

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Witter 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	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Witter Elementary School

10801 N 22ND ST, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ginette Hoze

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (37%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* 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 Hillsborough 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	19

Witter Elementary School

10801 N 22ND ST, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

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	Yes	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	D	D	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

To provide an education that enables each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become the nation's leader in developing successful students.

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
Irving, Rita Ann	Principal	To serve as an instructional leader in order to promote teacher and student growth.
Penney, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Ginette Hoze

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.*

1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (37%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* 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	65	80	83	93	81	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480	
Attendance below 90 percent	20	27	35	29	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	0	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	80	80	83	99	65	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	2	3	7	3	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	
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	40	26	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	

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	2	4	4	6	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	

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	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	80	80	83	99	65	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	2	3	7	3	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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	40	26	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	2	4	4	6	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	32%	52%	57%	44%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	55%	58%	65%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	50%	53%	69%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	31%	54%	63%	43%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	38%	57%	62%	59%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	51%	70%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	50%	53%	41%	48%	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	23%	52%	-29%	58%	-35%
	2018	37%	53%	-16%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	55%	-20%	58%	-23%
	2018	22%	55%	-33%	56%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
	2018	40%	51%	-11%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	26%	54%	-28%	62%	-36%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	24%	57%	-33%	64%	-40%
	2018	24%	57%	-33%	62%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2019	31%	54%	-23%	60%	-29%
	2018	39%	54%	-15%	61%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	29%	51%	-22%	53%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	38%	52%	-14%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	9	26	32	19	36	47	14				
ELL	31	47	50	25	34	38	29				
BLK	28	45	45	24	28	29	22				
HSP	38	45	43	35	45	62	36				
MUL	31			54							
FRL	32	44	44	31	38	39	30				
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	28	35	36	29	44	54					
ELL	28	40	50	32	53	64					
BLK	24	37	50	35	43	44	32				
HSP	44	42	44	45	49	62	47				
MUL	45			45							
WHT	46			54							
FRL	35	39	49	41	44	54	45				
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	31	69	75	51	74	90	38				
ELL	40	66		31	45	40	20				
BLK	40	67	73	40	54	76	38				
HSP	45	63	58	41	60	54	39				
WHT	55			50							
FRL	44	65	69	44	59	70	41				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	319
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	43
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

The following data components with the lowest performance in the year 2019:

ELA Achievement 32% (-4% from 2018)

Math Achievement 31% (-10% from 2018)

Science Achievement 29% (-15% from 2018)

Based on the following data, it appears core instruction across content areas requires strengthening: ELA Achievement, 23% of Grade 3, 35% of Grade 4, and 31% of Grade 5 students scored 3 or above.

Mathematics Achievement, 26% of Grade 3, 24% of Grade 4, and 31% of Grade 5 students scored 3 or above.

Our lowest performing ESSA subgroup is Students with Disabilities with a Federal Index of 26% followed by our Black/African American subgroup with a Federal Index of 36%.

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

All data with the exception of ELA Learning Gains showed declines in the 2019 school grade components. The data with the greatest decline was Science with a 15% decrease in achievement. Factors contributing to the decline are teacher content knowledge of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and all instructional units being self-contained.

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 (32%) in comparison to the state average was Math Achievement. The state average was 62% while Witter Elementary was 31%. Specific grade level gaps are as follows:
 36% in Grade 3
 40% in Grade 4
 29% in Grade 5

5/6 ESSA subgroup(s) for Mathematics achievement are as follows:
 Students with Disabilities 19%
 ELL 25%
 Black/African American 24%
 Hispanic 35%
 Economically Disadvantaged 31%

Contributing factors include teacher content knowledge and strategies for supporting students to reach desired learning targets.

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

The data component reflecting the most improvement was ELA Learning Gains with a 5% increase from 40% to 45%. According to the 2019-2020 School Improvement Plan, this was attributed to a "heavy focus on ELA with additional professional development and site-based resource support."

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

Attendance less than 90% and student tardies.

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

1. Achievement in ELA, Mathematics, and Science
2. Learning Gains in Mathematics (27%)
3. Learning Gains in Lowest Quartile in Reading (36%) and Mathematics (31%)
4. SWD ESSA Subgroup
5. Black/African American ESSA Subgroup

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on our data, student achievement in ELA, Mathematics, and Science were identified as components that decreased in the 2019 school year. 2020 projections created by HCPS Assessment and Accountability Department showed decreases in all components with the exception of Mathematics Achievement. Projected Total Points showed a decrease from 259 (37% points) to 240 (34% points).

From the data, one can infer that core instruction in all content areas is an area of growth, specifically in understanding the depth and expectations of grade level standards, planning protocols to support standard and task alignment, and implementation of strategies to deliver high quality, equitable instructional.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase ELA Achievement from 32% to 41% as measured by Florida Standards Assessment.

Increase ELA Learning Gains from 45% to 60% as measured by Florida Standards Assessment.

Increase ELA Learning Gains of Lowest 25% from 44% to 60% as measured by Florida Standards Assessment.

Increase Mathematics Achievement from 31% to 41% as measured by Florida Standards Assessment.

Increase Mathematics Learning Gains from 38% to 50% as measured by Florida Standards Assessment.

Increase Mathematics Learning Gains of Lowest 25% from 40% to 50% as measured by Florida Standards Assessment.

Increase Science Achievement from 29% to 41% as measured by Statewide Science Assessment.

* ESSA Subgroups are included in these increases.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rita Ann Irving (ritaann.irving@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Facilitated collaborative planning of specific content areas
2. Professional development for standards-based instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Support the development of high quality lessons utilizing sound instructional practices and deepen teachers' understanding of grade level content and standards. This will ensure students will receive instruction aligned to expectations of the grade level standards to meet learners' individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Restructure master schedule to ensure dedicated and protected common planning time for all grade levels on a weekly basis facilitated by a site-based coach.

a. Time will be scheduled from 7:00-8:00 am.

b. Schedule for supervision will be created for student safety during "Wildcat Walk"

Person Responsible

Jennifer Penney (jennifer.penney@hcps.net)

Establish systems for effective planning.

a. School-wide protocols and expectations for planning

Before planning: Review planning resources to include standards, FSA Test Item Specifications, ELA and

math resources (i.e. Heinemann Math in Practice, Reading Strategies, etc.)

During planning: Develop common understanding and expectations of standards. Select tasks aligned to standard and determine facilitation of instruction to include technology integration (i.e. Epson BrightLink projectors, Chromebook, etc.) Develop formative assessment(s) including tasks shared via Microsoft Forms. Capture planning and content notes shared in grade level Channels within Microsoft Teams, accessible to Leadership Team and administration.

After planning: Team leaders share planning notes in order for administration to monitor the transfer of planning and instruction.

b. Evidence of common planning including planning notes to monitor standard and task alignment, formal and informal daily assessments, planned questions to promote thinking, and small group instruction

Person Responsible Rita Ann Irving (ritaann.irving@hcps.net)

Collaborate with school-level leadership team and district-level support to provide professional development on standards-aligned instruction to include:

- a. Utilization of planning resources (i.e. Item Specifications, Achievement Level Descriptors, CPALMS, Implementation Guides, Heinemann Math in Practice, Reading Strategies, etc.)
- b. Leverage site-based leaders for job-embedded professional development including Learning Walks, classroom observations, side-by-side coaching, etc.
- c. Secure substitutes to allow opportunities for teachers to engage in professional development opportunities
- d. Increase use of classroom technology, specifically in Microsoft Office 365 platform in order to: Monitor learners' understanding of standards (Excel)
- e. Provide ongoing and instantaneous feedback to learners (Forms, Teams, and OneNote)
- f. Support best instructional practices in developing an understanding of standards (Epson BrightLink projectors)
- g. Differentiate for instructional strategies and resources to meet the demand of the grade level standard, specifically for ESSA subgroups including Black, SWD, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged

Person Responsible Rita Ann Irving (ritaann.irving@hcps.net)

Establish systems for progress monitoring.

- a. Establish schedule for content-specific and grade level walkthroughs
- b. Identify specific look-fors to monitor transfer of planning and/or professional development to instruction
- c. Create a template via Microsoft Forms to capture both qualitative and quantitative walkthrough data
- d. Analyze walkthrough trends in Microsoft Forms to determine next steps in common planning and/or coaching support.
- e. Analyze student data to identify content, grade level, teacher, and individual student trends in order to determine next steps and prioritize instructional supports (schedule time dedicated to data analysis to review and create a plan following district-based formative assessments)
- f. Respond to data trends to support students in our ESSA Subgroups scoring below 41% (Black, SWD, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged Students)
- f. Utilize data to intentionally support individual students through programs such as Extended Learning Program (ELP) and Saturday Academy. Both remediation and enrichment opportunities will be provided.

Person Responsible Rita Ann Irving (ritaann.irving@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on school culture data including 2019 SCIP and 2020 ASQI, social emotional learning was identified as an area of focus for the 2020 school year. There is a need to further develop an understanding the impact trauma, poverty, and lack of exposure has on closing the achievement gap for all learners, including our ESSA subgroups.

Measurable Outcome: Based on the SCIP indicators, the following percentages of agreement will increase from:
 Students at this school treat others with respect (24% to 50%)
 I enjoy coming to school (64% to 80%)
 I feel safe at school (69% to 100%)

Based on school discipline data, the total number of referrals will decrease from:
 2019-2020 (117)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rita Ann Irving (ritaann.irving@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: 1. Professional development for social-emotional learning (SEL) to create culturally responsive classrooms

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Support the development of teacher understanding of SEL to build capacity and create culturally responsive classrooms that model appropriate conflict resolution and strategies for self-regulation.

Action Steps to Implement

Establish a Student Services Team including School Counselor, School Psychologist, School Social Worker, and Rtl Resource

Person Responsible Rita Ann Irving (ritaann.irving@hcps.net)

Revisit and revise school-wide behavior expectations including:
 a. Procedures in classrooms
 b. Procedures in common areas (hallways, cafeteria, etc.)
 c. Protocol for disruptive behaviors which impede the learning environment including communication with administration and Student Services Team

Person Responsible Jennifer Penney (jennifer.penney@hcps.net)

Establish a system to monitor SEL to include:
 a. Classroom walkthroughs
 b. Analyzing trends in behavior data
 c. Individual coaching supports for teachers
 d. Small group and/or individualized supports for students

Person Responsible Jennifer Penney (jennifer.penney@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Witter Elementary will engage parents and families through several events and informational sessions throughout the school year. We will have a continued focus on parental and community support of academics, as well as the social and emotional health of our students. Our goal is to increase opportunities to meaningfully engage with our parents, families, and stakeholders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$244,521.86
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$66,150.00
			Notes: Reading Coach will facilitate content-area preparation for student learning. Coach will meet with teams of teachers weekly for planning, facilitate coaching cycles, provide feedback, and lead professional development.			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$56,500.00
			Notes: Rtl Resource will support teachers in problem-solving process for academics, behavior, and attendance. Rtl Resource will be involved in close monitoring of student progress and establishing next steps to meet the needs individual students.			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$5,850.00

			<i>Notes: Microsoft Office 365 training with Connection. 32 teachers x 6 hours of professional development over two days to focus on Teams, OneNote, Forms, and Excel. (32 teachers x 12 hours x \$15 ~ \$5,850)</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,322.00
			<i>Notes: Heinemann Math in Practice Books will be used during math planning sessions to support content building and instructional best practices. 6 to 8 Grade level sets. The prices vary (38 sets (2 titles per set) = \$3,322).</i>			
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,640.00
			<i>Notes: Substitute teachers will be utilized for classroom coverage during professional development opportunities (Learning Walks, etc) and progress monitoring meetings (Academic Reviews, PLCs, etc.) 1 extended planning block per session. Each grade level team will participate in 6 sessions throughout the year. Substitutes will rotate throughout the grade level during the day (6 days x 11 subs needed each day x \$120 per day).</i>			
	5100	621-Audio Visual Materials Capitalized	4921 - Witter Elementary School			\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Epson 685 wi BrightLink projectors in the classroom will allow for the seamless integration of technology into classroom instruction. Projectors will allow for students and teachers to showcase work, enhance dialogue, and provide instantaneous feedback in a live environment.</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$15,062.99
			<i>Notes: T Payroll will be utilized for planning, data analysis, progress monitoring, and content building, beyond contractual hours 32 teachers x 12 hours throughout the year @ \$35 per hour = \$13,440</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$16,944.00
			<i>Notes: Fall ELP, Summer ELP, and Saturday Academy will be intentionally planned for remediation and enrichment opportunities following formative data analysis. 12 teachers x 6 hours per week x \$27 per hour x 6 weeks throughout the year = \$11,664.</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$11,838.59
			<i>Notes: Instructional supplies as well as for professional development and planning will be purchased including chart paper, markers, post-its, etc. per- 5% cap</i>			
	6400	210-Retirement	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$5,602.91
			<i>Notes: Reading Coach Retirement 8.47%</i>			
	6400	220-Social Security	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$4,101.30
			<i>Notes: Reading Coach FICA 6.2%</i>			
	6400	220-Social Security	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$959.18
			<i>Notes: Reading Coach Medicare 1.45%</i>			
	6400	240-Workers Compensation	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$337.37
			<i>Notes: Reading Coach Workers Comp .51%</i>			
	6400	230-Group Insurance	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$12,568.50
			<i>Notes: Reading Coach Health Ins 19%</i>			

	5100	210-Retirement	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$4,785.55
			<i>Notes: Rtl Resource Retirement 8.47%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,503.00
			<i>Notes: Rtl Resource FICA 6.2%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$819.25
			<i>Notes: Rtl Resource Medicare 1.45%</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$288.15
			<i>Notes: Rtl Resource Workers Comp .51%</i>			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$10,735.00
			<i>Notes: Rtl Resource Health Ins 19%</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,138.37
			<i>Notes: T-payroll - retirement @ 8.47%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$833.28
			<i>Notes: T-payroll - social security (FICA) @ 6.20%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$194.88
			<i>Notes: T-payroll - social security (medicare) @ 1.45%</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$68.54
			<i>Notes: T-payroll - workers comp @ .51%</i>			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$4,400.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase Nearpod and Flocabulary subscriptions with quote attached. Nearpod/ Flocabulary School wide subscriptions will be used to for 600 students K-5 to increase student engagement, build vocabulary development and improve student learning.</i>			
	5000	510-Supplies	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: Items needed for science instruction include growing gators, weather watcher thermometers, hands lens, forceps, tape measures, stopwatches, scales, graduated cylinders, eye droppers, mirrors, flashlights, solar race cars, soldering irons, glue guns, five senses/sound kits, sink and float kits, magnets, rocks, UV beads, owl pellets, tuning forks, batteries, bins. These materials will support the entire school population and be used K-5.</i>			
	6400	510-Supplies	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,600.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase professional development books for the training: Understanding Text and Readers 35 at \$36=1080, Patterns of Power: Inviting Young Writers Into the Conversation of Language 35 copies at \$50 =1500, and Math Exchanges: Guiding Young Mathematicians in Small Group Meetings 35 copies at \$34=1020.</i>			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$804.00

			<i>Notes: The school will purchase Sunshine State Readers for K-5 classroom to support reading and writing instructions through books. Purchase 7 sets at \$192 per set for K-2 = \$1344 and 6 sets at \$134 per set for 3rd-5th =\$804 .</i>			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	4921 - Witter Elementary School	UniSIG		\$7,975.00
			<i>Notes: Our resource teachers will facilitate 3 trainings, (reading, writing, and math) at \$15 per hour for 30 teachers for 5 hours each training=\$7975 with fringe.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
					Total:	\$252,248.75