

Manatee County Public Schools

Gene Witt Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Gene Witt Elementary School

200 RYE RD E, Bradenton, FL 34212

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

Demographics

Principal: Connie Dixon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (72%) 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (68%)
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 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Gene Witt Elementary School

200 RYE RD E, Bradenton, FL 34212

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	27%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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.

Vision: The vision of Witt Elementary School is to become one of the top 50 Elementary Schools in the state of Florida (currently 109th), meeting the academic, social, and emotional needs of all students to best prepare them for their future to become a positive, productive, global citizen.

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
Dixon, Connie	Principal	Provide leadership and vision for the school to support staff and teachers in the common goal of increased student achievement.
Barrett, Karen	Assistant Principal	Provide leadership and vision for the school to support staff and teachers in the common goal of increased student achievement.
Alcantara, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Provide leadership and vision for the Kindergarten team of teachers with the common goal of increased student achievement, while fostering an environment to support students emotionally and socially, as well.
Ditzel, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	Provide leadership and vision for the First Grade team of teachers with the common goal of increased student achievement, while fostering an environment to support students emotionally and socially, as well.
Solazzo, Joanne	Teacher, K-12	Provide leadership and vision for the Third Grade team of teachers with the common goal of increased student achievement, while fostering an environment to support students emotionally and socially, as well.
Schuneman, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Provide leadership and vision for the Fifth Grade team of teachers with the common goal of increased student achievement, while fostering an environment to support students emotionally and socially, as well.
Lindsey, Amy	Other	Provide leadership and vision for the teachers with the common goal of increased student achievement, while fostering an environment to support students emotionally and socially, as well.
Figuerroa, Michelle	Teacher, PreK	Provide leadership and vision for the Pre-Kindergarten team of teachers with the common goal of increased student achievement, while fostering an environment to support students emotionally and socially, as well.
Vedder, Stacey	Teacher, K-12	Provide leadership and vision for the Second Grade team of teachers with the common goal of increased student achievement, while fostering an environment to support students emotionally and socially, as well.
Inners, Colleen	Instructional Media	Provide leadership and vision for the Fine Arts/STEAM team of teachers with the common goal of increased student achievement, while fostering an environment to support students emotionally and socially, as well.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pope, Deborah	Paraprofessional	Provide leadership and vision for the ParaEducators team with the common goal of increased student achievement, while fostering an environment to support students emotionally and socially, as well.
Deras, Cynthia	School Counselor	Provide leadership and vision for the teachers with the common goal of increased student achievement, while fostering an environment to support students emotionally and socially, as well.
Sharp, Jewel	Teacher, ESE	Provide leadership and vision for the teachers with ESE inclusion students with the common goal of increased student achievement, while fostering an environment to support students emotionally and socially, as well.
Dauphas, Eleanor	Teacher, K-12	Provide leadership and vision for the 4th Grade team of teachers with the common goal of increased student achievement, while fostering an environment to support students emotionally and socially, as well.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Connie Dixon

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.*

2

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

668

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

5

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

5

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	105	103	111	116	111	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	651
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	2	4	7	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	4	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	0	1	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

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	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	

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	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	
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		

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	80%	55%	56%				77%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	68%						68%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						57%	55%	53%
Math Achievement	87%	50%	50%				82%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	78%						65%	68%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%						54%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	65%	59%				71%	48%	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	82%	51%	31%	58%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	81%	52%	29%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

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	88%	60%	28%	62%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	82%	65%	17%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2022					
	2019	74%	60%	14%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	70%	48%	22%	53%	17%
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	34	39	24	48	60	60	18				
ELL	35	46	30	55	42						
ASN	75			100							
BLK	45			73							
HSP	69	59	38	71	65	36	53				
MUL	81	70		88	90						
WHT	84	72	57	90	80	80	76				
FRL	60	60	39	73	78	72	38				

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				

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	71
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	571
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	88
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
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	57
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	82
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	77
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
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?

Our data trend lines are pretty consistent from year to year. In the 2021 year, however, an area of need that has presented itself is within the Students With Disabilities subgroup, which data shows that only 40% of our SWD has been identified as having shown growth.

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

Based off of the 21-22 data, three areas will be address in the 2023 as needing improvement. The first area is to address the Federal Index of our Students With Disabilities showing a gain of at least 5 percentage points this year (45%) as compared to the 40% shown in 21-22. The second area is to show a gain of 5 percentage points in the area of 5th Grade Science. Finally, our overarching goal is to show at least a 4% point gain in the overall school grade percentage when comparing 21-22 school grade percentage to the 22-23 school grade percentage.

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

Regarding the need for improvement for our Students With Disabilities, our population of identified students continues to increase. New actions to address this need for improvement would be "intentional scheduling" of our ESE Resource Teachers and additional Professional Development for our General Education Teachers regarding best practices in instruction with an emphasis on serving the SWD population.

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

Math overall showed the most improvement. Our Math 21-22 Achievement increased by 1%-age point; our Math 21-22 Learning Gains Improved by 8%-age points; our Math 21-22 L25s also increased by 8%-age points.

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

When discussed with our leadership team, it was noted that more experience in working with Acaletics for more than one year allowed the students to leverage the program in grades 4 and 5 to see these positive increases.

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

Acceleration will occur in Grades 3 - 5 in Math and ELA, with only ELA being address in 5th Grade. Acceleration will be driven by student needs, fidelity to the Acceleration curriculum, and the strategy of flexibility among teachers. **A concern for Acceleration is the loss of instructional time as students are moving from class to class instead of providing this within their own classroom.

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.

Professional Development for Acceleration will be provided at the District Level as this is a District/State Initiative. The learning will then be supported at the school level.

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

We have adopted Acaletics at the 3rd grade level in order to build a stronger foundation of standards exposure and proficiency. Additionally, we are working hard to intentionally group students for Acceleration and/or Remediation as we possibly can.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our Students With Disabilities not meeting the threshold of 41% proficiency/growth or better was identified as a critical need as a result of the Florida State Assessment scores for the 21-22 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the 3rd Assessment of FAST, our average for Students With Disabilities showing gains/proficiency will have increased by 4%-age points for a total of 45% when compared with the same data for the 21-22 FSA.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students with Disabilities will be monitored for growth after each FAST Assessment and District Benchmark Assessment. Additionally, any students in the MTSS/IST process pending identification will also be closely monitored to this end. We will also be monitoring ESE data across the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Barrett (barrettk@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The evidence based strategies being implemented for this Area of Focus will be fidelity to meeting with our ESE students and continued progress monitoring using District Approved resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Ensuring fidelity to the students services as outlined and mandated by the student's IEP is critical. Additionally, ensuring that we are utilizing appropriate District mandated resources allow for optimal success for our SWDs.

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.

1. Review ESE Student Groupings at each grade level and any self-contained ESE classrooms.

Person Responsible

Karen Barrett (barrettk@manateeschools.net)

2. Monitor Progress Monitoring and FAST Assessments for our ESE students.

Person Responsible

Jewel Sharp (sharpm@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

5th Grade Student Proficiency in the area of Science during the 20-21 school year resulted in a proficiency score of 73%. However, for the 21-22 school year, the Science Proficiency scores dropped by 4%-age points, which wasn't relational to the ELA scores, which we would expect it to be.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our 5th grade NGSSS Science Proficiency scores will have increased by a minimum of 4%-age points over the 21-22 school year going from a 69% to a minimum of 73% or higher.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will continue to monitor ELA progress monitoring for our Tiered students, as Science scores should be in close proximity to our ELA scores. We will also monitor our District Science Benchmarks to provide support for students not meeting expectations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Barrett (barrettk@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

In order to increase our 5th Grade Students' overall Proficiency score in the area of Science, our instructional team has decided to purchase and utilize Science Acaletics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We have seen remarkable gains in the area of Mathematics due to, in large part, the use of Math Acaletics. With this in mind, we are going to implement Science Acaletics and monitor quarterly scrimmages and the results.

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.

1. Purchase 5th Grade Science Acaletics
2. PD will be provided for 5th grade teachers in the use and monitoring of Acaletics
3. Review of Acaletics Science date will occur throughout the year.

Person Responsible

Connie Dixon (dixonc@manateeschools.net)

4. Implement Science Acaletics in 5th grade for 20 minutes every day, either through the day the students visit STEM class or during their Science Block with their Science teacher.

Person Responsible

Karen Barrett (barrettk@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Due to this year's assessments being a "baseline" year, we are working to increase our Proficiency scores for ELA, Math, and Science.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase the FSA combined average of proficiency scores in ELA (79.6 to 80), Math (86 to 90), and Science (70 to 75) on the new FAST State Assessment by the last FAST assessment testing period (May 2023)

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor our proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science using FAST, as appropriate and District Benchmark Assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Barrett (barrettk@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is the use of and fidelity to the BEST standards for grades K - 5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Fidelity to instruction and research-based practices has a high-effect size number and the use of this strategy is mandated. We will learn more about high-effect size strategies to ensure the fidelity across K - 5 in the use of BEST standards for the 22 - 23 school year.

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.

1. Through classroom observations and walks, teachers implementation of the BEST standards will be monitored.
2. Collaborative planning time will be offered to K - 5 teachers three times during the school year.
3. FAST data will be reviewed during ILT and TCT meetings.

Person Responsible

Connie Dixon (dixonc@manateeschools.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

NA

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

NA

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)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

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.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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. Â§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?

NA

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?

NA

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

NA

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.

The positive school culture and environment at Witt is created through the emphasis on interpersonal relationships and truly valuing everyone's input in the operation of our school. Teachers work collaboratively with administration and staff to contribute ideas and suggestions that benefit our students. Teachers develop strong relationships with students and respect their contributions to the processes and procedures within their classrooms and work to get to know their students as individuals. Life Skills is not a program that is taught, but values that are modeled throughout our campus by everyone. This year we are implementing school-wide use of SPARK/CHAMPS to encourage a process of Life Skill Building and consistency within our school and across the District. Families are strongly encouraged to participate in the education and development of their children through attendance at SAC/PTO meetings and events, volunteering in classrooms, joining students for lunch on campus, and maintaining open communication with teachers and administration. Our staff share a common goal of taking care of students and each other. Colleagues are supported through "Angel Fund" collections when a family is experiencing a hardship, meal trains in times of need, and through everyday acts of kindness.

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

Teachers and staff are essential in establishing a positive school culture. They work closely with students throughout the day and since students emulate what they see, it is important that what they see are positive role models. Administration establishes a positive school culture and environment through ensuring that staff, students, and families feel safe, heard, and valued. Families are also stakeholders in providing a positive school culture through respecting school and district policies, addressing concerns in a timely, appropriate manner, and by supporting their students through academic and social growth as a student. Our community also takes an active role as a stakeholder in promoting and maintaining a positive school culture and environment. Many of our business partners, community members, and retail establishments gift our school with incentives for our students and quite often, our teachers and staff. It truly does take a village.