

Martin County School District

Warfield Elementary School



2021-22 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
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	
* 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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Warfield Elementary School

15260 SW 150TH ST, Indiantown, FL 34956

martinschools.org/o/wes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	96%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	C

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Cristina	Principal	Lead school instruction and learning
Gilbride, Angie	Assistant Principal	Co-lead school instruction and learning
Jacarusso, Cheryl	Assistant Principal	Co-lead school instruction and learning
Betscha, Rachael	Math Coach	Co-lead math instruction and learning
Stanley, Sarah	Reading Coach	Co-lead ELA instruction and learning
Mericle, Kyla	Teacher, ESE	Co-lead ESE & behavioral instruction and learning
Goddard, Jennifer	School Counselor	Co-lead MTSS instruction and learning

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.*

4

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

711

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

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

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	116	165	165	154	202	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	802
Attendance below 90 percent	36	54	44	29	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	96	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	96	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	13	35	58	96	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	298

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	84	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/8/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				42%	58%	57%	41%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	59%	58%	46%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				78%	56%	53%	54%	49%	48%
Math Achievement				56%	65%	63%	57%	66%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	65%	62%	41%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	53%	51%	20%	43%	47%
Science Achievement					58%	53%		59%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	58%	-13%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	67%	-7%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Reading data is pulled from 2020-2021 i-Ready Reading Diagnostics.

Math data is pulled from 2020-2021 i-Ready Math Diagnostics.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10.81	17.13	30.46
	Economically Disadvantaged	10.58	17.48	31.20
	Students With Disabilities	8.56	13.11	22.16
	English Language Learners	6.86	11.23	23.05
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6.92	15.56	34.14
	Economically Disadvantaged	7.06	15.25	34.14
	Students With Disabilities	5.38	14.36	27.32
	English Language Learners	5.33	12.70	27.99
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8.82	14.92	25.52
	Economically Disadvantaged	8.84	15.12	26.24
	Students With Disabilities	8.75	12.74	18.35
	English Language Learners	6.30	10.25	19.93
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5.79	13.74	31.96
	Economically Disadvantaged	5.94	13.55	32.51
	Students With Disabilities	5.63	12.18	23.57
	English Language Learners	4.72	12.18	28.32

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8.21	13.81	25.56
	Economically Disadvantaged	7.95	13.67	25.93
	Students With Disabilities	6.56	10.00	16.67
	English Language Learners	5.68	10.62	21.75
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5.71	14.24	31.73
	Economically Disadvantaged	6.24	14.20	32.16
	Students With Disabilities	5.74	13.33	21.01
	English Language Learners	4.54	13.13	29.26
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8.57	16.19	26.15
	Economically Disadvantaged	8.86	16.52	27.14
	Students With Disabilities	9.09	14.67	20.00
	English Language Learners	6.52	13.77	23.12
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6.20	15.47	32.31
	Economically Disadvantaged	7.18	16.10	34.00
	Students With Disabilities	7.79	14.67	22.97
	English Language Learners	5.42	14.88	31.11

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	11			9							
ELL	19	95		21	84						
BLK	10			7							

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
HSP	19	86		22	86						
FRL	19	81		21	81						
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					

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	276
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	9
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

- 2021 data: ELL learning gains, 95% of students had a learning gain on FSA.
- 2021 data: 87% of students in 4th grade had a learning gain in math and reading on FSA.
- Black and ESE subgroups have traditionally lower proficiency levels.
- Overall proficiency in math and ELA has significantly dropped in 2021.
- Vocabulary across content areas is one need for our students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

- Black and ESE student populations demonstrate the highest need for improvement in math and ELA proficiency.
- Increased proficiency in ELA and math for all subgroups.

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

Factors

- During the Covid-19 pandemic the majority of the black and ESE population began school on remote learning due to the impact of Covid-19 in the Indiantown community.

New Actions

- Support for students in small groups by teachers and ESSER positions.
- Benchmark curriculum implemented with fidelity.
- After-school tutoring & mentorship program for LQ students.
- Focus on collective teacher efficacy through PLCs.
- Social-emotional groups lead by male staff at Warfield (breakfast club).
- All classrooms have support from at least one other support staff throughout the day (paraprofessional, support facilitation teachers, and/or ESSER position) who provide small group/individualized instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

- ELL learning gains, 95% students had a learning gain on FSA.
- 87% of students in 4th grade had a learning gain in math on FSA.
- 87% of students in 4th grade had a learning gain in ELA on FSA.

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

- Strategic placement of students in highly effective teacher's classroom.
- Students paired up with mentors from the Leadership Team.
- Establishment of the PLC design team to support grade level teams through the PLC process.

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

- Flexible master schedule to maximize the amount of time grade level teams can meet in PLCs to collaborate and improve instructional practices by following the four essential questions.
- Utilize the Ellevation platform with student data & ELL supports planning protocols to incorporate ELL go-to strategies and increase language acquisition.
- Utilize programs/curriculum with fidelity by following the MCSD pacing calendar which includes frequent progress monitoring through unit assessments and classroom walk thoughts.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

- Goal: A school-wide culture built around high levels of teacher learning through collaboration and collective efficacy (PLCs) to attain high levels of learning for all students (grade-level expectations and beyond).
- Solution tree consultant provided professional development with the entire faculty and PLC Design Team to support PLC implementation.
- Content-specific trainings in math and ELA for teachers as well as coaching cycles.
- Continued PLC work and alignment of MTSS and core student data to make changes in instructional practices to close the academic gap.

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

- Continue to build capacity of all faculty around the school-wide goal of teacher collaboration for student achievement through the PLC process.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase achievement in ELA, as proficiency continues to be below the district and state average.
Measurable Outcome:	The school plans to increase ELA proficiency from 19% to 24% as measured by the FSA. Additionally, 70% of students will demonstrate a learning gain.
Monitoring:	Through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) structure teams will analyze district-wide and common formative assessments to monitor students progress and make instructional decisions for students based on this data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angie Gilbride (gilbria@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A school wide culture built around high levels of teacher learning through collaboration and collective efficacy (PLCs) to attain high levels of learning for all students (grade level expectations and beyond).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Current educational research done by John Hattie indicates that collective teacher efficacy (PLCs) is strongly correlated with student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize programs with fidelity (Benchmark & FUNdations/Geodes).
2. Continue professional development with Florida Benchmark Standards, Benchmark curriculum, instruction, and pedagogy.
3. Collect, analyze, and respond to data generated from these programs through the PLC process.
4. Increase vocabulary by the addition of visuals, realia, and links to Benchmark Curriculum as related to thematic units.
5. Utilize language acquisition data from Ellevation to plan scaffolded instruction around language development needs. Provide question stems, wait time, and opportunities to interact and practice.
6. Ensure interventions are aligned to student needs by monitoring Easy CBM, using the district decision tree, & coach support for teachers as needed.
7. Trainings for paraprofessionals in language acquisition, vocabulary, FCRR, and reading process with literacy coaches, Title I coach, & state literacy director.
8. Teacher support in science of reading connected to BEST standards and ELA curriculum Benchmark Advanced with literacy coaches and state literacy director.
9. Academic tutoring for lowest quartile students focusing on phonics, fluency, and comprehension in small groups.
10. Students will receive small groups in targeted skill deficient areas during Intervention block.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase achievement in math, as proficiency continues to be below the district and state average.
Measurable Outcome:	The school plans to increase math proficiency from 23% to 28% as measured by the FSA. Additionally, 70% of students will demonstrate a learning gain.
Monitoring:	Through Professional Learning Communities structure teams will analyze district-wide and common formative assessments to monitor students progress and make instructional decisions for students based on this data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cristina Smith (smithc1@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A school wide culture built around high levels of teacher learning through collaboration and collective efficacy (PLCs) to attain high levels of learning for all students (grade level expectations and beyond).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Current educational research done by John Hattie indicates that collective teacher efficacy (PLCs) is strongly correlated with student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilizing programs with fidelity (Number Talks, iReady/My Math/Go Math).
2. Continued professional development with Florida Standards, Math curriculum, number sense, Number Talks, instruction, and pedagogy.
3. Collect, analyze, and respond to data generated from these programs through the PLC process.
5. Ensure students are being given remediation and enrichment as needed.
6. Structure lessons using the Concrete, Representational, Abstract model.
7. Provide specific instruction around vocabulary including continued embedded exposure and usage
8. Utilize language acquisition data from Ellevation to plan scaffolded instruction around language development needs.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase science proficiency on the IMS FSSA from 16% to 21%.
Monitoring:	Through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) structure teams will analyze district-wide and common formative assessments to monitor students progress and make instructional decisions for students based on this data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheryl Jacaruso (jacaruc@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A school wide culture built around high levels of teacher learning through collaboration and collective efficacy (PLCs) to attain high levels of learning for all students (grade level expectations and beyond).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Current educational research done by John Hattie indicates that collective teacher efficacy (PLCs) is strongly correlated with student achievement.

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, Jennifer Borges 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 from Ellevation to plan scaffolded instruction around language development needs.

Person Responsible Cheryl Jacaruso (jacaruc@martin.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Through the implementation of PBIS classroom behaviors will be monitored monthly at PBIS meetings where teams can problem solve and create action steps to minimize behavior infractions. Focus on minimizing the amount of disruptions in the school day by adding engagement strategies throughout the day to prevent disruptions in the classroom.

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.

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 RtI data. Our 'check in/check out' mentoring and individual point sheet methods are also used as interventions.

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

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 work with and observe students so they can be appropriately supported in 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.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$1,250.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	510-Supplies	0131 - Warfield Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$250.00
			<i>Notes: Reading foundational activities to support language acquisition</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0131 - Warfield Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Classroom library books</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	510-Supplies	0131 - Warfield Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Supplies for instruction of Concrete, Representational, Abstract</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	510-Supplies	0131 - Warfield Elementary School	General Fund		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Supplies for science experiments with a focus on ELA standards and vocabulary words incorporated.</i>			
Total:						\$2,250.00