

Escambia County School District

# Warrington Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>22</b> |

# Warrington Elementary School

220 N NAVY BLVD, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

## Demographics

Principal: Timothy Rose S

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2018

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: D (38%)<br>2017-18: D (37%)<br>2016-17: F (31%)<br>2015-16: F (28%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northwest  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | CS&I   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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](http://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

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>22</b> |

## Warrington Elementary School

220 N NAVY BLVD, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 77%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | D       | D       | D       | F       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

Provide an environment that creates opportunities for all students to achieve their highest potential while building a foundation that will allow all students to be life-long learners. Our mission statement supports our school's message: Better and Brighter Every Day.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Warrington Elementary stands out in the community simply due to its location on Navy Boulevard. Our vision is that we would also stand out in our community as a positive and well respected learning environment that supports our students, families, and the community at large.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name                  | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Rose, Timothy         | Principal           | Oversee all functions of the school in an effort to create a culture of learning for all students.   |
| Harris, Angie         | Assistant Principal | Support the principal in the overall functions of the school.  |
| Harvey-Thomas, Sylvia | Other               | As the Reading Intervention Teacher, Ms. Harvey-thomas works primarily with low performing students in the area of reading.  |
| Sides, Paula          | Other               | As the Instructional Coach, Ms. Sides works with teachers to help facilitate effective teaching practices in ELA and Math through modeling, co-teaching, and collaboration. She works with students to ensure that best practice and learning approaches are being used to facilitate catch up growth in students who are not demonstrating grade level proficiency. |
| Sanderson, Teresa     | Teacher, K-12       | Serves as a representative for all K-5 teachers in communicating the expectations of the leadership team as well as the needs/requests of the faculty.   |
| Rawls, Mitsy          | Other               | PBIS Coach   |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 7/2/2018, Timothy Rose S

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

33

### Demographic Data

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: D (38%)<br>2017-18: D (37%)<br>2016-17: F (31%)<br>2015-16: F (28%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northwest  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | CS&I   |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled               | 52          | 54 | 33 | 53 | 45 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 278   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 19          | 29 | 16 | 24 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 121   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 2           | 4  | 4  | 11 | 6  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 8           | 24 | 7  | 9  | 3  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 54    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 9           | 2  | 12 | 5  | 4  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 22 | 21 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 60    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 37 | 27 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 80    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2           | 1 | 2 | 14 | 13 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 47    |

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     | 2           | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/2/2020

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 50          | 47 | 46 | 70 | 47 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 300   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 19          | 38 | 21 | 29 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 148   |
| One or more suspensions         | 1           | 6  | 5  | 15 | 8  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 47    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 12 | 3  | 16 | 9  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 44    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 16 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 74    |



**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 | 1           | 9 | 6 | 20 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 74    |

**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     | 2           | 13 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0  | 0 | 5  | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |

**Prior Year - Updated****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 50          | 47 | 46 | 70 | 47 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 300   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 19          | 38 | 21 | 29 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 148   |
| One or more suspensions         | 1           | 6  | 5  | 15 | 8  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 47    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 12 | 3  | 16 | 9  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 44    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 16 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 74    |

**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 | 1           | 9 | 6 | 20 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 74    |

**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     | 2           | 13 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0  | 0 | 5  | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |

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

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                        | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement        | 27%    | 53%      | 57%   | 26%    | 50%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains     | 40%    | 55%      | 58%   | 27%    | 51%      | 57%   |

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 45%    | 52%      | 53%   | 27%    | 43%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 32%    | 57%      | 63%   | 28%    | 53%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 40%    | 60%      | 62%   | 44%    | 53%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 42%    | 52%      | 51%   | 50%    | 45%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 39%    | 54%      | 53%   | 13%    | 50%      | 51%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     |     |     |     | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | K                                 | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   |       |
|           | (0)                               | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

### Grade Level Data

**NOTE:** This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 34%    | 56%      | -22%                       | 58%   | -24%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 19%    | 52%      | -33%                       | 57%   | -38%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 15%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 20%    | 52%      | -32%                       | 58%   | -38%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 20%    | 51%      | -31%                       | 56%   | -36%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 26%    | 51%      | -25%                       | 56%   | -30%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 29%    | 44%      | -15%                       | 55%   | -26%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 30%    | 55%      | -25%                       | 62%   | -32%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 36%    | 54%      | -18%                       | 62%   | -26%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -6%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 29%    | 58%      | -29%                       | 64%   | -35%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 49%    | 58%      | -9%                        | 62%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -20%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 38%    | 55%      | -17%                       | 60%   | -22%                    |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 2018 | 37%    | 52%      | -15%                       | 61%   | -24%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -11%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 36%    | 55%      | -19%                       | 53%   | -17%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 45%    | 55%      | -10%                       | 55%   | -10%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 4        | 7      |             | 4         | 7       |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 19       | 38     | 44          | 15        | 29      | 46           | 23       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 40       | 45     |             | 63        | 57      |              | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 27       | 41     | 44          | 33        | 42      | 42           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 10       | 21     |             | 10        | 21      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 15       | 26     | 32          | 24        | 46      | 29           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 44       | 29     |             | 65        | 52      |              | 90       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 25       | 28     | 36          | 40        | 49      | 32           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD                                       | 4        | 16     | 25          |           | 30      | 36           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 10       | 27     | 29          | 14        | 40      | 50           | 12       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 45       | 33     |             | 48        | 55      |              | 9        |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 26       | 27     | 29          | 27        | 42      | 52           | 11       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index           |      |
|------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | CS&I |

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 38   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 3    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 265  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 6    |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 2    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       |      |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A  |
| 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                                 | 31   |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  | 2    |
| Hispanic Students   |      |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students   |      |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | N/A  |

| Hispanic Students  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | N/A |
| 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   | 52  |
| 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                                | 39  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

ELA achievement scores showed the lowest performance on Spring 2019 state testing, at 27%. Based on STAR progress monitoring data from the 2020 school year, we are trending upward in ELA achievement, with a projected score on 2020 state testing of 38%. Students in grades 3-5 have difficulty making the shift from learning to read to reading to learn. Limited background knowledge and poor vocabulary skills compound the difficulty students have with comprehension, leading to a lack of confidence in their ability to understand what they are reading. Student learning was also disrupted during the 2019 school year when we had to reduce the number of 3rd grade classes due to our 10 day count, and then again when a third grade teacher and a fourth grade teacher both resigned in late October.

District created Science assessments showed that our 2020 state testing in Science was projected to be 34%, which is a 5 point reduction when compared to our Spring 2019 state testing Science score of 39%.

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

Math learning gains showed the greatest decline on Spring 2019 state testing, going from 50% to 40%.

During the 2019 school year, Reading proficiency was given more emphasis due to the overwhelming number of students in all grades that were well below grade level expectations. Student learning was also disrupted when we had to reduce the number of 3rd grade classes due to our 10 day count, and then again when a third grade teacher and a fourth grade teacher both resigned in late October.

STAR progress monitoring data from the 2020 school year showed that we were making strong gains this year in math, with projected Learning Gains at 62%.

Current 2020 District created Science progress monitoring showed that our 2020 state testing in Science was projected to be 34%, which is a 5 point reduction when compared to our Spring 2019 state testing Science score of 39%. Science is the only subject not showing gains on progress monitoring data.

**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.**

Achievement in both Reading (-30) and Math (-31) had the greatest gap when compared to the state average on Spring 2019 state testing. Contributing factors have been described above. STAR progress monitoring data from the 2020 school year shows that we are closing the gap and trending upward not only for achievement, but in all 6 Reading and Math cells. In Reading, Achievement was projected to move from 27% to 38%, Learning Gains from 40% to 49%, and LQ Learning Gains from 45% to 65%. In Math, Achievement was projected to move from 32% to 45%, Learning Gains from 40% to 62%, and LQ Learning Gains from 42% to 75%.

For the 2020 school year, even with increases in all 6 Reading and Math cells, achievement in both Reading and Math continue to have the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The gap has closed considerable; however, going from a 30 point deficit in reading achievement to 19, and from 31 points in math to 18. A District created Assessment for Science, showed that our 2020 state testing in Science was projected to drop from 39% to 34% on Spring 2020 state testing. This puts Science at a 19 point gap as well. Limited hands-on practice/experimentation may have contributed the drop in our projected Science scores. A comprehensive, hands-on Science review had been planned for the weeks leading up to state testing, designed to help us regain those lost points.

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

ELA Learning Gains showed the most improvement on Spring 2019 state testing, going from 27% to 40%. During the 2019 school year, a strong emphasis was placed on reading to address missing foundational skills across grade levels. Many students were 2 or more grade levels below expectations at the beginning of the 2019 school year, with students in every grade level, K-5, who were identified as having skill deficits in Phonemic awareness and phonics. As part of our intervention plan, we implemented the use of SRA and targeted small groups in all grades, and whole group, close reads in 3rd through 5th grade. During the 2020 school year, we added an emphasis on critical thinking and inference, which we believe had a strong impact on our 2020 STAR progress monitoring data. ELA Learning Gains grew from 40% on 2019 state testing to projected 49%. We have taken steps to reduce student dependence on unnecessary support (learned helplessness), showing them that they are capable readers. The whole group, close reads have continued to help us build a safe learning environment where students feel more confident in participating in reading activities through discussion and collaboration.

Our 3 identified ESSA subgroups last year were African American Students, Economically Disadvantaged students, and Students with Disabilities. In all 3 subgroups, we increased our Federal Index to beyond 41%, going from 31% to 41% for African American students, 39% to 41% for Economically Disadvantaged students, and from 6% to 43% for Students with disabilities.

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

An ongoing concern and struggle for Warrington Elementary School continues to be attendance below 90%, which, for the 2020 school year, was 44% of our K-5 enrollment.

Another area of concern is with the number of 3rd - 5th grade students scoring at Level 1 in both Reading (43%) and Math (58%) on state assessments in the 2019. STAR progress monitoring data from the 2020 school year indicate that this number has improved in both subjects, going from 43% to 30% in Reading and from 58% to 30% in Math.

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

1. Reading Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Math Learning Gains
4. Science Proficiency
5. Attendance

**Part III: Planning for Improvement****Areas of Focus:**



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | While our ESSA subgroups have all shown a great deal of growth, based on progress monitoring for the 2020 school year, these groups are still far short of the state average for overall academic performance on 2019 state testing. Even though progress monitoring shows significant upward movement in both proficiency and learning gains, that growth could not be confirmed on state testing due to the COVID 19 school shut down; therefore, they remain a concern. Two of these groups, African American students and Economically disadvantaged students, make up the majority of our overall student population. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Students in all 3 identified subgroups (African American, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged) will increase their overall Federal Index score to at least 41% as measured by the FSA. This goal is based on 2019/2020 progress monitoring projected scores for ELA and Math, which were all over the 41% threshold.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdf.us)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | In analyzing the 2019 FSA ESSA data and the current 2020 progress monitoring data, deficits in academic language skills appear to be a hindrance to reading comprehension. According to Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, found on What Works Clearinghouse, ensuring that students read connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension has a strong positive effect size on student performance.  |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. As students read orally, model strategies, scaffold, and provide feedback to support accurate and efficient word identification.
2. Teach students to self-monitor their understanding of the text and to self-correct word-reading errors.
3. Provide opportunities for oral reading practice with feedback to develop fluent and accurate reading with expression.

Professional development will be provided from, program specialists, and other district and faculty members during weekly PD meetings, after school meetings, and district scheduled trainings. Implementation of action steps will be monitored through Admin walkthroughs and follow up during weekly PD meetings.

Data from grade level unit assessments and i-Ready, STAR 360 reports will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of strategies implemented and to plan for future PD and next steps in ensuring continued success.

**Person Responsible** Paula Sides (psides@ecsdf.us)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Student scores in proficiency and learning gains in reading continue to be areas of focus and cause for concern. While data from the 2020 school year shows considerable growth in all 3 FSA Reading cells, the gap between the school's data and the data from both the district and state is still evident that growth must continue. Even though progress monitoring shows upward movement in both proficiency and learning gains, that growth could not be confirmed on state testing due to the COVID 19 school shut down.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Looking back to our 2019 state testing results in ELA, we will increase student proficiency from 27% to at least 37% on 2021 state testing. This would match our progress monitoring projected 2020 FSA score of 37%. ELA Learning Gains will improve by 10 percentage points, going from 40% on the 2019 FSA to at least 50% in 2021, as predicted from our progress monitoring data for our 2020 FSA score.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdf.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.</li> <li>2. Help students build explanations by asking and answering deep questions.</li> </ol>  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In analyzing the 2019 FSA data and the current 2020 progress monitoring data, deficits in academic language skills appear to be a hindrance to reading comprehension. According to Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, found on What Works Clearinghouse, ensuring that students read connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension has a strong positive effect size on student performance.</li> <li>2. Another hindrance to reading is the inability to think deep and explore the range of possible answers and finding the best answer. According to Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning, found on What Works Clearinghouse, helping students build explanations by asking and answering deep questions has a strong positive effect size on student performance.</li> </ol> |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Action steps for strategy 1:

1. As students read orally, model strategies, scaffold, and provide feedback to support accurate and efficient word identification.
2. Teach students to self-monitor their understanding of the text and to self-correct word-reading errors.
3. Provide opportunities for oral reading practice with feedback to develop fluent and accurate reading with expression.

Professional development will be provided from, program specialists, and other district and faculty members during weekly PD meetings, after school meetings, and district scheduled trainings. Implementation of action steps will be monitored through Admin walkthroughs and follow up during weekly PD meetings.

Data from grade level unit assessments as well as i-Ready and STAR 360 reports will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of strategies implemented and to plan for future PD and next steps in ensuring continued

success.

**Person Responsible** Sylvia Harvey-Thomas (sharvey-thomas@ecsdf1.us)

4. Continue to build classroom libraries to include a variety of connected texts, including texts of varied levels, diverse genres, and wide-ranging content.

**Person Responsible** Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdf1.us)

Action Steps for Strategy 2:

1. Encourage students to “think aloud” in speaking or writing their explanations and allow them to gain feedback through observing good explanations of peers, tutors, teachers, and computer environments
2. Ask questions that elicit explanations: why, what caused X, how did X occur, what if, what-if-not, how does X compare to Y, what is the evidence for X, and why is X important?
3. Ask questions that challenge students’ prior beliefs and assumptions

Professional development will be provided from program specialists, and other district and faculty members during weekly PD, after school meetings, and district scheduled trainings.

Implementation of action steps will be monitored through Admin walkthroughs and follow up during weekly PD.

Data from grade level unit assessments and i-Ready, STAR 360 reports will be used to evaluate the strategies implementation/effectiveness and to plan for future PD and appropriate next steps.

**Person Responsible** Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdf1.us)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Student scores in proficiency and learning gains in math have been recognized as areas of focus and cause for concern because math achievement and learning gains scores decreased on FSA math testing in 2019 when compared to math scores from 2018 testing. Not only were math test scores lower in 2019, but the gaps in achievement and learning gains between the school's math data and data from both the district and state indicate that more growth is needed and must continue. While the data from 2019/2020 progress monitoring shows upward movement in all 3 FSA math cells, that growth could not be confirmed on state testing due to the COVID 19 school shut down.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Looking back to our 2019 state testing results in Math, we will increase student proficiency from 32% to at least 45% on 2021 state testing, matching our progress monitoring predicted 2020 FSA score. Math Learning Gains will improve by 10 percentage points as well, going from 40% on the 2019 FSA to at least 50% in 2021. Our 2020 progress monitoring projected score for Math Learning Gains was at 62% for our 2020 FSA math score.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdf.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Help students recognize and articulate mathematical concepts and notation.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

In analyzing the 2019 FSA Math data and the current 2020 progress monitoring data, deficits in the ability to organize information in a problem and understand and think about the problem appears to be a hindrance to math comprehension. According to Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4 Through 8, found on What Works Clearinghouse, Helping students recognize and articulate mathematical concepts and notation has a moderate positive effect size on students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Describe relevant mathematical concepts and notation, and relate them to the problem-solving activity.
2. Ask students to explain each step used to solve a problem in a worked example.
3. Help students make sense of algebraic notation.

Professional development will be provided from, program specialists, and other district and faculty members during weekly PD meetings, after school meetings, and district scheduled trainings. Implementation of action steps will be monitored through Admin walkthroughs and follow up during weekly PD meetings.

Data from grade level unit assessments and i-Ready, STAR 360 reports will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of strategies implemented and to plan for future PD and next steps in ensuring continued success.

**Person Responsible**

Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdf.us)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Science Achievement scores (5th grade) have been recognized as an area of focus and cause for concern because Science achievement scores decreased on NGSSS Science testing in 2019 when compared to Science scores from 2018 testing. Not only were Science test scores lower in 2019, but the gap in achievement between the school's Science data and data from both the district and state indicate that more growth is needed and must continue. While the data from 2019/2020 progress monitoring shows a decline in our projected NGSSS 2020 Science score, a plan, to include training of 5th grade teachers, was implemented and specific students had been identified to move our Science scores to at least 42% on 2020 NGSSS testing. Science growth could not be confirmed on state testing due to the COVID 19 school shut down.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Looking back to our 2019 state testing results in Science, we will increase student achievement from 39% to at least 45% on 2021 state testing, exceeding our 2020 progress monitoring projected goal of 34% and our anticipated score of 42% (based on careful planning for strategic changes in the final month before testing).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdf.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Help students build explanations by asking and answering deep questions.
2. Connect and integrate abstract and concrete representations of concepts.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. In analyzing the 2019 NGSSS data and the current 2020 progress monitoring data, deficits in the application of skills appear to be a hindrance to Science achievement. According to Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning, found on What Works Clearinghouse, helping students build explanations by asking and answering deep questions has a strong positive effect size on student performance.
2. Also found in Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning, found on What Works Clearinghouse, the ability to Connect and integrate abstract and concrete representations of concepts has a moderate effect size on student performance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Action Steps for Strategy 1:

1. Encourage students to "think aloud" in speaking or writing their explanations and allow them to gain feedback through observing good explanations of peers, tutors, teachers, computer environments
2. Ask questions that elicit explanations: why, what caused X, how did X occur, what if, what-if-not, how does X compare to Y, what is the evidence for X, and why is X important?
3. Ask questions that challenge students' prior beliefs and assumptions

Professional development will be provided from program specialists, and other district and faculty members during weekly PD, after school meetings, and district scheduled trainings.

Implementation of action steps will be monitored through Admin walkthroughs and follow up during weekly PD.

Data from unit assessments, Study Island reports, and district quarterly assessments will be used to evaluate effectiveness of strategies implemented and planning for future PD and next steps in ensuring continued success.

**Person Responsible**

Angie Harris (aharris@ecsdf.us)

**Action Steps for Strategy 2:**

Provide opportunity for hands-on representation of science concepts to coincide with instruction.  
Each Science unit will include a hands-on lab.

**Person Responsible** Angie Harris (aharris@ecsdf.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Attendance will be addressed through School callouts, Quarterly newsletters to families, communication with families of students who are identified as chronically absent, and Attendance Child Study Team meetings.**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

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

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

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

Warrington Elementary provides opportunities throughout the year for all stakeholders to provide input concerning the school's culture and environment, including scheduled School Advisory Council meetings, a beginning of the year Title 1 meeting, and surveys.

One of our goals in building the school culture is to become a school that operates from a non-punitive standpoint. While there are times when behavior might warrant more stringent consequences, we strive to meet problems with solutions, not punishment. We are teaching our students that mistakes are inevitable and that it is acceptable to admit to those mistakes. Last year we created and implemented our RESET room. The reset room is a place where students can go at the start of the day, before they ever go to class, if they need to process something that is not school related in order to be able to move forward and have a successful day at school. It is also a place where students go if they have had an issue during the school day that requires them to have a break from their classroom. Once there, students are asked to complete a reflection on their behavior/choices and then they are given the opportunity to talk about what happened and discuss other options/solutions that might have had a better, more positive outcome. The concept of resetting has allowed us to teach students that mistakes can have value and that it is alright to admit or "own" our mistakes, choices, and behavior.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups |  |                |     | \$88,544.66 |
|---|----------|--|--|----------------|-----|-------------|
|   | Function | Object   | Budget Focus   | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21     |
|   | 6400     | 310-Professional and Technical Services                        | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School  | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$80,000.00 |
|   |          |  | Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, 3, & 4: External Operator Consulting Contract with The Rensselaerville Institute to support administration, academic coaches, teachers, and students (100 day contract = \$160,000) (UniSIG covers 1/2 of \$160,000) (Escambia District General Funds covers 1/2 of \$160,000) (Contract previously approved in the 19-20 UniSIG budget)  |                |     |             |
|   | 6400     | 750-Other Personal Services                                    | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School  | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$870.00    |
|   |          |  | Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, 3, & 4: Substitutes to cover Highly Effective Teacher Observations (A substitute will cover a classroom so a teacher in the process of a coaching cycle may visit a highly effective or effective teacher's classroom with the instructional coach) (10 days x \$87)  |                |     |             |
|   | 6400     | 220-Social Security  | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School  | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$66.56     |
|   |          |  | Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, 3, & 4: Social Security for Substitutes to cover Highly Effective Teacher Observations (A substitute will cover a classroom so a teacher in the process of a coaching cycle may visit a highly effective or effective teacher's classroom with the instructional coach) (0.0765 x 10 days x \$87)   |                |     |             |
|   | 6400     | 240-Workers Compensation                                       | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School  | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$10.44     |
|   |          |  | Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, 3, & 4: Workers Comp for Substitutes to cover Highly Effective Teacher Observations (A substitute will cover a classroom so a teacher in the process of a coaching cycle may visit a highly effective or effective teacher's classroom with the instructional coach) (0.012 x 10 days x \$87)   |                |     |             |
|   | 6400     | 100-Salaries   | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School  | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$5,730.00  |
|   |          |  | Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, 3, & 4: Extra pay for content-based professional development conducted with administration, external operator, instructional coach, and district content specialists (20 teachers x 1 h x 12 months x \$15) Summer Professional Development (2 days x 3.5 hours x 18 teachers x \$15) (Professional Planning previously approved in 19-20 budget)                                 |                |     |             |
|   | 6400     | 210-Retirement   | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School  | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$573.00    |
|   |          |  | Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, 3, & 4: Retirement for Extra pay for content-based professional development conducted with administration, external operator, instructional coach, and district content specialists (0.1 x 20 teachers x 1 h x 12 months x \$15) Summer Professional Development (2 days x 3.5 hours x 18 teachers x \$15) (Professional Development previously approved in 19-20 budget)         |                |     |             |
|   | 6400     | 220-Social Security  | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School  | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$438.35    |
|   |          |  | Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, 3, & 4: Social Security for Extra pay for content-based professional development conducted with administration, external operator, instructional coach, and district content specialists (0.0765 x 20 teachers x 1 h x 12 months x \$15) Summer Professional Development (2 days x 3.5 hours x 18 teachers x \$15) (Professional Development previously approved in 19-20 budget) |                |     |             |
|   | 6400     | 240-Workers Compensation                                       | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School  | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$68.76     |



|          |               |   |   |                |     |                    |
|----------|---------------|---|---|----------------|-----|--------------------|
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4: Workers Comp for Extra pay for content-based professional development conducted with administration, external operator, instructional coach, and district content specialists (0.012 x 20 teachers x 1 h x 12 months x \$15) Summer Professional Development (2 days x 3.5 hours x 18 teachers x \$15) (Professional Development previously approved in 19-20 budget)</i> |                |     |                    |
|          | 6400          | 510-Supplies  | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$718.50           |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4: Supporting Distance learning in all Focus areas: Distance Learning Playbook (\$23.95 x 30 books)</i>  |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 510-Supplies  | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$69.05            |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: FOCUS 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4: Student data supplies (Copy paper, binders, tabs)</i>   |                |     |                    |
| <b>2</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>  |   |                |     | <b>\$20,657.37</b> |
|          | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21            |
|          | 5100          | 369-Technology-Related Rentals                      | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$4,000.00         |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4: Nearpod Software Licences (virtual delivery platform for instruction)</i>   |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 100-Salaries  | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$11,466.00        |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, &amp; 3: Extra pay for After School Tutoring for 3rd-5th (13 Teachers x 21 days x 1h x \$42)</i>  |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 100-Salaries  | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$4,368.00         |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, &amp; 3: Planning for After School Tutoring for 3rd-5th (13 Teachers x 21 Days x 1 hour x \$16)</i>   |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 210-Retirement                                      | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$436.80           |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, &amp; 3: Retirement for Planning for After School Tutoring for 3rd-5th (0.1 x 13 Teachers x 21 Days x 1 hour x \$16)</i>  |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 220-Social Security                                 | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$334.15           |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, &amp; 3: Social Security for Planning for After School Tutoring for 3rd-5th (0.0765 x 13 Teachers x 21 Days x 1 hour x \$16)</i>  |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 240-Workers Compensation                            | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$52.42            |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1, 2, &amp; 3: Workers Comp for Planning for After School Tutoring for 3rd-5th (0.012 x 13 Teachers x 21 Days x 1 hour x \$16)</i>  |                |     |                    |
| <b>3</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b> |   |                |     | <b>\$6,319.00</b>  |
|          | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21            |
|          | 5100          | 369-Technology-Related Rentals                      | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$3,295.00         |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 1 &amp; 3: Reflex Math Software Licences (Site licences for 2nd-5th grade focusing on Math fluency)</i>   |                |     |                    |
|          | 6400          | 330-Travel  | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$3,024.00         |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 3: Instructional Practice in Math: Travel Expenses for FCTM for 4 teaches to attend the state conference in June of 2021 in Orlando, FL Hotel</i>   |                |     |                    |

|               |               |   |                                     |                |     |                     |
|---------------|---------------|---|-------------------------------------|----------------|-----|---------------------|
|               |               | Rooms for 3 days: (\$150 a night x 4 days x 4 rooms = \$1800) Car Rental for 4 days (\$100 per day x 4 days = \$400) Registration: \$70 x 4 teachers = \$280 Parking = \$17 x 4 days = \$68 Stipends: 3 breakfast, 4 lunches, 3 dinners (3 x \$6) + (4 x \$11) + (3 x \$19) x 4 people = \$476                  |                                     |                |     |                     |
| <b>4</b>      | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science</b>  |                                     |                |     | <b>\$2,723.51</b>   |
|               | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus                        | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21             |
|               | 5100          | 520-Textbooks   | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$1,934.28          |
|               |               | Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 4: Instructional Practice in Science: Science Studies Weekly (supplemental science reading to support the Core science program)  |                                     |                |     |                     |
|               | 5100          | 510-Supplies  | 0551 - Warrington Elementary School | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$789.23            |
|               |               | Notes: Warrington ES UniSIG: Focus 4: Instructional Practice in Science: Consumable Science Lab materials to support science instruction K-5 (Professional development and planning will be conducted with District Science specialists and teachers to utilize lab materials with standards-based instruction) |                                     |                |     |                     |
| <b>Total:</b> |               |   |                                     |                |     | <b>\$124,996.25</b> |