# Bay Haven School Of Basics Plus

**2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# Bay Haven School Of Basics Plus

## 2901 W TAMIAMI CIR, Sarasota, FL 34234

## www.sarasotacountyschools.net/bayhaven

## School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2017-18 Title I School | 2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School KG-5 | No | 43% |

| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 45% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | B | A | A | A* |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota 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.**

Bay Haven School of Basics Plus provides a highly structured environment through the collaboration of the staff, students, and parents. High expectations are maintained through written contract commitments.

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

The Bay Haven School of Basics Plus is based on the premise that all students can grow academically, physically, and emotionally in a highly structured environment.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

| Name | Title |
|---|---|
| Erickson, Chad | Principal |
| Brusoe, Erica | Assistant Principal |
| Taylor, Robert | Teacher, K-12 |
| Wedebrock, Mary | Teacher, K-12 |
| Lyons, Sheila | Teacher, K-12 |
| Mickley, Sarah | Teacher, K-12 |
| Germanio, Melissa | Teacher, K-12 |
| Hayes, Laurie | Teacher, K-12 |
| Hanson, Rolf | Teacher, K-12 |
| Fehr, Farnaz | Administrative Support |

**Duties**

**Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.**

The School Leadership Team is responsible for making decision and/or providing input on school topics including grading procedures, school routines and and other tasks that impact the school as a whole. At times this team will make decisions by consensus and at times this team will provide input for administration to consider when making decisions.

### Early Warning Systems

**Year 2017-18**

**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** | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 15 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

**Date this data was collected**
Friday 10/19/2018

**Year 2016-17 - 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** | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**Year 2016-17 - 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 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**Assessment & Analysis**
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

The percentage of students making learning gains in the ELA bottom quartile is the lowest of all areas. Looking closer, black students and students with disabilities within this group are making the least gains of all. The data connected to our fourth grade students shows the greatest level of need in all indicators. This group showed the greatest number of absences, course failures and students with two or more indicators.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

The performance of our bottom quartile students in ELA experienced the greatest decline from 46% percent proficient to 30% proficient.

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

Bay Haven's greatest area of need, as compared to the state average, is ELA Learning Gains for our bottom 25%. The state proficient percentage is 48% as compared to Bay Haven's 30%. Our greatest are of success is in the area of ELA proficiency. The state average is 56%, while 77% of Bay Haven students are proficient.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

The performance of our 5th grade students in Science improved from 67% to 72% proficient. No, this is not a trend since the previous year indicated a drop in proficiency by one percentage point.

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.**

During SY 1718 our staff placed a greater focus on Science K-5. This included site based Science professional development, as well as vertical discussions among teachers at all grade levels so they understood the level of rigor demanded by the FSSA, as well as the standards that did not spiral and must be covered in grades K-4. The 5th grade team additionally participated in the district-based

Science benchmark assessments, which provided data after each window that was used to guide instruction and target students and standards that needed support.

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

| School Grade Component | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 77% | 66% | 56% | 70% | 65% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | 57% | 55% | 55% | 54% | 52% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 30% | 46% | 48% | 50% | 49% | 46% |
| Math Achievement | 78% | 72% | 62% | 83% | 70% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 64% | 63% | 59% | 70% | 66% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | 51% | 47% | 60% | 50% | 46% |
| Science Achievement | 72% | 66% | 55% | 68% | 64% | 51% |

| **EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey** | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 (4) | 7 (10) | 7 (4) | 9 (8) | 15 (4) | 8 (6) | 53 (36) |
| One or more suspensions | 1 (0) | 0 (1) | 1 (2) | 2 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 5 (3) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 2 (0) | 3 (5) | 4 (1) | 17 (1) | 7 (1) | 33 (8) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 4 (5) | 17 (10) | 7 (12) | 28 (27) |

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

| ELA | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison | |
| 03 | 2018 | 92% | 68% | 24% | 57% | 35% | |
| | 2017 | 84% | 71% | 13% | 58% | 26% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 66% | 67% | -1% | 56% | 10% | |
| | 2017 | 74% | 69% | 5% | 56% | 18% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -18% | | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 71% | 66% | 5% | 55% | 16% | |
| | 2017 | 71% | 66% | 5% | 53% | 18% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | | |

## MATH

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 03 | 2018 | 79% | 72% | 7% | 62% | 17% |
| | 2017 | 81% | 71% | 10% | 62% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 71% | 71% | 0% | 62% | 9% |
| | 2017 | 81% | 73% | 8% | 64% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 84% | 72% | 12% | 61% | 23% |
| | 2017 | 73% | 70% | 3% | 57% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |

## SCIENCE

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 05 | 2018 | 72% | 67% | 5% | 55% | 17% |
| | 2017 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data

### 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 | 52 | 42 | 25 | 47 | 43 | 33 | 17 | | | | |
| ELL | 73 | | | 45 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 62 | 40 | 19 | 50 | 43 | 35 | 55 | | | | |
| HSP | 76 | 61 | 60 | 82 | 79 | | 69 | | | | |
| MUL | 69 | | | 85 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 82 | 61 | 26 | 84 | 67 | 57 | 75 | | | | |
| FRL | 67 | 48 | 29 | 67 | 54 | 47 | 57 | | | | |

### 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWD | 38 | 35 | 28 | 35 | 58 | 56 | 8 | | | | |
| BLK | 55 | 58 | 56 | 55 | 55 | 50 | 21 | | | | |
| HSP | 76 | 80 | | 78 | 69 | | 75 | | | | |
| MUL | 64 | 64 | | 79 | 64 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 84 | 63 | 44 | 86 | 69 | 71 | 83 | | | | |
| FRL | 68 | 60 | 52 | 70 | 61 | 57 | 56 | | | | |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement
Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

### Areas of Focus:

| Activity #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Lowest Quartile students will make learning gains in FSA Mathematics |
| **Rationale** | Assessment data showed a significant decrease in percent of students proficient in the lowest quartile (62% to 50%). |
| **Intended Outcome** | Through implementing the Action Steps, this student group will make significant gains (increase by 5%) in Math. |
| **Point Person** | Chad Erickson (chad.erickson@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | *Increase time amount and frequency of Math with Jane Weichmann, our interventionist, who serves our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students.<br>*Solidify ESE pull-out and push-in Math service delivery program utilizing the i-Ready toolbox |
| **Person Responsible** | Chad Erickson (chad.erickson@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | Hold quarterly grade level and individual data meetings focusing on the needs of our lowest achieving 25%. During these data meetings, pay special attention to our lowest performing student groups (black students and students with disabilities). The support team will collaborate with homeroom teachers to provide additional resources or support strategies to address academic and/or social/emotional needs. |
| **Person Responsible** | Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| Activity #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Lowest Quartile students will make learning gains in FSA ELA |
| **Rationale** | Assessment data showed a significant drop in proficiency (-16%) for students in this group. |
| **Intended Outcome** | By implementing the Action Steps, students working in the lowest ELA quartile will make a twenty percentage point gain in proficiency. |
| **Point Person** | Chad Erickson (chad.erickson@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | * Increase time amount and frequency of ELA intervention with Jane Weichmann, our interventionist, who seves 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students<br>*Solidify ESE pull-out and push-in ELA service delivery program utilizing the i-Ready toolbox and cold read results<br>*Participate in ELA professional development provided by the district and on-site leaders<br>*Increase before and after school ELA tutoring for students who earned a 1, 2, or low 3<br>Increase the use of common formative and summative ELA assessments in all grade levels |
| **Person Responsible** | Chad Erickson (chad.erickson@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | Hold quarterly individual teacher and team level data meetings with a focus on students in the bottom quartile. These meetings will review common data, identify areas of need and implement/follow up on support structures. During these data meetings, pay special attention to our lowest performing student groups (black students and students with disabilities). The support team will collaborate with homeroom teachers to provide additional resources or support strategies to address academic and/or social/emotional needs. |
| **Person Responsible** | Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

## Part V: Budget

| | |
|---|---|
| **Total:** | **$15,839.04** |