

Dixie District Schools

# James M. Anderson Elementary School



2018-19 School Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>12</b> |

## James M. Anderson Elementary School

815 SE 351 HWY, Cross City, FL 32628

<http://aplusweb.dixie.k12.fl.us/~aes@dixie.k12.fl.us/>

### School Demographics

**School Type and Grades Served**  
(per MSID File)

Elementary School  
PK-5

**2018-19 Title I School**

Yes

**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**  
(As Reported on Survey 3)

100%

**Primary Service Type**  
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

**Charter School**

No

**2018-19 Minority Rate**  
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

20%

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C       | C       | C       | C*      |

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement

##### Mission Statement

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

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

##### GOALS

- Ensure safety and security of all students.
- Results of all IOWA scores will be above the 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               |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| McCaskill, Kristen | Principal           |
| Kreinbihl, John    | Guidance Counselor  |
| Cannon, Lynn       | Instructional Coach |
| Lord, Chasity      | Assistant Principal |

#### Duties

**Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making**

The school leadership team is responsible for planning and contributing to the decision making process for the best educational plan for our students.

### Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

**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 identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**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     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**Date this data was collected**  
 Thursday 7/26/2018

**Year 2016-17 - 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     | 23          | 15 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 90    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 2  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 4           | 8  | 5  | 8  | 12 | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 17 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |

**Year 2016-17 - 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     | 23          | 15 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 90 |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 2  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 3  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 4           | 8  | 5  | 8  | 12 | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 42 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 17 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 41 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 23 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

Our lowest performing component was Math bottom quartile at 25%. This was a decline from 36% the prior year.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

Greatest decline from prior year was ELA learning gains from 54% to 36%.

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

The biggest gap when compared to state average was math bottom quartile- 47%-25%.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

Our most improved component was science achievement from 52%-66%.

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area**

Leading up to this change, our leadership team made sure science standards were being taught effectively in the lower grades. We also used our time to pull different resources to best meet the needs of our curriculum maps. PD was attended by our 5th grade science teacher.

### 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 | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                        | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement        | 49%    | 56%      | 56%   | 55%    | 54%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains     | 36%    | 41%      | 55%   | 54%    | 45%      | 57%   |

Dixie - 0101 - James M. Anderson Elementary School - 2018-19 SIP  
James M. Anderson Elementary School

| School Grade Component      | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 33%    | 38%      | 48%   | 44%    | 46%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 52%    | 61%      | 62%   | 55%    | 62%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 43%    | 50%      | 59%   | 54%    | 62%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 25%    | 36%      | 47%   | 36%    | 51%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 66%    | 72%      | 55%   | 52%    | 60%      | 51%   |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey |                                   |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Indicator                                     | Grade Level (prior year reported) |        |        |        |        |        | Total  |
|   | K                                 | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      |        |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   | 0 (23)                            | 0 (15) | 0 (12) | 0 (15) | 0 (12) | 0 (13) | 0 (90) |
| One or more suspensions                       | 0 (0)                             | 0 (2)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (1)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (3)  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math                 | 0 (4)                             | 0 (8)  | 0 (5)  | 0 (8)  | 0 (12) | 0 (5)  | 0 (42) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment               | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (2)  | 0 (17) | 0 (22) | 0 (41) |

**Grade Level Data**

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

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2018 | 58%    | 65%      | -7%                        | 57%   | 1%                      |
|                       | 2017 | 65%    | 66%      | -1%                        | 58%   | 7%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 41%    | 48%      | -7%                        | 56%   | -15%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 46%    | 47%      | -1%                        | 56%   | -10%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -24%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 45%    | 49%      | -4%                        | 55%   | -10%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 49%    | 42%      | 7%                         | 53%   | -4%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2018 | 54%    | 64%      | -10%                       | 62%   | -8%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 59%    | 66%      | -7%                        | 62%   | -3%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 55%    | 62%      | -7%                        | 62%   | -7%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 60%    | 65%      | -5%                        | 64%   | -4%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 42%    | 49%      | -7%                        | 61%   | -19%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 39%    | 48%      | -9%                        | 57%   | -18%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -18%   |          |                            |       |                         |

**Subgroup Data**

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| WHT                                       | 51       | 37     | 32          | 56        | 43      | 25           | 66       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 32       | 35     |             | 38        | 44      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 41       | 36     |             | 39        | 27      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| SWD                                       | 26       | 38     | 29          | 28        | 16      | 6            | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 45       | 34     | 33          | 50        | 40      | 23           | 62       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 2017 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 |
| WHT                                       | 57       | 50     | 33          | 56        | 56      | 33           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 41       | 67     |             | 50        | 58      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 60       |        |             | 60        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| SWD                                       | 15       | 18     | 13          | 17        | 35      | 24           | 15       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 51       | 48     | 41          | 50        | 50      | 37           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

**Areas of Focus:**



|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Activity #1</b>                   |  |
| <b>Title</b>                         | Improve our lowest performing compenent, Math bottom quartile (at 25%) to 50%.   |
| <b>Rationale</b>                     | This was a decline from 36% the prior year.  |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>              | To increase bottom quartile math scores to 50%   |
| <b>Point Person</b>                  | Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Action Step</b>                   |  |
| <b>Description</b>                   | Through added resources in the classroom and district math coach modeling lessons in the classroom. See SIP budget for list of resources to impact this Area of focus.   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>            | Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Plan to Monitor Effectiveness</b> |  |
| <b>Description</b>                   | Through iReady, we will monitor students success on previously determined needs from iready diagnostic. Classroom teacher and para will also collect records on bottom quartile students to address needs and change plan of cation as needed.   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>            | Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Activity #2</b>                   |  |
| <b>Title</b>                         | Improve ELA learning gains (at 36%) to 43%.  |
| <b>Rationale</b>                     | Greatest decline from prior year was ELA learning gains from 54% to 36%.   |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>              | Increase learning gains to 43%   |
| <b>Point Person</b>                  | Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Action Step</b>                   |  |
| <b>Description</b>                   | Determine needs of students from prior year FSA scores. Supplement curriculum with ready materials, which is explicit and rigorous. Contract with NEFEC to coach/model in the classrooms where needs are most evident accoring to FSA and iready diagnostic. RTI students who are deficient with SIPPS and iready printable lessons. After school tutoring services will also be provided to students deficient in reading. See SIP budget for list of resources to impact this Area of focus. |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>            | Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Plan to Monitor Effectiveness</b> |  |
| <b>Description</b>                   | Through iReady, we will monitor students success on previously determined needs from iready diagnostic. Classroom teacher and para will also collect records on bottom quartile students to address needs and change plan of cation as needed. RTI data will be kept and small group skills instruction changed as needed.   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>            | Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)   |

**Activity #3**

**Title** Improve overall ELA (at 49%) to 53%.  
**Rationale** Our ELA scores at 49% was a decline from prior year at 55%  
**Intended Outcome** Improve overall ELA from 49% to 53%  
**Point Person** Kristen McCaskill (kristenmccaskill@dixie.k12.fl.us)

**Action Step**

**Description** Through resources purchased through title 1, we will incorporate Ready materials as well as explicit, small group instruction. After school tutoring services will also be provided to students deficient in reading. See SIP budget for list of resources to impact this Area of focus.

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

**Plan to Monitor Effectiveness**

**Description** Through iReady, we will monitor students success on previously determined needs from iReady diagnostic. Classroom teacher and para will also collect records on bottom quartile students to address needs and change plan of cation as needed. RTI data will be kept and small group skills instruction changed as needed.

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

**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 Pilot SIP 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**

Please see our 2014-2015 Parental Involvement Plan.

**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**

The social-emotional needs of the students at Anderson Elementary are met using a tiered approach. The lowest level of support for our students is ensured by teachers maintaining a friendly and safe environment. Students are greeted warmly by teachers and staff when they arrive at school and throughout the day. Bulletin boards and classroom programs ensure that positive behaviors are encouraged and negative behaviors (e.g. bullying et. al.) are discouraged. As students needs for emotional support increase, counseling services are available through the Guidance Office. Both group and individual counseling sessions are available with our certified school guidance counselor. As parents

are the most powerful resource we have, they are involved with prompt communication as student needs arise. When parents and staff agree that a student has social emotional needs which cannot be met by school staff, local agencies (e.g. Meridian Behavior Healthcare Inc.) may be involved.

**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.

Parents are invited to participate during the school year in various activities that occur during the regular school day. Special parent lunches, programs, etc.

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**

**Implementation**

Using STAR assessment data and teacher input, students are placed in tiers for instruction.

Tier 1 student needs are met by the classroom teacher during the initial instruction period.

In addition to the initial instruction the Tier 2 student needs are met with an additional block of time to meet their individual needs. This is also provided by the regular classroom teacher using the assessment data that STAR provides.

In addition to the Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction provided, our Tier 3 students needs are met by a third block of time for instruction. This is provided by one of the following: classroom teacher, reading coach, P.E. coach, assistant principal, or guidance counselor.

**Monitoring**

Every four weeks our Tier 2 and 3 students are reassessed. At this time the grade level team meets and makes decisions about new placements for these students depending on their progress the previous four weeks. This cycle is repeated every four weeks.

Three times a year our school-wide MTSS/RTI team meets and makes data-based decisions on student movement up or down within the tiers.

Funding for all instruction is provided out of district and Title 1 funds.

Our town, Cross City, is in a rural part of our state. We are also on the Gulf coast. Agriculture, fishing, and the timber industry support many families in our community. Our school is carefully and thoughtfully trying to meet the needs of our students through these federal, state and local programs. Carol Anne Forehand, our Title 1 coordinator is our district contact person for Title 1 and most of these other programs. She makes sure the needs of these students are met so that they can participate in our academic programs on an equal basis with our other students. Extra para-pros have been hired to assist some of these subgroup students, extra materials are provided, etc.

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

Anderson Elementary school is now part of the AVID initiative. Advancement via Individual Determination. Students use WICOR (writing to learn, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading to learn) in their classwork to advance learning.

| Part V: Budget |              |
|----------------|--------------|
| Total:         | \$277,908.54 |





