Witter Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: D (37%) 2017-18: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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

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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	96%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		D	D

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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities**.**:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Irving, Rita Ann	Principal	
Trombley, Calvin	Assistant Principal	
Olson, Chelsea	Reading Coach	
Nalepa, Carly	Math Coach	
Stone-Hamilton, Samantha	Behavior Specialist	RtI Resource
Lozano, Roxane	Instructional Media	
Pimienta, Garrick	Staffing Specialist	ESE Specialist
Soto, Cherilyn	ELL Compliance Specialist	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Ginette Hoze

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
28

Total number of students enrolled at the school
499

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	56	79	67	91	66	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	429
Attendance below 90 percent	0	34	31	39	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	21	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	4	11	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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
Monday 8/29/2022

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	86	74	79	104	75	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	506
Attendance below 90 percent	39	31	29	43	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	35	22	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	41	40	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	

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	86	74	79	104	75	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	506
Attendance below 90 percent	39	31	29	43	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	35	22	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	41	40	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	27%	53%	56%				32%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						45%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						44%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	39%	50%	50%				31%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						38%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%						40%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	59%	59%				29%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	23%	52%	-29%	58%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	55%	-20%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	26%	54%	-28%	62%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	24%	57%	-33%	64%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
05	2022					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	60%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	29%	51%	-22%	53%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	7	38	59	19	65	72	10				
ELL	22	49	25	40	61	50	35				
BLK	24	50	59	34	63	84	29				
HSP	30	54	36	46	68	53	31				
MUL	36			45							
FRL	27	50	60	38	64	74	28				

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	9	25		15	45	60	12				
ELL	27	57		34	53		31				
BLK	27	42		28	55		26				
HSP	31	47		40	56		34				
WHT	20			20							
FRL	27	45	55	31	54	68	26				

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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	48
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	46
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	41
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Mathematics achievement, learning gains, and learning gains of the lowest 25%ile over a four year period outperformed English Language Arts (ELA) achievement, learning gains, and learning gains of the lowest 25%ile as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment. ELA achievement decreased by nine percent points over a four year period. Science achievement decreased from 44 to 29 and then stagnated over the past three FSA captures.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data components that demonstrated the greatest need for improvement are ELA and Science achievement. The ELA and Science achievement components have decreased over a four year trend.

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

The contributing factors that lead to this need for improvement was a lack of instruction relative to reading comprehension. The need for improved reading comprehension surfaced in the science achievement component. New actions that will need to be taken are a focus on reading comprehension in primary grades instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Mathematics learning gains demonstrated the most improvement over a four year period. In the learning gains and learning gains of the lowest 25th%ile components increase by approximately 20 percentage points.

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

The contributing factors for increased student growth in the area of mathematics was a focus on standards based instruction. Planning for instruction centered on alignment of the learning target and student task.

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

The strategies that need to be implemented to accelerate learning are continuing to work to align the standards based learning target to the student learning task.

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.

The change to BEST standards presents an opportunity to use the Big M and other state released materials to developing professional learning opportunities around planning for standards based instruction. This planning will include deliberate checks for understanding and scaffolding strategies that provide equitable access for all students to the learning opportunities. Professional learning will be guided by data to foster growth in teacher clarity, questioning for understanding, release of learning and increasing student dialogue focusing on academic language.

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

Teacher are provided with one hour of uninterrupted planning time a week. Teachers also have 45 minutes per day of planning during specials time. We have many new teachers this school year. This time affords our coaches the opportunity to provide data and planning services that will build teacher capacity to sustain improvement.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Student achievement related to ELA, Mathematics, and Science are identified as components underperforming in relation to our learning gains and lowest quartile gains. With the shift to B.E.S.T. standards, core instruction requires strengthening. More specifically, it is critical to understand the depth and expectations of grade level standards. Established collaborative planning protocols for before, during, and after planning will support the development of coherent instruction and high-leverage strategies to deliver high quality standards-aligned instruction.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Achievement scores will increase from spring 2022 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) to Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) and Statewide Science Assessment (SSA): ELA Achievement (27% to 30%) Mathematics Achievement (39% to 42%) Science Achievement (29% to 32%)
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This Area of Focus will be monitored through strategic classroom walkthroughs using a school-created Microsoft Form. This Form's observables will align with our Area of Focus to monitor progress towards high quality standards-aligned instruction and include opportunities for both quantitative and qualitative data. Student assessment data for both formative and adaptive assessments will allow for additional opportunities for monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rita Ann Irving (ritaann.irving@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	1. Ongoing feedback based on classroom walkthrough observation data. 2. Facilitated collaborative planning based on B.E.S.T. standards and research-based best practices 3. Data analysis sessions 4. Site-based professional development focused on standards-based instruction and instructional best practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for	Based on our number of students who are not yet scoring 3+ on statewide assessments, the supports of ongoing feedback, collaborative planning, data analysis, and site-based PD will increase teacher capacity and knowledge of students to increase the percentage of students achieving a 3 or higher.

**selecting this
strategy.**

The master schedule ensures dedicated and protected common planning time for all grade levels on a
weekly basis, facilitated by site-based coaches, to plan for standards-aligned instruction. This occurs from
7:00-8:00 am.

**Person
Responsible**   Calvin Trombley (calvin.trombley@hcps.net)

Establish systems for effective instructional planning. Content-area coaches (Reading and Math Coach)
will collaborate with administration to develop protocols for planning including:
Before planning: Review planning resources including B.E.S.T. standards, ELA and Math resources (i.e.
Wonders, STEMscopes, district resources)
During planning: Develop a common understanding of the standards utilizing benchmark clarifications.
Select tasks aligned to standards and determine facilitation of instruction including technology integration
(i.e. Newline display panels) Develop formative assessment(s).
After planning: Monitor implementation of plans into instructional practice including evidence of task
alignment, formal and informal assessments, planned questions and discourse strategies, and small group
instruction.

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

The school leadership team and district level support will provide professional development on high quality
standards-aligned instruction to include:
a. Utilization of planning resources
b. Targeted job-embedded professional development focused on instructional practices (i.e. learning
walks, coaching cycles, side-by-side coaching, and peer-developed PD)
c. Provided professional development opportunities by securing substitutes for classroom coverage
d. Increase use of classroom technology, including Newline display panels, to monitor students'
understanding, provide immediate feedback, and differentiate strategies and resources
e. Specific strategies to address the under-performing ESSA Subgroup (SWD)

**Person
Responsible**   Chelsea Olson (chelsea.olson@hcps.net)

Implement systems for progress monitoring:
a. Follow schedule for content-specific walkthroughs conducted by leadership team
b. Utilize look-fors to monitor the transfer of plans to practice
c. Use a systems to capture both qualitative and quantitative data (Microsoft Forms)
d. Analyze walkthrough trends to determine next steps in 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
f. Dedicated time will be provided following district and site-based formative assessments for data chats to
conduct data analysis and action planning. Time will be dedicated on the agenda for an in-depth analysis
of the progress and needs of our underperforming ESSA subgroup (SWD).

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

Provided targeted support to specifically identified groups of students through Extended Learning Program
(ELP) including Saturday Academy opportunities. Hire highly-effective staff to provide both remediation
and enrichment opportunities to students. Teachers will use school and district formative assessments to

monitor students' growth as a result of the additional instruction provided. The Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, and Math Coach will review the tutorial plans used during instruction.

Person Responsible   Calvin Trombley (calvin.trombley@hcps.net)

Purchase instructional supplies to support task alignment and standards-based planning. Instructional suppies include:
Math manipulatives
Science tools
Student notebooks
White boards
Chart paper
Clip boards
Headphones
Folders, binders
These supplies will be used by students and teachers to provide access to appropriate grade-level tasks.

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

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Rationale: Based on spring 2022 Panorama Education student survey data, students had a low perception of the following topic: School Safety 46% favorable responses (0-19th percentile compared to others nationally) The need for positive behavior intervention supports and social-emotional learning curriculum is necessary. Students and teachers receive ongoing support in understanding and implementing PBIS Rewards and Response to Intervention, in order to meet the needs of students.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	From the spring 2022 student Panorama Education student survey data, scores will increase on the spring 2023 survey as listed below: School Safety (46% to 60%)
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Data will be monitored from multiple data sources including 2022-2023 Panorama Education student surveys, EdConnect discipline (Behavior Tracker and Office Discipline Referrals), and PBIS Rewards fidelity data in order to assess effectiveness or tiered behavior system and SEL implementation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Samantha Stone-Hamilton (samantha.stone-hamilton@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. Behavior Matrix to support tiered behavior system 2. Professional development to create culturally responsive and trauma-informed classrooms
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Support the development of teacher understanding of effective behavior management and social-emotional learning in order to build capacity in creating culturally responsive and trauma-informed classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The RtI Resource Teacher and leadership team will support teachers as they implement a school-wide Behavior Matrix expectations including:
a. Procedures in classrooms
b. Procedures in common areas (hallways, cafeteria, Media Center, etc.)
c. Protocol for disruptive behaviors impeding the learning environment (Majors vs. Minors and Behavior Tracker vs. Office Discipline Referral)

Person Responsible	Samantha Stone-Hamilton (samantha.stone-hamilton@hcps.net)

The RtI Resource Teacher supports teachers' implementation of the following social-emotional learning supports in each classroom including:
a. Zones of Regulation for emotional regulation
b. Sanford Harmony

c. Inner Explorer for mindfulness
d. Peace Corner/Safe Space (purpose, components, and examples)

Person Responsible   Samantha Stone-Hamilton (samantha.stone-hamilton@hcps.net)

Utilize the system to progress monitor the Behavior Matrix expectations and social-emotional learning including:
a. Schedule for walkthroughs conducted by the leadership team
b. Specific look-fors to capture both qualitative and quantitative data
c. Walkthrough trends to determine next steps in planning and/or coaching support

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

RtI Resource will serve as a chairperson of the behavior and SEL committees and will lead professional development alongside committee members. Committee will be responsible for establishing school-wide behavior expectations including transitions, cafeteria, dismissal, classroom, etc. Committee will also monitor data from multiple sources including 2022-2023 Panorama Education student services, discipline, and PBIS Rewards data in order to assess the effectiveness of the tiered behavior system and SEL implementation.

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Spring 2022 results from Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), minimal growth was made from spring 2021 to spring 2022 in the areas of ELA Learning Gains and Learning Gains of Lowest 25%. As stated in the Instructional Practice Area of Practice related to Standards-aligned Instruction, the majority of students are scoring a Level 1 or 2. Many of our students have needs in foundational skills, specifically in phonics. A focus on foundational skills and standards-aligned will be provided, resulting in more students reaching on grade level goals.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Spring 2022 results from Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), minimal growth was made from spring 2021 to spring 2022 in the areas of ELA Learning Gains and Learning Gains of Lowest 25%. As stated in the Instructional Practice Area of Practice related to Standards-aligned Instruction, the majority of students are scoring a Level 1 or 2. Many of our students have needs in foundational skills, specifically in phonics. A focus on foundational skills and standards-aligned will be provided, resulting in more students reaching on grade level goals.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

On the spring summative Star Early Literacy and Star Reading assessments, 35% of students will score on grade level.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

On the spring summative Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) assessment, 35% of students will score on grade level.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

This Area of Focus will be monitored through strategic classroom walkthroughs including quantitative data. Formative and adaptive student assessment data will be utilized to monitor progress in both foundational skills and core grade-level instruction. Monitoring for the desired outcome will be ongoing, including ELA progress monitoring assessments and i-Ready Diagnostic assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Olson, Chelsea, chelsea.olson@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

1. On-going feedback to teachers based on the classroom walkthrough observation data.
2. Facilitated collaborative planning based on student data analysis
3. Professional development for foundational skills grade-level standards-based instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The need for scaffolded instruction was determined based on historical student data performing below grade level. The further development of teachers' expertise through ongoing feedback, professional development, and collaboration through planning sessions was determined from walkthroughs during 2021-2022. These strategies will ensure students receive instruction aligned to expectations of the grade-level standards to meet learners' needs.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Hire a Reading Coach. The Reading Coach will plan weekly with grade level teams and individual teachers to ensure high-quality instruction is provided to all students. Reading Coach will implement coaching cycles including goal-setting and specific instructional feedback. Following adaptive and formative assessments, Reading Coach will facilitate data chats to identify grade level, classroom level, and individual student data trends. Coach will also support next step action planning based on assessment results. Reading Coach will provide specific instructional support to prioritized students in grades 3-5, both in the Lowest Quartile and in our identified ESSA subgroups (Students with Disabilities). Monitoring: The principal will monitor the Reading Coach's coaching log, observe the Coach during coaching and planning sessions and provide feedback.	Irving, Rita Ann, ritaann.irving@hcps.net
Establish systems for effective instructional planning. The Reading Coach will collaborate with administration to develop protocols for planning including: Before planning: Review planning resources which include standards, FSA Test Item Specifications, ELA resources (i.e. district instructional guides, Reading Strategies by Jennifer Serravallo, etc.) During planning: Develop a common understanding of the standards. Select tasks aligned to standards and determine facilitation of instruction. Develop formative assessment(s) including tasks, shared via Microsoft Teams, accessible to Leadership and administration. After planning: Monitor implementation of plans into instructional practice including evidence of task alignment, formal and informal assessments, planned questions to promote thinking, and small group instruction. Monitoring: The principal will monitor to ensure the planning protocol components (before, during, after) are followed.	Irving, Rita Ann, ritaann.irving@hcps.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

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.

We will communicate consistent and clear expectations for positive school behavior based on our ROAR expectations:
Remain Responsible
Operate Safely

Achieve Academic Goals
Respect Others

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

Rita Ann Irving, Principal
Calvin Trombley, Assistant Principal
Natosha Bagley, Parent & Family Engagement Liaison
Samantha Stone-Hamilton, RtI Resource
Roxane Lozano, Media Specialist & SAC Chair