

Manatee County Public Schools

Gene Witt Elementary School



2021-22 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 | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

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: 7/8/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 27% |
| 2020-21 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%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

* 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 | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

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) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | No | 22% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 27% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | 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 academically and behaviorally with respect for others while fostering life-long 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 | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| Marshall, David | Principal | Functions of an elementary school. |
| Barrett, Karen | Assistant Principal | Support school |
| Pellegrino, April | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Sanders, Michelle | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Solazzo, Joanne | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Douthett, Colleen | Instructional Media | |
| Schuneman, Laura | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Alcantara, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Dauphas, Eleanor | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/8/2021, 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

49

Total number of students enrolled at the school

671

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

3

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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 | 103 | 100 | 110 | 116 | 111 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 645 |
| 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 | 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 FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |

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 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/1/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 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 | |

2020-21 - 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 | 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 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 77% | 52% | 57% | 82% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 68% | 57% | 58% | 63% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 57% | 55% | 53% | 51% | 47% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 82% | 63% | 63% | 84% | 60% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 65% | 68% | 62% | 66% | 61% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 54% | 53% | 51% | 52% | 47% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 71% | 48% | 53% | 77% | 49% | 55% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 82% | 51% | 31% | 58% | 24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 56% | 8% | 58% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -82% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 81% | 52% | 29% | 56% | 25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 88% | 60% | 28% | 62% | 26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 82% | 65% | 17% | 64% | 18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -88% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 74% | 60% | 14% | 60% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -82% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 48% | 22% | 53% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Iready benchmark tool kit, dibels, weekly assessments.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 27.5 | 56.7 | 78 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23.1 | 56.5 | 63.6 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13 | 41.7 | 70.8 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 16.7 | 33.3 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 20.4 | 47.5 | 78 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13.6 | 30.4 | 72.7 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 9.1 | 33.3 | 70.8 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 33 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 56.8 | 70.3 | 84.4 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 47.3 | 53.2 | 77.6 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 28.7 | 47.7 | 60 |
| | English Language Learners | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 31.8 | 47.7 | 71.8 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28.1 | 35.4 | 64.5 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 19 | 19 | 42.9 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| Grade 3 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 73.1 | 86.1 | 80 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 44.4 | 66.7 | 84.4 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 36.2 | 47.8 | 78.3 |
| | English Language Learners | 20 | 40 | 80 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 25 | 56.8 | 85 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 5.6 | 39.3 | 69.3 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4.5 | 35.8 | 59.4 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 14.3 | 27.8 |
| | | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 77.1 | 77.8 | 85 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 60.8 | 62.5 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 35.7 | 42.9 | |
| | English Language Learners | 50 | 0 | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 90.4 | 69.7 | 87 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 81.8 | 62.3 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 61.6 | 35.7 | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 50 | |
| | | | | |
| Grade 5 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 76.2 | 71.3 | 79 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 65.3 | 66.6 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10 | 42.9 | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 76.1 | 80.5 | 77 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 64 | 73.3 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12.5 | 42.9 | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 65.5 | 64.6 | 73 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 57.7 | 50 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12.5 | 14.3 | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 100 | |
| | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 44 | 60 | | 53 | 60 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 47 | | | 63 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 82 | | | 91 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 74 | 69 | | 77 | 69 | | 77 | | | | |
| MUL | 86 | | | 86 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 87 | 70 | 59 | 89 | 72 | 65 | 80 | | | | |
| FRL | 67 | 52 | | 70 | 56 | 45 | 67 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 71 |
| 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 | 73 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 571 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 54 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 61 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 87 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 42 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 73 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 86 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 75 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 60 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

All grade levels increased scores from Fall, Winter and Spring. Sub groups also increased.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math for our 4th and 5th grade students.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Progress monitoring of our lowest quartile of students will be needed.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

From this data we need to increase math lowest quartile scores.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Progress monitor Lowest quartile students in grades 4 - 5.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Use of acaletics, review of monthly scrimmages, instructional support from intervention, and small group instruction with tutors.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Acaletics training for 4 - 5 teachers.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Implementation of best practices in math to ensure student learning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Gene Witt Learning Gains in the lowest quartile are 3 points lower than the district average. We will increase from 61% to 64% by May 2022. |
| Measurable Outcome: | When teachers engage in purposeful, collaborative planning that promotes rigorous standards based instruction, the percentage of identified lowest quartile students will increase by 3 points. |
| Monitoring: | We will use the prior year FSA data and match it with the district benchmark results for quarter 1 and 2. We will also use Acaletic Scrimmage on a monthly basis. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | David Marshall (marshald@manateeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Acaletics will be used daily to build student understanding of standards over time. We will provide Core 1 instruction with small group and individual lessons. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Use of Acaletics lessons and scrimmages will allow us to monitor students on a weekly and monthly basis. the benchmark data will be collected each quarter. Adjustments will be made based on student performance. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor daily Acaletic lessons.
- 2 Track Acaletic monthly scrimmage results.
3. Use Core 1 instruction assessments to identify individual weaknesses
4. Use the quarterly benchmarks assessment results.

Person Responsible Karen Barrett (barrettk@manateeschools.net)

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Based on the 2020- 2021 Witt SEL survey students at Gene Witt raised their Emotion Regulation 2 point from October 2020 to May 2021. The increase was from 44% to 46%. All areas of the SEL students competecies were higher than the district average. Emotion Regulation was the lowest area at Witt |
| Measurable Outcome: | Students in grades K - 5 will have direct instruction of the character traits on a monthly basis. Students will share their emotion on a daily basis. Teachers will use trade books to create lessons that reflect positive character traits. Based on the SEL survey Gene Witt will increase their Emotion Reulation by 3 points during the 2021-2022 school year. |
| Monitoring: | Teachers will monitor the daily emotion of students and track regulation data each month. Teachers will monitor the outcome one week out of each month. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | David Marshall (marshald@manateeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Monthly lessons provided by the classroom teachers. Lessons provided by the school counselors during the school year. Student data collected each month. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Based on the SEL survey this is our weakest competency. Lessons will be developed to introducce, practice and praise student character traits. Trade books will be purchased to support the tratis. |

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Lowest quartile in math has increased in the past 5 years. We continue to make progress. However, we have not met a year to year growth goal during this time. The ILT will monitor iReady data for tier 2 and tier 3 students in grades 4 - 5. We will use benchmark data from quarter 1 and 2 and look at the monthly acaletics scrimmages. The ILT wil identify specific standards or lessons to support struggling students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the lowest quartile from 61% to 64% in math.

Monitoring: The ILT will monitor iReady data for tier 2 and tier 3 students in grades 4 - 5. We will use benchmark data from quarter 1 and 2 and look at the monthly acaletics scrimmages. The ILT wil identify specific standards or lessons to support struggling students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: David Marshall (marshald@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: ILT will meet monthly to review data and support standards that are the weakest for our lowest quartile group. We will use the Comprehensive Domain Review materials to target specific standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Target the lowest quartile students. We will use Iready, acaletics, and benchmark data along with the Savaas math.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Gene Witt does not have significant behavior or discipline data to warrant additional improvement priorities.

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.

We have an SEL committee that promotes positive culture for our school. We have monthly character traits that are taught and reviewed. Trade books are used to provide examples of the expected trait. Students are recognized for practicing the trait each month.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Cynthia Deras- School Counselor, Jaclyn Andon - school counselor, Karen Barrett - Assistant Principal, Amy Lindsey - Student Support Specialist, Jennifer Alcantara, April Pellegrino, Michelle Sander, Joanne Sollazzo, Eleanor Dauphas, Laura Schunemant, Colleen Douthett - K - 5 teachers.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|--|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |