-5 will show 75% growth.
- To increase knowledge of Florida Standards 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 educational opportunities within a safe environment conducive to learning which will enable them to become thriving, successful and productive students.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McCaskill, Kristen	Principal	
Kreinbihl, John	Guidance Counselor	
Lord, Chasity	Assistant Principal	
St. Laurent, Aimee	Instructional Coach	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	15	9	7	6	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	3	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

30

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/15/2019

Prior Year - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Prior Year - 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
Attendance below 90 percent	22	13	11	13	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	1	1	2	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	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%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	15 (0)	9 (0)	7 (0)	6 (0)	8 (0)	8 (0)	53 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)	10 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	9 (0)	17 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	19 (0)	21 (0)	44 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	60%	62%	-2%	58%	2%
	2018	58%	65%	-7%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	58%	-4%	58%	-4%
	2018	41%	48%	-7%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	43%	51%	-8%	56%	-13%
	2018	45%	49%	-4%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	66%	-8%	62%	-4%
	2018	54%	64%	-10%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	73%	-3%	64%	6%
	2018	55%	62%	-7%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	51%	64%	-13%	60%	-9%
	2018	42%	49%	-7%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	58%	-8%	53%	-3%
	2018	64%	70%	-6%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
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

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	56
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	391
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	53
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	70
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	57
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile was our lowest area at 43%. Contributing factors include lack of multi-sensory instruction and rigorous instruction to the depth of the standard.

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

Science achievement declined 17 points from 66% in 2018 to 49% in 2019. Contributing factors include lack of rigorous instruction.

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

ELA lowest 25% had the greatest gap when compared to the state at 10% points. Contributing factors include lack of multi-sensory instruction and rigorous instruction to the depth of the standard.

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

Math lowest 25% increased 36% points from 2018. Our district was able to provide support in the area of a math coach who worked one on one with math teams to increase rigor and increase effective planning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance was a concern. Since then, we have adopted a new district wide truancy plan.

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

1. Attendance
2. ELA bottom 25%
3. Science Achievement
4. ELA achievement
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	ELA Achievement
Rationale	ELA achievement was one of our lower categories at 53%. Even though this was an increase of 4 points from the previous year, we are working hard in this area to increase proficiency.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve To increase ELA achievement to 60%

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

Evidence-based Strategy Students needs will be met through multi sensory, explicit and rigorous lessons that are standards based. Teachers were also trained through NEFEC Literacy Initiative (30 hrs.) and are expected to plan for these proven strategies weekly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Through a supplemental resource Ready curriculum. This resource was chosen as it provides rigorous lessons that challenge the students to the depth of the standard. Every student is exposed and taught the grade level standard and follow up with a standards master test, also through iReady. After the initial Literacy training, teachers will complete an additional 30 hours throughout the school year with text dependent questions, think alouds and selecting complex texts to increase their knowledge.

Action Step

Description

1. NEFEC Literacy Training
2. Determine goal from scores
3. plan with scores and goal in mind
4. assess and monitor
5. complete additional training throughout year

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

#2	
Title	ELA Lowest 25%
Rationale	ELA lowest 25th percentile was our lowest area at 43%
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase lowest 25% ELA scores to 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students needs will be met through multi sensory, explicit lessons tailored to meet their specific needs. Needs are determined from previous year FSA scores and prior rti information. Lowest 25% students have been determined and given to teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our teachers were trained in SLI (Summer Literacy Initiative) with NEFEC.. Throughout this year, our coach will continue to train teachers on best practices within the reading block.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SLI 2. Fidelity checks 3. RTI monitoring 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	Science achievement declined 17 points from 66% in 2018 to 49% in 2019. Contributing factors include lack of rigorous instruction.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase science achievement to 70%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Text dependent questions, think alouds and selecting complex texts to increase students knowledge.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Through the NEFEC Literacy initiative, teachers learned proven strategies to increase mastery. Teacher also provided with percentage tested standards so planning is effective.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review scores 2. create goal 3. plan/map effectively using tested standards 4. attend 30 additional hours of literacy initiative (throughout school year) 5. assess and monitor
Person Responsible	Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

To build positive relationships with parents at our school we use a variety of ways. Class Dojo is an app all parents are encouraged to have on their phones that allows the teacher to communicate with the parent without having to give out their cell phone number. This app also has an option called "school story" that allows any parent signed up to view. We

have very high parent use with this tool and get good feedback from it. We also send out a monthly school newsletter as well as facebook posts to keep parents involved.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

Our school district has chosen to use Sanford Harmony for social emotional learning. This is incorporated daily in every classroom on our campus.

"Kristopher's Kloset" is an outside program we are a part of that meets the needs of students such as shoes, coats, school supplies, etc.

We also have school counseling (both in our Guidance office as well out outside counselors who come in).

All these resources are used to make sure the social emotional needs of our students are being met.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

Our incoming Kindergarten students come from several different Preschool programs within our community. In late spring we invite them to bring their students to visit our campus. During this visit they get to walk through our Kindergarten classrooms and we then give them a screening assessment to determine readiness for Kindergarten. The children end their visit with a trip to the playground.

Kindergarten registration is ongoing throughout the summer for the parents convenience. They can come to the school Monday through Thursday between 7:30 and 4:00.

Our Kindergarten parents and students attended a 'Meet the Teacher' night in August, the week before school started. The students had received a postcard from their teacher earlier in the week telling them how excited their new teacher was to meet them.

Outgoing 5th graders who will go to the middle school the following year participate in a welcoming assembly, a field day at their new school and a tour of their new campus.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

We meet with Title Coordinator, Carol Anne Forehand, monthly to identify and align resources to meet student needs. We also discuss how to apply various resources to meet the needs of students for the highest impact.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

AES has a program called "Adopt A Classroom". This program allows a business or individual to adopt a classroom for \$250.00. The teacher can use this money for the benefit of his/her students. The business/individual is encouraged to visit the classroom to talk to students about what they do. The business/individual is also recognized in the community as a classroom sponsor. It is a good way to partner with the community and our students get to see what their business is all about. This partnership advance college and career awareness along with our AVID program. AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) creates the mindset for students to "think college and career" even in elementary school. Through this program, we focus on mindset, organization, and how to take and use notes in the classroom.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA Achievement				\$48,386.08
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
5100	310-Professional and Technical Services	0101 - James M. Anderson Elementary School			\$3,229.80	
<i>Notes: Write Score</i>						
5100	360-Rentals	0101 - James M. Anderson Elementary School			\$16,292.50	
<i>Notes: Curriculum Associates- iready site license</i>						
5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0101 - James M. Anderson Elementary School			\$3,805.50	
<i>Notes: AR subscription renewal</i>						
5100	510-Supplies	0101 - James M. Anderson Elementary School			\$7,658.28	
<i>Notes: Ready FI books- ELA</i>						
6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0101 - James M. Anderson Elementary School			\$14,400.00	
<i>Notes: NEFEC Summer Lit.</i>						
6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0101 - James M. Anderson Elementary School			\$3,000.00	
<i>Notes: Iready PD</i>						
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest 25%				\$14,249.22
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
5100	510-Supplies	0101 - James M. Anderson Elementary School			\$11,280.47	
<i>Notes: Saxon Phonics books</i>						
6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0101 - James M. Anderson Elementary School			\$168.75	
<i>Notes: Reading Eggs</i>						
6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0101 - James M. Anderson Elementary School			\$2,800.00	

						<i>Notes: Saxon PD</i>
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Science Achievement				\$150.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0101 - James M. Anderson Elementary School			\$150.00
						<i>Notes: Great Minds PD (STEM)</i>
Total:						\$62,785.30