Lynn Haven Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lynn Haven Elementary School

301 W 9TH ST, Lynn Haven, FL 32444

https://lynnhaven.bay.k12.fl.us/

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 PK-5	No	72%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay 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.

We at Lynn Haven Elementary School celebrate educational excellence in a safe, nurturing environment. We value the education of each individual so that our children become lifelong learners and productive civic stewards.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We at Lynn Haven Elementary School strive to be a model of continued educational excellence where all of our students become proud lifelong learners and soar in all of their pursuits.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Cannon, John	Principal
Alford, Tonya	Teacher, PreK
Weeks, Lara	Teacher, K-12
Morel, Casey	Teacher, K-12
Shepherd, Deena	Teacher, K-12
Walsingham, Jetiame	Teacher, K-12
Worcester, Angie	Teacher, K-12
Edwins, Christina	Teacher, K-12
Nelson, Betsy	Instructional Media
Merrill, Cheryl	School Counselor
DeMoss, Maegan	Assistant Principal
Garrett, Karrie	Teacher, K-12
Miller, Ashley	Teacher, ESE
Collier, Kevin	Teacher, K-12

Duties

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

SBLT members were chosen based on an application they submitted in May of 2018. The team met over the summer to ingrain a refreshed culture within the school. We chose a theme for the school year (Eagle PRIDE), developed a plan to educate faculty on the UChicago 5Essentials, chose Peace First as our character education curriculum, set a monthly meeting schedule for the school (SBLT meetings, faculty meetings, and MTSS meetings), addressed campus safety concerns, and developed the school's 2018-19 improvement plan. The SBLT meets monthly make decisions that drive the school and to ensure that we are on track with our school improvement plan. We practice consensus based decision making where all members have a voice.

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	25	27	16	16	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	4	5	3	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	2	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	2	5	3	4	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	6	13	4	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	2	3	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 7/11/2018

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	19	16	13	10	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	4	3	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	5	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	19	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	2	0	1	4	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	19	16	13	10	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	4	3	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	5	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	19	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	2	0	1	4	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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?

Both ELA and math low quartiles are a concern. This is a trend for both ELA and math. FRL performance is a concern as well. ELA performance of Black subgroup is concerning. Behaviors and attitudes toward school including defiance and disrespect are a concern.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

ELA performance from 3rd to 4th grade showed the greatest decline; learning gains and low quartile are included. This is true for the group, but not necessarily for individual students. This trend is also true moving into 5th grade.
ELA and math learning gains for FRL students dropped.

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

3rd grade ELA outperformed the state (58% satisfactory vs. 56% satisfactory). 4th/5th ELA is a concern, especially the lowest quartile. LHES 4th grade learning gains were at 42% as compared to 55% statewide. LHES low quartile learning gains were at 31% as compared to 48% statewide.

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

3rd grade ELA and math outperformed the state by double digits. This is a trend for both ELA and math. 71% of 3rd grade students were at satisfactory in ELA as compared to 57% statewide. 72% of 3rd grade students were at satisfactory in math as compared to 62% statewide.
4th grade also outperformed the district and state in math (69% at satisfactory as compared to 59% and 62% for the district and state, respectively), and 5th made increases in the percentage of satisfactory students as well (57% in 2018, 41% in 2017).
Science satisfactory performance increased by 12 percentage points, from 53% to 41%.

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

Science was a deliberate focus schoolwide; more hands on learning opportunities. Vertical planning occurred, and a shift in thinking has also occurred that science is everyone's responsibility.
3rd and 4th grade used Fusion benchmark tests to increase rigor.
Eureka math was implemented school wide and customized to meet students' needs.

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	58%	50%	56%	51%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	49%	55%	40%	47%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	45%	48%	39%	43%	46%
Math Achievement	67%	57%	62%	58%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	53%	57%	59%	49%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	46%	47%	32%	43%	46%
Science Achievement	53%	50%	55%	48%	44%	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	25 (19)	27 (16)	16 (13)	16 (10)	18 (13)	19 (19)	121 (90)
One or more suspensions	4 (4)	5 (3)	3 (1)	3 (3)	5 (3)	3 (2)	23 (16)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	7 (2)	2 (5)	2 (4)	9 (3)	1 (2)	21 (16)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (7)	16 (19)	23 (43)	43 (69)

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	71%	57%	14%	57%	14%	
	2017	74%	59%	15%	58%	16%	
Same Grade Comparison		-3%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2018	49%	51%	-2%	56%	-7%	
	2017	59%	52%	7%	56%	3%	
Same Grade Comparison		-10%					
Cohort Comparison		-25%					
05	2018	49%	50%	-1%	55%	-6%	
	2017	49%	49%	0%	53%	-4%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	72%	63%	9%	62%	10%
	2017	71%	56%	15%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	69%	59%	10%	62%	7%
	2017	68%	62%	6%	64%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2018	57%	57%	0%	61%	-4%
	2017	41%	52%	-11%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	52%	54%	-2%	55%	-3%
	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	43	44	39	54	57	47	29				
BLK	43	29		57	54	55	42				
HSP	53	45		63	55						
MUL	65	50		76	30						
WHT	59	42	34	68	54	23	55				
FRL	51	38	26	59	46	30	40				

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	49	47	30	45	54	54	25				
ASN	62			62							
BLK	36	38		36	56	47	7				

		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
HSP	63	36		56	45						
MUL	37	57		53	50						
WHT	66	51	38	63	55	46	44				
FRL	54	48	50	53	49	45	34				

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	Schoolwide ELA focus
Rationale	Our data dictated this decision. Our fourth and fifth grade performance levels in ELA are below state and district levels. We believe that focusing on ELA school wide will address low quartile concerns, FRL concerns, and subgroup concerns.
Intended Outcome	We are setting a goal that 78% of our students will score level 3 or better on the FSA ELA. In addition, we want 62% of our students to achieve a learning gain, and 62% or our low quartile to achieve a learning gain.
Point Person	John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description	We will implement a newly re-focused school wide emphasis on the MTSS process. - Day 1 of back to school inservice will be a re-training of the MTSS process for all staff. Grade levels will make decisions on what data belongs on the MTSS universal spread sheet. We will inventory and survey to determine what intervention materials we have on hand and what is needed. - Monthly MTSS meetings will be used to analyze data and make decisions on interventions. - Each teacher will document intervention activities and students in their weekly lesson plans.
Person Responsible	John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	We will monitor individual students' progress at monthly MTSS meetings. We will analyze mid-year MAP performance and make necessary adjustments. We will analyze end-of-year MAP performance and FSA performance to determine our success.
Person Responsible	John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Parent conferences for all students
Rationale	Involved Families is an established effective school correlate. The SBLT decided that having individual conferences with every student's family in the school will raise their awareness of their students' performance levels and raise their capability to help them with their academic performance.
Intended Outcome	Increased family involvement, which will, in turn, positively impact student academic achievement.
Point Person	John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	Teachers will schedule parent conferences with every student immediately following the end of fall MAP testing. Camilla Hudson will come to the school the morning of September 20th to help us fully understand individual student MAP reports.
Person Responsible	John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Teachers will make a note in the Student Documentation tab of Focus as they accomplish these conferences. Student performance will be monitored monthly.
Person Responsible	John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Activity #3	
Title	Mentoring for all low quartile students
Rationale	Mentoring is proven by research and by practice to improve students' academic performance. Every 4th and 5th grade student in our low quartile will be assigned an adult mentor. Mentors will either be employees of Lynn Haven Elementary or be trained by Elevate Bay.
Intended Outcome	62% of our low quartile will achieve a learning gain on the FSA ELA.
Point Person	John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	Every 4th and 5th grade student in our low quartile will be assigned an adult mentor. Mentors will either be employees of Lynn Haven Elementary or be trained by Elevate Bay. Students will receive mentoring at least twice monthly.
Person Responsible	John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Low quartile students' academic performance will be monitored at monthly MTSS meetings. Mentors will log in their activity on a Google sheet.
Person Responsible	Maegan DeMoss (demosml@bay.k12.fl.us)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Positive relationships with families are increased through academic and non-academic opportunities for parental involvement.
Academic Opportunities include:
Semi-annual Curriculum Based Events
Parent Conferences/Emails
Parent Portal
Student Agendas
Weekly Progress Folders
Classroom Volunteers
Honor Roll Assemblies
Non-Academic Opportunities include:
Field Trip Chaperones
Classroom Volunteers
Picture Day
Health Screenings
PTO
SAC
Going Green Celebration
Christmas/Thanksgiving Lunches
Book Fairs
Spring Fling
Star Gazing Night
Student Performances
Immediate Response Information System (IRIS)
School Website
School Handbook
Facebook
Soaring Eagle of the Month

Other parent events are scheduled throughout the year in an effort to increase parent participation and involvement.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Guidance counselors are very involved on a school-wide level and more importantly on a classroom level.
Counselors also offer individual support to students. For our military parents and students, we have a counselor on campus three days a week.

Counselors provide monthly lessons to all classrooms on subjects related to students' needs. Our

counselors are also available to assist parents with parenting skills and offer strategies for family success.

4th and 5th graders assisting other students in the morning to get to their classrooms and build a relationship, via our Eagle Eye (safety patrol) program.

MTSS Problem Solving Process
Tier 2 Interventions: Social skills groups, Zoo-U, Check-in/check-out mentoring, ISS 360, etc.
tier 3 interventions: individualized functional behavior assessments & positive behavioral interventions Plans

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Our school based Pre-K classes develop vocabulary and background knowledge through a variety of hands-on learning experiences. The program builds a capacity for literacy through a print-rich environment. Opportunities are provided to develop gross and fine motor skills through a variety of activities.

Pre-screening of students entering Kindergarten is administered during summer hours by our teachers. Kindergarten also has a staggered start to the school year.

Representatives visit the fifth grade classrooms to explain the transition to middle school. Additionally, fifth grade classes visit these schools to observe expectations and opportunities available for the upcoming school year.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The members of the school-based leadership team take part in a variety of roles. Team members identify and align resources through participation on teacher interview teams, vertical planning teams, committees, Professional Learning Communities and grade level teams. This promotes collaboration among all teachers and helps identify resources to meet the needs of all students.

All funds will be distributed and utilized in accordance with local, state, and federal guidelines.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget	
Total:	**$0.00**