Warfield Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Warfield Elementary School

15260 SW 150TH ST, Indiantown, FL 34956

martinschools.org/o/wes

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Martin County School Board on 9/19/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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 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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Cristina	Principal	Oversee all instruction, learning, and professional development.
Gilbride, Angie	Assistant Principal	Oversee ELA instruction, learning, and professional development.
Grauer, Crystal	Assistant Principal	Oversee all instruction, learning, and professional development.
Betscha, Rachael	Instructional Coach	Oversee math and science instruction, learning, and professional development.
Mericle, Kyla	Instructional Coach	Oversee ELA instruction, learning, and professional development.
Rooney, Alexis	Instructional Coach	Oversee math and science instruction, learning, and professional development.
Hammond, Nicole	Other	Oversee ESE instruction, learning, and professional development.
Torres, Cyndy	Behavior Specialist	Oversee student positive behavior and parent relations.
Montenegro, Bibi	School Counselor	Oversee behavior and attendance.
Goddard, Jennifer		Oversee behavior and attendance.
Bodie, Erica	Other	Coordination of MTSS process for all students.

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

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

The development of the SIP requires the input of a variety of stakeholder groups.

Leadership team analysis: The school leadership team conducts an initial analysis of preliminary data. The team reviews academic performance, student outcomes, and instructional walk through data to assist in the identification of specific growth areas.

SIP schoolwide committees: The leadership team brings the preliminary data to the SIP committees, who participate in a root cause analysis in order to identify research-based strategies to implement throughout the year.

Student and family surveys: The leadership team utilizes student surveys and family surveys through the Five Essentials framework to gain insights into the school experience from the perspective of students

and families.

School Advisory Council (SAC) involvement: The School Advisory Council, consisting of representatives from various stakeholder groups, including parents, community members, plays a vital role in the SIP development process. The SAC acts as a liaison between the school and the broader community, providing input, feedback, and recommendations on the school's improvement efforts.

SAC engagement in data analysis: The SAC members participate in the analysis of data, including the preliminary data and the results of student and family surveys. They bring their unique perspectives and insights to the discussions, ensuring that the community's voice is integrated into the decision-making process.

Finalizing the SIP: After incorporating the feedback from the SAC and other stakeholders, the school leadership team finalizes the SIP. The plan takes into account the input and perspectives of the SAC, ensuring that the community's interests are represented.

Including the School Advisory Council in the SIP development process promotes collaborative decision-making, community engagement, and shared ownership of the school's improvement efforts. The SAC's involvement ensures that the plan reflects the diverse perspectives and interests of the school's broader community.

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

To monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) for effective implementation and its impact on increasing student achievement, particularly for those with the greatest achievement gap, the following steps are completed.

Data Collection: The leadership team and faculty will gather and analyze various data points regularly-state progress monitoring assessments, formative and summative assessments, attendance rates, and discipline records. This data will help identify areas of improvement and measure progress.

Evaluation of Strategies: The effectiveness of strategies outlined in the SIP will be assessed through ongoing evaluations. This includes classroom observations, surveys, interviews, and feedback from teachers, students, and parents. The data collected will be compared against the established goals and benchmarks to determine the success of the implemented strategies.

Achievement Gap Analysis: The leadership team will conduct an analysis of the achievement gap between different student groups, such as students from different socio-economic backgrounds, ethnicities, or English language learners. By examining the data disaggregated by these groups, we will ensure that the SIP addresses the needs of all students.

Review and Feedback: The SIP will be regularly reviewed by a the SIP committees. SIP committees will analyze student data and classroom walk through data to provide feedback on the plan's effectiveness, identify areas of improvement, and suggest modifications or additional interventions to address the achievement gap.

Professional Development: Continuous professional development opportunities will be provided to teachers and staff to support the effective implementation of the SIP. This will include trainings for all instructional staff with Instructional Empowerment. These trainings will focus on creating consistent

opportunities for authentic student engagement and ensuring that student tasks are aligned with the complexity of the benchmark/standard. This will also include intensive support around utilizing data to make responsive instructional decisions.

By implementing these monitoring and evaluation processes, we will be able to assess the effectiveness of the SIP, track progress in closing the achievement gap, and make informed adjustments to continuously improve student outcomes.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	95%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	35	28	23	33	15	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	4	1	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	50	24	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	38	26	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	6	8	35	4	0	0	0	0	55

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	5	2	19	8	0	0	0	0	37

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	48	0	0	0	0	0	48
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	44	30	29	44	27	0	0	0	0	174
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	82	65	0	0	0	0	147
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	70	62	0	0	0	0	132
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	52	55	127	90	115	0	0	0	0	439

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	0	69	60	0	0	0	0	131

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	56	0	0	0	0	0	56
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	44	30	29	44	27	0	0	0	0	174
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	82	65	0	0	0	0	147
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	70	62	0	0	0	0	132
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	52	55	127	90	115	0	0	0	0	439

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	0	69	60	0	0	0	0	131

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	56	0	0	0	0	0	56
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	27	55	53	22	53	56	19		
ELA Learning Gains				53			87		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46					
Math Achievement*	41	62	59	29	43	50	23		
Math Learning Gains				63			87		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42					
Science Achievement*		55	54		54	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	53	59	54			60		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	139
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	309
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	23	Yes	1	1
ELL	29	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	2	2
HSP	34	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	37	Yes	2	
FRL	34	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	49			
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	18	Yes	1	1
HSP	44			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	27	Yes	1	1
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	27			41								48
SWD	11			23							4	45
ELL	19			32							4	48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	8			50							2	
HSP	27			40							4	48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	33			40							2	
FRL	26			40							4	47

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	22	53	46	29	63	42						54
SWD	17	60	50	26	72	64						54
ELL	19	50	42	26	62	39						54
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	12			24								
HSP	22	53	47	29	63	43						54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	27			27								
FRL	22	57	56	29	66	55						52

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	19	87		23	87							60
SWD	11			9								58
ELL	19	95		21	84							60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	10			7								
HSP	19	86		22	86							59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	19	81		21	81							60

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2023 - Spring	42%	66%	-24%	58%	-16%
03	2023 - Spring	23%	51%	-28%	50%	-27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	37%	62%	-25%	59%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	71%	-16%	61%	-6%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

ELA proficiency on the FAST Spring ELA assessment was 29%, with the lowest performing subgroups at 20% proficiency for black students, 21% proficiency for ELL students, and 16% proficiency for ESE students.
Overall ELA proficiency increased from 22% to 29% from 2022 to 2023, however proficiency remains below 41%.
From 2022 to 2023, the black and ELL subgroups saw an increase in ELA proficiency, from 12% to 20% and 19% to 21% respectively.
From 2022 to 2023, the ESE subgroup saw a decrease in ELA proficiency, from 17% to 16%.
(Indiantown Middle School data) Overall science proficiency was maintained at 12% from 2022 to 2023.
Based on Instructional Rigor Walk data, a misalignment of complexity of student tasks and the benchmark as well as missed opportunities for authentic student engagement contributed to the low performance.

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

The greatest decline from 2022 to 2023 was ESE proficiency in ELA which went from 17% to 16%.
Based on Instructional Rigor Walk data, a misalignment of complexity of student tasks and the benchmark as well as missed opportunities for authentic student engagement contributed to the low performance.

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.

Grade 3 ELA proficiency was 27% versus the state average of 50%. (27 points difference)
Grade 3 Math proficiency was 37% versus the state average of 59%. (22 points difference)
(Indiantown Middle School data) Grade 5 Science proficiency was 12% versus the state average of 51% (39 points difference)

In order to increase science proficiency score, we must increase explicit vocabulary instruction and increase students' engagement with standards-based science experiences.

In order to increase proficiency across subject areas we must complete the following:
-Increase our student authentic engagement and ownership of learning.
-Ensure that student tasks are aligned with the complexity of the standard.

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

From 2022 to 2023, our black subgroup increased in math proficiency from 24% to 49%. We intentionally targeted this subgroup with additional supports focused on PBIS expectations, including peer interactions, and mindset.

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

Based on the EWS data, there is a significant number of kindergarten students displaying high levels of absenteeism. This is a concern because kindergarten students need a strong instructional foundation in order to be successful across grades.

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

1. Provide a framework for constant student collaboration (student led teaming)
2. Ensure that student tasks are aligned with the rigor of the standard (target-task alignment)
3. Increase student attendance rates

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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

Teacher retention and recruitment play a key role in student success.
Based on spring 2023 5 Essentials survey data, school commitment scored an overall rating 36/weak.
Specific data-
Look forward to working each day- 90% agree or strongly agree
Don't want to work at any other school- 83% agree or strongly agree
Feel loyal to school- 87% agree or strongly agree
Recommend this school- 87% agree of strongly agree

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

5 Essentials survey data will indicate the following data by spring of 2024.
Look forward to working each day- 95% agree or strongly agree
Don't want to work at any other school- 95% agree or strongly agree
Feel loyal to school- 95% agree or strongly agree
Recommend this school- 95% agree of strongly agree

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

Teachers will have opportunities to share feedback on their school commitment via surveys three times a year as well as via informal opportunities throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Cristina Smith (smithc1@martin.k12.fl.us)

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

Previously, team met to plan, however the PLC process was not followed with fidelity.
New this year, teachers will be provided with support and opportunities to collaborate within grade teams using the PLCs structure. Instructional coaches will co-lead the PLCs to ensure that they have the knowledge and support needed to successfully deliver instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As a result of our 20 new faculty members this year and the lack of fidelity in PLC implementation, there is a significant need to redesign PLCs.
Teachers who have strong and collaborative connections to colleagues working toward a common purpose display higher levels of school commitment.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

-Additional time for PLC collaboration provided to grade teams

-Additional coach support in planning and implementation

-Additional support from admin on data analysis and instructional decision making

-New teachers are paired with mentors through the Martin Mentors program

-The recruitment team works to build relationships with new hires prior to the start of the year

-Individual and team recognitions throughout the year (announcements, PBIS notes, Warrior Wagon, etc.)

-Incentivize completion of surveys

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

By When: Throughout the year, on-going.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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

2023 data indicated a 23% proficiency rate for 3rd grade students in ELA, with 49 students being retained. The following proficiency rates were indicated for ELA and math for each subgroup respectively:
Black: 20%, 49%
ELL: 21%, 36%
ESE: 16%, 29%

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

All subgroups will reflect a minimum proficiency of 41% in all subject areas.

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

The leadership team will conduct on-going Instructional Rigor Walks and monitor data bi-weekly. The administrative team will conduct weekly IRWs and provide on-the-spot coaching to teachers. The administrative team will review lesson plans and provide feedback directly to teachers weekly.
Instructional coaches co-facilitate twice weekly grade team PLCs to support the development of explicit and intentional instruction that is aligned to Benchmarks.
FAST and unit/topic assessment data will be used to ensure that students are mastering grade level benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

The leadership team, in collaboration with Instructional Empowerment, will provide teachers with extensive professional learning, as well as planning and implementation support, on aligning learning targets and student tasks with the Benchmark as well as planning for and delivering opportunities for authentic student engagement through PD sessions, PLCs, and coaching cycles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Aligning the learning targets and student tasks with the Benchmark will ensure that students are reaching the rigor of the Benchmark. Developing lessons around student led teaming will create authentic engagement and increase student ownership of learning.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

-PLC planning for ELL scaffolds and ESE accommodations so that all students can successfully access grade level content
-Analysis of WIDA Access scores to identify student needs and inform instructional decisions
-Use of Imagine Learning program to support and progress monitor student language acquisition
-Implementation of language development lab for all grades to build oral language and background knowledge
-Implementation of PLAYS instruction in kindergarten classrooms to build oral language and background knowledge
-Use of push-in instructional support to frontload key learning
-3rd grade retainee, ESE subgroup, black subgroup support with goal setting and mindset, with Positive Behavior Coach
-3rd grade retainee, ESE subgroup, black subgroup support through tier 2/3 of MTSS for academics, behavior, and attendance
-ESE subgroup will receive instruction through the SPIRE intervention program as appropriate
-Implementation of Geodes and FUNdations in primary classrooms and interventions across grade levels
-Collaboration with State Literacy Director with specific focus on kindergarten teacher instructional practice improvement with oral language, Science of Reading, and student led teaming
-Training provided to faculty through PBIS on strategies to support students from a variety of cultures
-Mentors provided to students to foster connections and build relationships
-Incentivizing student attendance with PBIS awards

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

By When: Throughout year, on-going.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

We will ensure that instruction and student tasks are aligned to the rigor of the Benchmark.
In May of 2023, Instructional Rigor Walk (IRW) data demonstrate that 23% of teachers' lesson learning targets address the Benchmark. (question 1 on IRW tool)
In May of 2023, IRW data demonstrate that 15% of student tasks were aligned to the learning target. (question 4 on IRW tool)

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

IRW data will increase to 75% by midyear and 100% at EOY in the area of teachers' lesson learning targets addressing the Benchmark. Additionally, FAST data will reflect a minimum of 41% of students proficient in ELA, 52% in math, and 41% in science by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

The leadership team will conduct on-going Instructional Rigor Walks and monitor data bi-weekly. The administrative team will conduct weekly IRWs and provide on-the-spot coaching to teachers. The administrative team will review lesson plans and provide feedback directly to teachers monthly.
Instructional coaches co-facilitate twice weekly grade team PLCs to support the development of explicit and intentional instruction that is aligned to Benchmarks.
FAST and unit/topic assessment data will be used to ensure that students are mastering grade level benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

The leadership team, in collaboration with Instructional Empowerment, will provide teachers with extensive professional learning, as well as planning and implementation support, on aligning learning targets and student tasks with the Benchmark through PD sessions, PLCs, and coaching cycles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Aligning the learning targets and student tasks with the Benchmark will ensure that students are reaching the rigor of the Benchmark.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- Instructional coaches, with support from administration, will co-facilitate weekly grade level planning meetings and support teachers in developing Benchmark-aligned lessons.
- Administration team will review lesson plans and provide feedback to teachers.
- Instructional coaches will provide coaching cycles to assist teachers in implementation of instructional practices, with a focus on benchmark-based instruction and alignment of student task to the benchmark
- Leadership team will conduct IRWs bi-weekly, administrative team will conduct IRWs weekly. Leadership will review trends bi-weekly.
- Faculty coaches from Instructional Empowerment collaborate with Warfield coaches and admin to provide direct coaching and support to faculty and staff

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

By When: Throughout the year, on-going.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

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

We will ensure that intentional planning for student engagement and planning for rigorous standards-based instruction is completed through PLC planning and implemented in classrooms.
Spring 2023 FAST data indicated a 29% proficiency in ELA, a 42% in math, and 12% in science. (Science data from Indiantown Middle School)

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

State student data will reflect a minimum proficiency rate of 41% in ELA, 52% in math, and 41% in science in Spring 2024.

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

The leadership team will conduct on-going Instructional Rigor Walks and monitor data bi-weekly. The administrative team will conduct weekly IRWs and provide on-the-spot coaching to teachers. The administrative team will review lesson plans and provide feedback directly to teachers weekly.
Instructional coaches co-facilitate twice weekly grade team PLCs to support the development of explicit and intentional instruction that is aligned to Benchmarks.
FAST and unit/topic assessment data will be used to ensure that students are mastering grade level benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

The leadership team, in collaboration with Instructional Empowerment, will provide teachers with extensive professional learning, as well as planning and implementation support, on aligning learning targets and student tasks with the Benchmark as well as planning for and delivering opportunities for authentic student engagement through PD sessions, PLCs, and coaching cycles. To accomplish this, we will utilize the 4 Steps Protocol from Instructional Empowerment to align instructional targets and student tasks, based on the rigor of the Benchmark.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Aligning the learning targets and student tasks with the Benchmark will ensure that students are reaching the rigor of the Benchmark. Developing lessons around student led teaming will create authentic engagement and increase student ownership of learning.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Admin and coaches will lead teams in the analysis of student data and planning for instruction. We will use high-visibility data walls to monitor student process and adjust instruction accordingly.
Instructional Empowerment coaches will collaborate with instructional coaches and Design Team leads to assist in facilitating PLCs.

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

By When: Throughout the year, on-going.

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

The leadership team conducts an analysis of student achievement data, including a subgroup achievement gap analysis. Based on this analysis, goals and research-based strategies are developed to address specific student learning needs. Funding priorities are created in order to execute the research-based strategies. Funds are allocated accordingly.

Stakeholder groups, including SAC, faculty and staff, and community members provide input on research-based strategies and spending priorities.

The effectiveness of strategies is monitored throughout the year and funds distribution is adjusted as needed based on student learning outcomes.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA
Increase the number of students achieving on or above grade level on the ELA FAST STAR assessment because ELA proficiency continues to be below the district average.
Increase the number of students achieving a passing score on the FUNdations unit assessment because phonics proficiency continues to be below the district average. We will specifically focus on the transfer of phonics skills into reading comprehension.

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

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA
Increase the number of students achieving on or above grade level on the ELA FAST assessment because ELA proficiency continues to be below the district and state averages.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)
The school plans to increase the percentage of students scoring a 90% or above level on FUNdations Unit assessments.
The school plans to increase the percent of students on or above level on the ELA FAST STAR Spring Assessment to 41%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)
The school plans to increase the percent of students on or above level on the ELA FAST Spring Assessment to 41%.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) structured teams will analyze district-wide and common formative assessments to monitor students progress and make instructional decisions for students based on this data.

In conjunction with PLCs the leadership team will analyze state, district, and classroom formative/ summative data following the cycle of continuous improvement.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Smith, Cristina, smithc1@martin.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Professional Learning Communities, FUNdations, Heggerty, Benchmark, Phonics for Reading, SPIRE, Geodes, Story Champs, Savvas Reading Interventions

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The evidence-based programs listed above address our identified needs in phonics and phonemic awareness as well as have a proven record of effectiveness for our population. These programs have been adopted and approved by the Martin County School District.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Action Steps to Implement: List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below: ◦ Literacy Leadership ◦ Literacy Coaching ◦ Assessment ◦ Professional Learning	Smith, Cristina, smithc1@martin.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

SIP and progress monitoring will be shared monthly at SIP meetings. Warfield's SAC meetings held monthly are provided in-person and translated for all attendees speaking other languages. Parent meetings are also opportunities where school staff focus on strategies to bolster SIP goals and areas of focus.
Additionally, SIP plan is provided in a language parents can understand through the following webpage as an additional measure of dissemination beyond in-person:
https://www.martinschools.org/o/wes

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school uses monthly calendars, Thrillshare text alerts, and social media to keep stakeholders aware of activities and our mission. SAC meetings, Family Nights, and events such as literacy week, STEM night, and conference night allow for the school to build a positive relationship with parents, families, and other community stakeholders. The community supports and sponsors programs, such as PBiS rewards to fulfill the school's mission as well.
https://www.martinschools.org/o/wes

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The school plans to strengthen its academic program through focused professional development, coaching, and collaborative PLCs. These efforts will align instructional strategies with targeted tasks, emphasizing rigorous standards.

With support from Instructional Empowerment coaching and classroom walkthroughs, student-led teaming will boost engagement and accountability. Additionally, the school will provide differentiated scaffolds based on students' language acquisition stages. This approach aims to optimize learning time, accelerate the curriculum, and foster a genuine passion for learning.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Warfield's plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as:

Tile I Part A
Title III/ ELL
Title 9/ Homeless Families in transition

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Guidance counselors, school based mental health services and our school social service workers are available to provide individual, group and classroom counseling to all students. Additionally, the counselors provide personal/social, behavioral, and academic counseling to identified students. Other available services include new student orientation, parental assistance ,referrals for community and state resources, identification and referral of students with particular needs (MTSS) and Standardized testing.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

We will begin our planning year for implementing AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) schoolwide. The AVID framework helps guide our instruction to teach and reinforce academic behaviors and higher-level thinking with awareness and exposure to postsecondary opportunities in our community and beyond. AVID in elementary helps develop the academic habits that students need to be successful in middle school, high school, and college and the workforce. AVID students from middle and high school will come and share AVID Showcases with grade levels. We will build this learning with our community and parents through SAC and parent engagement nights.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We will first implement tier 1 classroom management strategies using PBIS program schoolwide. Our Guidance counselors, behavior interventionist, Prevention Intervention Specialist and ESE Staffing Specialist will be available to help guide, instruct and implement positive behavior supports within the school culture. When students are struggling with the school wide expectations, staff from our Student Services Team will support through intervention and collaboration. As a team, we will decided if a student requires additional supports and services provided by a tier 2 or tier 3 intervention.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

- Collaborations with State Regional Literacy Director to develop and implement ELA reading and foundational skills in professional learning.
- Classroom coaching support with state regional literacy director, instructional coaches, and prevention intervention program specialists.
- Martin Mentors program to build teacher capacity and support teacher retention.
- Instructional Empowerment consultant and coaches to provide professional development with the entire faculty, PLC design team, coaches, and administration
- Content-specific training in math and ELA for teachers, as well as, coaching cycles.
- Continue to build the capacity of all faculty around the school-wide goal of teacher collaboration for student achievement through the PLC process using the think tank professional development.
- New teacher mentors are assigned strategically to assist and help grow new staff.
- Teachers are given opportunities to observe other educators as a way of building their pedagogy through a program called Collaborative Colleagues.
- Teachers work collaboratively to use evidence of student learning and their data from academic assessments to problem-solve and plan using the PLC process.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

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 50% 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.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	510	0131 - Warfield Elementary School	General Fund		$1,000.00
			Notes: Supplies for oral language and background knowledge development in support of science, math, and social studies content areas.			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	510	0131 - Warfield Elementary School	General Fund		$1,000.00
			Notes: Supplies for standards-based science and math hands-on experiential learning.			
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	510	0131 - Warfield Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$5,000.00
			Notes: Classroom library materials to support standards-based instruction.			
					Total:	$7,000.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No