

Martin County School District

Warfield Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Warfield Elementary School

15260 SW 150TH ST, Indiantown, FL 34956

martinschools.org/o/wes

Demographics

Principal: Cristina Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Warfield Elementary School

15260 SW 150TH ST, Indiantown, FL 34956

martinschools.org/o/wes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	97%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.

The mission statement of the Martin County School District, and Warfield Elementary, is to 'Educate all students for success'.

The faculty and staff of Warfield Elementary School are dedicated and accountable to the children, parents, and community. We work collaboratively to provide successful educational experiences so all students become literate, environmentally conscious, and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision statement for the Martin County School District and Warfield Elementary is, 'A dynamic educational system of excellence.'

Warfield Elementary School is committed to providing our students with the most effective and dynamic instruction purposed with ensuring the success of all students.

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
Smith, Cristina	Principal	
Ferreira, Jean	Assistant Principal	
Goddard, Jennifer	School Counselor	
Betscha, Rachael	Teacher, K-12	
Gilbride, Angie	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Cristina Smith

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.*

3

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	110	145	148	148	194	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	745
Attendance below 90 percent	0	20	22	24	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	21	27	31	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/2/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	166	160	157	203	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	832
Attendance below 90 percent	53	47	35	53	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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

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

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	1	3	5	25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	42%	58%	57%	42%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	59%	58%	47%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	78%	56%	53%	58%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	65%	63%	65%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	65%	62%	72%	67%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	53%	51%	63%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	58%	53%	0%	55%	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%	54%	-20%	58%	-24%
	2018	39%	57%	-18%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%
	2018	40%	55%	-15%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	58%	-13%	62%	-17%
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	67%	-7%	64%	-4%
	2018	49%	64%	-15%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
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	19	68	75	23	68	69					
ELL	40	62	76	57	67	72					
BLK	29	36		39	64						
HSP	42	63	76	58	68	70					
WHT	69			62							
FRL	44	63	83	58	70	77					
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	32	33	15	23	18					
ELL	39	52	63	55	38	15					
BLK	35	29		48	38						
HSP	42	51	63	58	40	16					
FRL	41	46	54	58	40	16					
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	9	33	41	36	48	42					
ELL	35	41	56	61	69	61					
BLK	50	53		59	68						
HSP	39	46	58	63	70	65					
WHT	64			82							
FRL	38	44	57	64	71	59					

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	431
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
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	
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	66
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	64
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

Overall ELA Achievement showed the lowest performance. Students are performing in lower text complexity bands, as well as an increased need for language acquisition support.

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

Third grade ELA Achievement and Math Achievements showed the greatest declines. The same trends are pervasive in that students are performing in lower text complexity bands, as well as an increased need for language acquisition support.

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.

ELA Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The factors that contributed to this gap are struggles with text complexity and language acquisition.

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

Math Learning Gains for the lowest quartile was the data component showing the most improvement, with a gain of 51%. The actions taken to achieve this end result were to work on the presentation of math lessons in a focused mini-lesson format, increasing accountable student math talk and problem-solving skills using Number Talks, and a comprehensive focus on math vocabulary.

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

1. Overall improved ELA and Math Achievement
2. Student attendance, especially at lower grades.

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

1. Improved ELA Achievement via differentiation
2. Improved Math Achievement via differentiation
3. Improved student attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase proficiency in science. Students need a variety of diverse experiences and background in science aligned to standards.

Measurable Outcome: Fifth grade science proficiency scores at Indiantown Middle School will increase by 10% points, from 27% to 37%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Angie Gilbride (gilbria@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Integration of rigorous, standard-aligned science vocabulary by embedding throughout lessons in each subject area. Incorporation of hands-on science labs and experiments to assist students in making concrete connections to grade level science content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The data indicates that second language learners require explicit focused vocabulary instruction in order to make connections to the content. Use of hands-on science experiments will facilitate the transference of knowledge and the making of connections.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create grade level specific vocabulary lists at the rigor of the standards for use within each science unit and across content areas
2. Provide specific instruction around vocabulary including continued embedded exposure and usage in science
3. Plan collaboratively to make science connections through hands-on science labs and experimentation
4. Collect, analyze, and respond to Elevate science workbook assessments (grade K-2) and Performance Matters science assessment data (grades 3 and 4) through PLC process
5. Collaboration with district science coordinator, Valerie Gaynor, to utilize her expertise with the selection of standard-aligned experiments and development of rigorous vocabulary lists for implementation in science lessons
6. Utilize language acquisition data to plan scaffolded instruction around language development needs

Person Responsible: Angie Gilbride (gilbria@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	Title: Increase proficiency in math achievement and ensure learning gains for all students.
Description and Rationale:	Rationale: Math achievement proficiency continues to be below the district average.
Measurable Outcome:	The school plans to increase the math proficiency achievement by 10 percentage points as measured by the FSA from 56% to 66%. The school plans to ensure that 100% of students make learning gains as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cristina Smith (smithc1@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement and maintain daily number sense and vocabulary routines, as well as instruction designed around the CRA model, to promote real world problem solving and critical thinking skills needed to be successful.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that utilizing the CRA model as well as building a strong foundation in number sense are critical to support student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilizing Number Talks with fidelity
2. Continued professional development around number sense
3. Collect, analyze, and respond to data through PLC process
4. Plan collaboratively to make connections
5. Ensure students are being given remediation and enrichment as needed
6. Structure lessons using the CRA model
7. Provide specific instruction around vocabulary including continued embedded exposure and usage
8. Utilize language acquisition data to plan scaffolded instruction around language development needs

Person Responsible Cristina Smith (smithc1@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase proficiency in ELA achievement because ELA proficiency continues to be below the district and state average.

Measurable Outcome: The school plans to increase ELA proficiency achievement by ten percentage points as measured by the FSA from 42% to 52% as well as having 100% of students demonstrate learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement and maintain an explicit, systematic, multi-sensory phonics curriculum in order to improve overall comprehension and reading achievement within grade-level expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Current educational research indicates a need for phonics as a foundational building block leading towards ability to read with appropriate accuracy and fluency in order to comprehend texts at increasingly complex levels aligned to grade-level expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize programs with fidelity (RUOS, Foundations, Words Their Way, System 44)
2. Continue professional development with phonics curriculum, instruction, and pedagogy
3. Collect, analyze, and respond to data generated from these programs through the PLC process
4. Plan collaboratively to make connections between components of balanced literacy to ensure application of phonics skills
5. Ensure interventions are aligned to student needs.
6. Utilize language acquisition data to plan scaffolded instruction around language development needs

Person Responsible Angie Gilbride (gilbria@martin.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team at Warfield is developing a Dual Language program to support the language acquisition of our English Language Learners as well as a Continuous Improvement Model to ensure high quality instruction.

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.

The school ensures that all stakeholders have a voice in order to meet student needs, both academically and socially. The school works closely with our School Advisory Council, which consists of members of the community, parents, and staff, to build a positive school culture. Additionally, the school collaborates with four counseling agencies: Tykes and Teens, Legacy Behavioral Services, Treasure Health/Hospice and The Dept. of Children and Families. Furthermore, our guidance counselor provides individual and small group counseling to address social/emotional, incidental and chronic issues affecting students. The guidance counselor conducts numerous Character Counts, Anti-Bullying, Mental Wellness and other programs specific to our RtIB data. Our 'check in/check out' mentoring and individual point sheet methods are also used as interventions.

Each year in April and May, three different local PreK providers collaborate with school officials to schedule a Pre-K to Kindergarten transition visit for students, support personnel and parents. These visits also include children who have no previous schooling and their parents. The visits provide students and parents an opportunity to tour the campus, visit KG classrooms and special areas (art, music, P.E.), and receive a snack in the cafeteria. Parents are able to ask questions and receive information to support transitioning their child(ren) to kindergarten. In March, a PreK to Kindergarten Parent Transition meeting is held to provide them with information to effectively support students coming to a new school. In May, our school's Individual Education Plan (IEP) team and parents meet with Indiantown Middle School personnel to review academic and behavioral support services for each ESE student and determine appropriate placement based on the student's needs.

Each summer (in June) any student who registers for Kindergarten is invited to attend our Jump Start to Kindergarten program. This is a half day program for 15-20 days focusing on academic readiness and social emotional skills. Teachers have an opportunity to screen and observe students so they can be appropriately grouped/placed for the next school year. The students have an opportunity to become acclimated to the school environment and the expectations for their learning, behavior and work habits. Approximately 75 to 80% of the incoming kindergarten students participate in this program.

In March of each year, the local Pre-K providers collaborate with school officials to plan and present a Transition to Kindergarten Parent Night. Parents of all three local Pre-K providers as well as those whose children haven't been enrolled in a Pre-K program are welcome to attend this meeting. The school's kindergarten teachers and administration present information (in English and Spanish) to parents focusing on what to expect in kindergarten and how to make the transition to school easier. Parents are provided with written information, as well.

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: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0131 - Warfield Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	1.0	\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Number Talks books & supplies</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0131 - Warfield Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	1.0	\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Math in Practice Books</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
					Total:	\$1,500.00