

Manatee County Public Schools

Gene Witt Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Gene Witt Elementary School

200 RYE RD E, Bradenton, FL 34212

<https://www.manateeschools.net/witt>

Demographics

Principal: Connie Dixon

Start Date for this Principal: 9/9/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Gene Witt Elementary School

200 RYE RD E, Bradenton, FL 34212

<https://www.manateeschools.net/witt>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	21%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

Gene Witt Elementary School community will work together to assist all students in reaching their highest potential and to foster a love of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gene Witt Elementary will challenge children of all abilities to achieve excellence in all areas of academics and in their social development. It will equip children for the demands and the opportunities of the twenty-first century by offering a differentiated and rigorous curriculum to all students, as well as opportunities to become good citizens. As a school community made up of a professional and highly motivated staff, in partnership with parents, we will encourage every child to achieve.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Marshall, David	Principal	
Solazzo, Joanne	Teacher, K-12	
Douthett, Colleen	Teacher, K-12	
Houston, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Pellegrino, April	Teacher, K-12	
Burke, Catherine	Teacher, K-12	
Barrett, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Sanders, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/9/2020, Connie Dixon

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

14

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	90	106	107	120	106	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	652
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	113	112	126	125	134	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	722
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	77%	52%	57%	77%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	57%	58%	68%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	55%	53%	56%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	82%	63%	63%	79%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	68%	62%	64%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	53%	51%	53%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	71%	48%	53%	69%	42%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	51%	31%	58%	24%
	2018	83%	49%	34%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%
	2018	76%	51%	25%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2019	81%	52%	29%	56%	25%
	2018	80%	52%	28%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	88%	60%	28%	62%	26%
	2018	86%	56%	30%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	65%	17%	64%	18%
	2018	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	74%	60%	14%	60%	14%
	2018	81%	58%	23%	61%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	48%	22%	53%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	76%	49%	27%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	43	40	43	57	47	48	23				
ELL	50	64		67	45						
ASN	81			94							
BLK	40	80		40	64						
HSP	76	71		78	57		69				
MUL	76			94							
WHT	79	67	50	84	66	54	74				
FRL	60	71	61	65	52	45	48				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	55	31	29	55	54	48	33				
ELL	36	30		64	70						
ASN	75			100							
HSP	74	63	50	84	74		69				
WHT	85	65	52	86	66	54	77				
FRL	64	43	33	65	58	38	57				
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
SWD	46	61	52	54	44	35	48				
ELL	19			38							
ASN	82			91							
HSP	59	59	53	70	54	38	38				
MUL	80			90							
WHT	80	68	55	80	66	60	77				
FRL	59	61	60	63	57	48	47				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
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	87
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	561
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	63
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	88
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
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	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	85
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
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	57
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.

Our Learning Gains for Math is 3 points lower than the district average and is 3 points higher than the state average. The ELL subgroup and SWD subgroup percentages both dropped from 2018 to 2019. The ELL and SWD students that were below proficiency did not make learning gains. Students that were in the top third of level 1 and higher half of level 2 did not make enough gain.

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

Grade 5 ELA results declined 12% from 2018-2019. Reviewing the quarterly benchmark data the percent of students that dropped was consistent from quarter 1 - FSA results. Instruction of grade level standards and rigor of the work may be contributing factors.

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.

Gene Witt was above the state average in all 7 categories.

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

Our greatest increase was 3rd grade math. We moved up 2% from the previous year. We have a new math series. We are in the second year of implementation.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our learning gains are the areas that continue to lag behind our achievement. While we are above the state average in proficiency, we are striving to get above 62% in all areas.

The second area of concern is Science. We dropped 6 point from 76% to 70% from 2018-2019.

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

1. Learning gains in math.
2. Science increase.
3. Learning gains lowest quartile in math
4. Learning gains in ELA
5. Learning gains lowest quartile in ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Our Science FSA percentage dropped from 76 percent to 70 percentage point

Measurable Outcome: When teachers engage in purposeful, collaborative planning that promotes that promotes rigorous standards based and student driven instruction, the percentage of FCAT science will increase from 70 percentage points to 74.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Marshall (marshald@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The district Science Specialist has developed lessons to review 3rd and 4th grade science standards. The specialists can support science instruction in collaborative planning by sharing resources and aiding with standards based planning. We will use the lessons developed in schoology. These lessons are directly linked to the tested science standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The FCAT Science Assessment encompasses standards from the third, fourth and fifth curriculum. Using the schoology resource will allow time to review and reteach prior year standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Introduce the Schoology Science information to teachers.
2. Make a plan to implement the lessons into the curriculum.
3. Monitor student success with formative assessments
4. Use the quarterly benchmark test to monitor student success.

Person Responsible

David Marshall (marshald@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Math was an area that was identified as 3 points lower than the district average.

Measurable Outcome:

When teachers engage in purposeful, collaborative planning that promotes that promotes rigorous standards based and student driven instruction, the percentage of the identified lowest quartile students in math will increase from 65 to 68 percent.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Marshall (marshald@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will use the prior year FSA data and match it with the district benchmark results for quarter 1 and quarter 2. We will also monitor individual student iReady data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The benchmark assessment will give us information over time that we will use to make adjustment to instruction.
Using iReady, we can monitor growth on a weekly basis. If necessary, we can then pull small groups or individual students to review or reteach a math standard.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor and track individual student growth
2. Use tier 2 and 3 progress monitoring
3. assign additional lessons in iReady as needed.
4. Use the quarterly benchmark testing results.

Person Responsible

David Marshall (marshald@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The Leadership Team will use Rtl data to monitor Tier 2 and 3 students monthly. The quarterly benchmark tests will be used to determine what standards need additional instruction. Small groups will be created. Mileage funds will be used to provide additional instruction after school or through during the day instruction with a tutor.