

Gene Witt Elementary School



Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Gene Witt Elementary School

200 RYE RD E, Bradenton, FL 34212

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Witt Elementary School 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 School will be an exemplary school, developing life-long learners, morally driven to serve and make a positive impact in a competitive global society.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

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.
Cannon, Amanda	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.
Dauphas, Eleanor	Teacher, K-12	Provide leadership and vision for the Fourth 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.
Nunn, Kristin	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.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
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.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

In addition to a full DRAFT review of the School Improvement Plan by our school leadership team, our School Advisory Council Chair, Shannon Cooley, on behalf of our SAC team, both review the DRAFT and provide any revisions/information as necessary. Once approved by the school leadership team and SAC Chair, the SIP plan is then shared at our School Advisory Council meeting for all members. At that time, the SIP plan is either approved or sent back for revisions. If revisions are necessary, we repeat the above process. If the SIP is approved, it moves on for District approval.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The goals of our SIP is consistently monitored monthly through our RtI/MTSS/Data meetings with each grade level and grades 3 - 5, in particular. We continue to focus on our goals and whether we are on track to meet them. If we are, we continue to move forward. If we are not, we brainstorm with our leadership team and any teams that need additional support to provide what may be needed to regain forward momentum towards achieving our goals.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	27%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	2	0	4	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	4	3	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	6	12	0	0	0	23	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	7	9	0	0	0	20	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	21	23	14	12	0	0	0	78	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	5	4	6	0	0	0	16

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	12	5	0	0	0	25	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	9	4	0	0	0	21	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	2	4	7	8	4	0	0	0	29	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	12	5	0	0	0	25	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	9	4	0	0	0	21	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	2	4	7	8	4	0	0	0	29	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	77	51	53	80	55	56	83		
ELA Learning Gains				68			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			54		
Math Achievement*	82	62	59	87	50	50	86		
Math Learning Gains				78			70		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			61		
Science Achievement*	76	51	54	69	65	59	75		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	46	59	59	67			73		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	365
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	571
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	46			
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	45			
HSP	62			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	83			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	62			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	59			
HSP	57			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	60			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	77			82			76					46
SWD	47			52			25				4	
ELL	25			38							3	46
AMI												
ASN	79			93							2	
BLK	45			45							2	
HSP	74			72			55				5	30
MUL	75			75							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	79			85			80				4	
FRL	61			72			65				5	45

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	80	68	53	87	78	69	69					67
SWD	34	39	24	48	60	60	18					
ELL	35	46	30	55	42							67
AMI												
ASN	75			100								
BLK	45			73								
HSP	69	59	38	71	65	36	53					62
MUL	81	70		88	90							
PAC												
WHT	84	72	57	90	80	80	76					
FRL	60	60	39	73	78	72	38					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	83	69	54	86	70	61	75					73
SWD	44	60		53	60							
ELL	47			63								73
AMI												
ASN	82			91								
BLK	33			50								
HSP	74	69		77	69		77					70
MUL	86			86								
PAC												
WHT	87	70	59	89	72	65	80					
FRL	67	52		70	56	45	67					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	79%	53%	26%	54%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	54%	19%	58%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	82%	47%	35%	50%	32%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	85%	62%	23%	59%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	64%	17%	61%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	83%	61%	22%	55%	28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	77%	49%	28%	51%	26%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Of our third, fourth, and fifth grades, the data component showing the lowest proficiency performance was fourth grade ELA at a 72%. We believe that the employment of new BEST Standards, as well as the new FAST assessment, these were the two biggest factors impacting the performance of our students.

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

Our Math Proficiency data for the 22-23 school year shows a decline of three percentage points from the prior year. This is our greatest subject area decline. We fell from an 87% to an 84%. We believe two

explicit factors that may have contributed to this decline was the use of new curriculum standards, grouping students for Acceleration for the first time, and then having a new state assessment.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

School Grade 3 ELA Proficiency = 82% vs. State Grade 3 ELA Proficiency = 50% GAP = +32%

School Grade 4 ELA Proficiency = 72% vs. State Grade 4 ELA Proficiency = 57% GAP = +15%

School Grade 5 ELA Proficiency = 78% vs. State Grade 5 ELA Proficiency = 56% GAP = +22%

School Grade 3 MATH Proficiency = 85% vs. State Grade 3 MATH Proficiency = 59% GAP = +26%

School Grade 4 MATH Proficiency = 81% vs. State Grade 4 MATH Proficiency = 61% GAP = +20%

School Grade 5 MATH Proficiency = 83% vs. State Grade 5 MATH Proficiency = 55% GAP = +28%

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 3rd grade ELA with a GAP of +32%. The factors that contributed to this grade level scoring so much higher than the state was to allow the teachers to do what they know how to do and that is to make sound instructional decisions to support students' needs through scheduling. Third grade typically outscores the state and grade levels within the school due to intentional, direct and specialized instruction meeting the needs of the students.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in the area of fifth grade SCIENCE. Last year we implemented Science Acaletics to support our Science curriculum. Additionally, there were no state or district changes to the standards or the state assessment. We are confident that stability contributes to higher test scores.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

1. Proficiency of Grades 3, 4, and 5 SWD students in ELA and Math.
2. Learning Gains of L25 K - 5 students in ELA and Math.

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

Highest Academic Priorities for the 23 - 24 school year:

1. Increased learning gains for SWD students in grades 3, 4, and 5, in the subjects of ELA and Math.
2. Increase overall learning gains for students in grades 3, 4, and 5 in the subjects of ELA and Math.
3. Increase proficiency scores for students in grades 3, 4, and 5 in the subjects of ELA, Math, and Science.
4. Increase learning gains for L25 students in grades 4 and 5 in the subjects of ELA and Math.

Highest School Culture Priority for the 23 - 24 school year:

Student Recognition

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As we continue to focus on providing a positive culture and environment, we will be employing the following:

Meaningful Parent Involvement

Celebrating students'/staff personal achievement and behavior

Establish school norms that provide value

Set consistent discipline with appropriate modeling

Increase student engagement

Creating rituals and traditions that are fun for students and teachers

Encouraging innovation in the classroom

Providing Teacher Selected Professional Development

Maintaining a lovely and safe physical environment of the school

and

Making adjustments as necessary as we monitor the culture and environment of our school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May of 2024 Gene Witt Elementary will have celebrated each quarter students nominated for the S.O.A.R (Self-Control, Ownership, Academics/Attitude, and Responsibility).

During these celebrations, parents will be invited to attend. This will bring back a tradition for our school that is enjoyed by all.

Monitoring:

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

This outcome will be monitored by implementing and hosting a quarterly S.O.A.R Awards breakfast for our students and their parents.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Lindsey (lindsey2a@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidence-based Intervention being Implemented: Student S.O.A.R Quarterly Awards Assemblies

An awards ceremony makes people feel that their work is valued. It shows approval and gratitude for each person's good job, and it makes people aware that good work will be rewarded. It shows others, such as the general public and other staff members, that you're aware of outstanding accomplishments.

Recognition motivates others to strive for excellence and we all benefit from it.

Recognition motivates people. For instance, if a social worker receives an award for an outstanding performance in the outreach program, other social workers will strive to do better also, so that they too can be recognized. Being rewarded for doing well is one of the biggest incentives anyone can receive.

An awards ceremony or activity is a chance for celebration and reflection. People will get a break and a party, getting their minds away from everyday work, allowing them to see the bigger picture. At the same time, they will have the chance to discuss the importance of their work and the achievement of the person being awarded. Gathering and sharing experiences is a very powerful means of encouragement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

An awards ceremony makes people feel that their work is valued. It shows approval and gratitude for each person's good job, and it makes people aware that good work will be rewarded. It shows others, such as the general public and other staff members, that you're aware of outstanding accomplishments.

Recognition motivates others to strive for excellence and we all benefit from it.

Recognition motivates people. For instance, if a social worker receives an award for an outstanding performance in the outreach program, other social workers will strive to do better also, so that they too can be recognized. Being rewarded for doing well is one of the biggest incentives anyone can receive.

An awards ceremony or activity is a chance for celebration and reflection. People will get a break and a party, getting their minds away from everyday work, allowing them to see the bigger picture. At the same time, they will have the chance to discuss the importance of their work and the achievement of the person being awarded. Gathering and sharing experiences is a very powerful means of encouragement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. 3rd - 5th Grade Teachers and Students will be taught what S.O.A.R stands for and how you earn an award. (Timeline: Mid-quarter 1 by Administration--Dixon, Barrett, and Lindsey)
2. 3rd - 5th Grade Teachers will have students nominate students for these awards by written nominations. Students not selected for the award will still receive specific written feedback from peers and teachers about being nominated. Peer feedback has an Effect Size of .73 (high). (Timeline: To occur during the 8th week of each quarter; Person Responsible: 3rd - 5th Grade Teachers.)
3. Teachers will turn in those selected for the S.O.A.R awards. (Timeline: During the 8th week of each quarter--3rd - 5th Grade Teachers are responsible.)
4. Invitations to parents will be sent one week before S.O.A.R Awards assemblies. (Timeline: One week before the assembly dates; Person Responsible: Kayla Kissinger)
5. Awards will be printed for students to receive at the assembly. (Person Responsible: Kayla Kissinger)
6. Breakfast Items will be purchased for the assembly for the students and their guests. (Person Responsible: Lisa Blakemore)
7. Awards Assembly hosted by Dixon/Barrett/Lindsey, as they are available.
8. Pictures will be taking of students and their awards and shared via social media. (Person Responsible: Kayla Kissinger)

****To protect instructional time, the only students attending the awards assembly will be those students earning the awards. They will return to class with their awards to motivate other students.**

Person Responsible: Amy Lindsey (lindsey2a@manateeschools.net)

By When: Goal will be met throughout the school year to be achieved by May 2024.

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Gene Witt Elementary has historically met proficiency goals, however, learning gains for our L25 students continues to be a priority area for growth. In 2022, when learning gains were last documented by state data, our L25 students showed 53% learning gains in ELA and 69% in math. Although the percentage of L25 students making gains in math increased from 61% in 2021 to 69% in 2022, our L25 learning gains dropped in ELA from 54% in 2021 to 53% in 2022. Our L25 (and all) students are provided with rigorous learning experiences by highly-effective teachers. The percentage of L25 students making learning gains should be higher!

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, Gene Witt Elementary will have shown an increase of learning gains in our L25 students by 5 percentage points from the 2022 scores (53% in ELA and 69% in math) to 58% in ELA and 74% in math on the spring FAST assessments.

Monitoring:

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

This outcome will be monitored by completing data analysis meetings with all grade level teams after each FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment. These meetings will occur in September, January and May. Data analysis documents will be completed by each teacher and will be part of data discussions with colleagues and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Barrett (barrettk@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students are being provided Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions for ELA and/or math by highly-effective, reading endorsed teachers, using district-required curriculum and progress monitoring materials. These tier interventions, along with core instruction, will support L25 students in increasing learning gains in ELA and math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will provide students with small group instruction using research-based curriculum and intentional monitoring of their progress. Small group instruction has proven to be a highly effective instructional method, ensuring all students are on task and actively participating in their learning. Research-based curriculum and progress monitoring materials ensure students are receiving current strategies to help them succeed. The intentional monitoring of student progress ensures that teachers are aware of student needs and determine when a change in materials, strategies, tier placement, or additional services are needed.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. K. Barrett, Assistant Principal, will schedule data analysis meetings with all grade levels after each FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment.
2. Using district-provided "By the Numbers" forms and school-created FAST goal forms, teachers will calculate the percentage of learning gains by L25 students at a class level and compare it to our school goals.
3. After determining if their L25 students are meeting school goals for learning gains, teachers will calculate how many additional L25 students are needed to show learning gains to reach the school goal.
4. Teachers will determine which students to target and will use state standards analysis to create instructional groups to support learning gains for these students.
5. K. Barrett will monitor the completion of data analysis documents from all teachers after each FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment and, along with Connie Dixon, Principal, conduct data discussions with teachers in each grade level.
6. Teachers will continue to monitor the growth of L25 students through classwork and assessments, making instructional changes as needed.
7. Teachers will complete data analysis after each FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment and repeat the procedures above.

Person Responsible: Karen Barrett (barrettk@manateeschools.net)

By When: Data discussions with grade levels will occur after the completion of each FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment (September, January, and May).

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Gene Witt Elementary has historically met overall proficiency goals, however, proficiency for our Grade 3-5 SWD students continues to be a priority area for growth. In 2023, proficiency for our Grade 3-5 SWD students was 80% in ELA and 85% in math. Although our percentage of proficiency in math exceeded the federal index, our ELA percentage did not. Our SWD (and all) students are provided with rigorous learning experiences by highly-effective teachers. The percentage of Grade 3-5 SWD students showing proficiency in ELA should be higher!

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, Gene Witt Elementary will have shown an increase of Grade 3-5 SWD students meeting proficiency by 3 percentage points from the 2023 scores (80% in ELA and 85% in math) to 83% in ELA and 88% in math on the spring FAST assessments.

Monitoring:

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

This outcome will be monitored by completing data analysis meetings with all grade level teams after each FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment. These meetings will occur in September, January and May. Data analysis documents will be completed by each teacher and will be part of data discussions with colleagues and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Barrett (barrettk@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students are being provided Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions for ELA and/or math by highly-effective, reading endorsed teachers, using district-required curriculum and progress monitoring materials. These tier interventions, along with core instruction, will support SWD students in meeting proficiency in both ELA and math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will provide students with small group instruction using research-based curriculum and intentional monitoring of their progress. Small group instruction has proven to be a highly effective instructional method, ensuring all students are on task and actively participating in their learning. Research-based curriculum and progress monitoring materials ensure students are receiving current strategies to help them succeed. The intentional monitoring of student progress ensures that teachers are aware of student needs and determine when a change in materials, strategies, tier placement, or additional services are needed.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. K. Barrett, Assistant Principal, will schedule data analysis meetings with all grade levels after each FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment.
2. Using district-provided "By the Numbers" forms and school-created FAST goal forms, teachers will calculate the percentage of proficiency by SWD students at a class level and compare it to our school goals.
3. After determining if their SWD students are meeting school goals for proficiency, teachers will calculate how many additional SWD students are needed to show proficiency to reach the school goal.
4. Teachers will determine which students to target and will use state standards analysis to create instructional groups to support these students in meeting proficiency.
5. K. Barrett will monitor the completion of data analysis documents from all teachers after each FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment and, along with Connie Dixon, Principal, conduct data discussions with teachers in each grade level.
6. Teachers will continue to monitor the growth of SWD students through classwork and assessments, making instructional changes as needed.
7. Teachers will complete data analysis after each FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment and repeat the procedures above.

Person Responsible: Karen Barrett (barrettk@manateeschools.net)

By When: Data discussions with grade levels will occur after the completion of each FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment (September, January, and May).

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

School Improvement funding will be reviewed (Dixon, Barrett, Blakemore) to ensure that we are using the funds to serve our school improvement goals including any funding supporting our Students With Disabilities, our sub-group requiring additional support. Funding will be continuously monitored prior to any expenditures.