

Sarasota County Schools

Bay Haven School Of Basics Plus



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Bay Haven School Of Basics Plus

2901 W TAMIAMI CIR, Sarasota, FL 34234

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/bayhaven

Demographics

Principal: Chad Erickson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (65%) 2014-15: A (79%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

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)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	B	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 an engaging educational environment through a collaboration of staff, students, families and community. This engagement is maintained through written contract commitments, family partnership, dedicated staff and a supportive PTO.

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 caring, engaging and structured environment.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Erickson, Chad	Principal	Facilitate meetings, gather information, communicate needs or concerns to district level support, provide resources required to meet student needs
Brusoe, Erica	Assistant Principal	Facilitate meetings, gather information, communicate needs or concerns to district level support, provide resources required to meet student needs
Germanio, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Fehr, Farnaz	Administrative Support	
Nickelson, Lorienne	Teacher, K-12	Communicate information between her grade level team and administration
Stein, Alicia	Teacher, K-12	Communicate information between her grade level team and administration
Nowaski, Jeannette	Teacher, K-12	Communicate information between her grade level team and administration
Budai, Kandace	Teacher, K-12	Communicate information between her grade level team and administration
Walton, Catherine	Teacher, K-12	Communicate information between her grade level team and administration
Sarazen, Bill	Teacher, K-12	Communicate information between her grade level team and administration
McCarthy, Christa	Paraprofessional	Communicate information between her grade level team and administration

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	108	107	105	103	93	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	611
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	3	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	1	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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

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

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	2	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

43

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/4/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

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

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%	68%	57%	76%	68%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	62%	58%	64%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	53%	53%	46%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	75%	73%	63%	78%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	67%	62%	66%	68%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	53%	51%	62%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	65%	53%	67%	64%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	108 (0)	107 (0)	105 (0)	103 (0)	93 (0)	95 (0)	611 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (7)	11 (7)	3 (7)	6 (9)	6 (15)	6 (8)	32 (53)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (2)	1 (1)	0 (0)	2 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	4 (2)	1 (3)	3 (4)	2 (17)	5 (7)	15 (33)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (4)	10 (17)	14 (7)	25 (28)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	85%	70%	15%	58%	27%
	2018	92%	68%	24%	57%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	67%	4%	58%	13%
	2018	66%	67%	-1%	56%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2019	67%	68%	-1%	56%	11%
	2018	71%	66%	5%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	80%	73%	7%	62%	18%
	2018	79%	72%	7%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	72%	1%	64%	9%
	2018	71%	71%	0%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	73%	70%	3%	60%	13%
	2018	84%	72%	12%	61%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	67%	65%	2%	53%	14%
	2018	72%	67%	5%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	41	41	44	46	52	44	36				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL	77			77							
BLK	65	63	63	49	60	52	48				
HSP	74	70		79	69		62				
MUL	57			57							
WHT	80	53	52	84	64	38	76				
FRL	66	60	57	58	58	50	54				
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				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	77
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	71
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Science achievement for our SWD students. Consistency of quality resource instruction for our SWD students was a factor in their achievement level.

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

ELA Achievement declined 21 percentage points from third grade to fourth grade. Low incidence of identification or students with tier 2 and 3 intervention needs.

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.

3rd grade ELA achievement. Bay Haven scored 85% achievement and the state earned a 58% achievement. Some factors include before and after school tutoring, collaborative planning utilizing common assessments, support from interventionists and district level coaching regarding targeted instruction.

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

4th grade ELA achievement moved from 66% to 71% achievement. District level focus and ELA training was impactful, before and after school tutoring and interventionist support were also influential.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Our primary area of concern is achievement for our Students With Disabilities. The percentage of students reaching proficiency is 43%.

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

1. ELA Learning Gains for students in the lowest quartile
2. ELA Achievement for Students With Disability
3. ELA Achievement for the cohort of students tested in 5th grade during 2020
4. Math Achievement for all 5th grade students
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title ELA Learning Gains for students in the lowest quartile

Rationale Based on FSA data, this subgroup has made improvement (from 46% in 2018 to 54% in 2019), but still has room for growth.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

In 2020, ELA Learning Gains for students in the lowest quartile will grow from 54% to 58%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Chad Erickson (chad.erickson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy

Quarterly Data Chats: Teachers will share common student data each quarter with a team of administration and support staff (ESE liaison, ESE teacher, Guidance Counselor, contract service small group instructors and a grade level peer) to determine if current support is appropriate and/or develop plan to intervene or support if necessary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Working collaboratively to review data through multiple perspectives allows the opportunity for discussion, ensuring the student's academic, behavioral, social and emotional needs are met.

Action Step

Description

1. Contract services for intervention support to facilitate small group instruction.
2. Participate in learning sessions with district level support provided by Holly Chesnoff.
3. Consistent and effective ESE instructional programming utilizing push-in and pull-out service delivery models based on student and classroom data as well as IEP information.
4. Utilizing computer lab time to conduct student conferences including progress monitoring, goal setting and intervention completion
5. 4th and 5th grade data focused CPT learning regarding definition of learning gains, learning gains calculation and i-Ready progress monitoring with site-based personnel and district staff, including Katie Shunk and Amy Beechy.
6. Bay Haven SWST member attends weekly CPT meetings to discuss students who may in need of intervention, or who are in the intervention process, to provide support.
7. Facilitate monthly opportunities for staff to vertically share effective instructional strategies with peers.

Person Responsible

Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2	
Title	Math Learning Gains for students in the lowest quartile
Rationale	Achievement in this area declined from 50% in 2018 to 45% in 2019.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In 2020, Math achievement for our students in the lowest quartile will increase from 45% to 49%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chad Erickson (chad.erickson@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Quarterly Data Chats: Teachers will share common student data each quarter with a team of administration and support staff (ESE liaison, ESE teacher, Guidance Counselor, contract service small group instructors and a grade level peer) to determine if current support is appropriate and/or develop plan to intervene or support if necessary.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Working collaboratively to review data through multiple perspectives allows the opportunity for discussion, ensuring the student's academic, behavioral, social and emotional needs are met.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contract services for intervention support to facilitate small group instruction. 2. Participate in learning sessions with district level support provided by Alicia Charbonneau. 3. Consistent and effective ESE instructional programming utilizing push-in and pull-out service delivery models based on student and classroom data as well as IEP information. 4. Utilizing computer lab time to conduct student conferences including progress monitoring, goal setting and intervention completion 5. 4th and 5th grade data focused CPT learning regarding definition of learning gains, learning gains calculation and i-Ready progress monitoring with site-based personnel and district staff, including Katie Shunk and Amy Beechy. 6. Bay Haven SWST member attends weekly CPT meetings to discuss students who may in need of intervention, or who are in the intervention process, to provide support. 7. Facilitate monthly opportunities for staff to vertically share effective instructional strategies with peers.
Person Responsible	Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	Achievement in this area declined from 72% in 2018 to 67% in 2019.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In 2020, achievement in this subject will increase from 67% to 71%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chad Erickson (chad.erickson@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Quarterly Data Chats: 5th grade teachers will share common student data (classroom assessments/observations, benchmark data) each quarter with a team of administration and support staff (including our Science Lab teacher) to determine if current support is appropriate and/or develop plan to intervene or support if necessary.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Working collaboratively to review data through multiple perspectives allows the opportunity for discussion, ensuring the student's academic, behavioral, social and emotional needs are met.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contract services for intervention support to facilitate small group instruction. 2. Participate in learning sessions with district level support provided by Cheri Dame, including standards based lesson planning and utilizing the new science textbook and coordinating materials. 3. Consistent and effective ESE instructional programming utilizing push-in and pull-out service delivery models based on student and classroom data as well as IEP information. 4. 5th grade CPT learning regarding collaborative planning and common assessment discussion. 5. 5th grade to collaborate with Science Lab teacher to prepare and implement two-week 'boot camp' to review 3rd, 4th and 5th grade concepts prior to the FSSA. 6. Bay Haven's Science Committee (Science Lab teacher and a grade level representative K-5) to hold monthly STEM Fair Help Nights, inviting families to the school for support in planning and producing highly effective STEM Fair projects.
Person Responsible	Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

To support our 5th grade team and students, we will focus our intervention contract staff to our 5th grade students utilizing FSA, FSSA, i-Ready and common assessment data to drive small group instruction in ELA, Math and Science. Our ESE teacher will monthly attend 5th grade PLCs to review student performance and adjust instruction accordingly. Quarterly data chats and district-level personnel will reinforce these conversations by reviewing student growth/need with a team-based lens.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

Approximately 99% of parents will attend general PTO meetings.

Approximately 94% of families will complete volunteer hours.

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.

The students at Bay Haven receive whole class guidance lessons focusing on positive character traits in alignment with the Civility Squad program. These traits are reviewed weekly on the morning news and attention is called to students demonstrating each trait. Students also receive small group (Restorative Conferencing) or individual counseling on an as needed basis. The groups are based off needs as noticed by student behavior. Students participate in service projects sponsored by the Student Leadership Team. The projects support Families in Need, Mayors Feed the Hungry, United Way and Make a Difference day. Outside organizations, including the Child Protection Team, SPARCC, fire department, and outside agencies who provide counseling services are regular visitors on the campus. Plymouth Harbor, Sara Bay Club and the All Faith's Food Bank provide weekend groceries and classroom snacks to students in need.

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

Kindergarten teachers complete a screening of each entering kindergarten student during the summer to determine student readiness. The school offers tours to parents and students which includes a visit to several kindergarten classrooms. A "Meet the Teacher" event is held the Friday before school begins which offers students not only a chance to meet their teacher but also an opportunity to explore their classroom. The Star Early Literacy assessment is administered during the first 30 days of school which provides detailed information in academic areas. The iReady Diagnostic is also administered as part of this screener to determine individual student reading needs. The results allow teachers to differentiate their instruction to meet the needs of all students and increase their success in school. A PBIS assembly is held during the first week of school to introduce staff and share school rules, policies and procedures. Bay Haven staff collaborates with the local middle schools by participating in articulation meetings with the receiving middle school staff to ensure a smooth transition for our exiting 5th graders.

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 Leadership team meets bi-weekly in both an advisory and/or decision making function depending on the task at hand. The notes from these meetings are kept by the Secretary and shared with the entire staff. Meeting agendas include, but are not limited to, curriculum needs, school wide routines and procedures, upcoming events, and school/building maintenance. When applicable, supplementing funds for student support is discussed and decided upon as a team. Discussion on necessary issues may be initiated by any/all members of the Leadership Team. While we strive for a consensus vote for topics of discussion, at times voting to determine a majority is necessary.

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

Students and families are encouraged to tour and explore middle schools in the area. School support staff work with local middle and high schools to develop relationships to facilitate smooth transitions. These relationships involve inviting area middle schools to one of our mandatory PTO meetings in the Spring, so parents and students can meet middle school faculty and hear the various strengths and focus areas of each school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains for students in the lowest quartile					\$26,667.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus		Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	9100	239-Other	0071 - Bay Haven School Of Basics Plus		Other	2.0	\$26,667.00
			Notes: Contracted services to provide small group, targeted instruction based on progress monitoring of student data and collaborative planning.				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains for students in the lowest quartile					\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Achievement					\$0.00
Total:							\$26,667.00