

Bay District Schools

Lynn Haven Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Lynn Haven Elementary School

301 W 9TH ST, Lynn Haven, FL 32444

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

Demographics

Principal: John Cannon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	80%
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: B (57%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (45%) 2014-15: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Bay 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Lynn Haven Elementary School

301 W 9TH ST, Lynn Haven, FL 32444

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>72%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>25%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	C	C

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 academic excellence in a safe, nurturing environment. We value the emotional and educational well-being of each individual. It is our mission that our students 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 academic excellence. It is our vision that 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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cannon, John	Principal	
Alford, Tonya	Teacher, K-12	
Weeks, Lara	Teacher, K-12	
Morel, Casey	Teacher, K-12	
Shepherd, Deena	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	
Peacock, Cindy	Teacher, PreK	
Bauer, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	
Perry, Laura	Teacher, K-12	

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	83	83	90	89	71	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	520
Attendance below 90 percent	14	12	7	10	7	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	4	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	2	0	3	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	5	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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)

39

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

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

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

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	67%	55%	57%	61%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	59%	58%	50%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	57%	53%	45%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	66%	56%	63%	59%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	54%	62%	54%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	42%	51%	45%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	53%	53%	41%	44%	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	83 (0)	83 (0)	90 (0)	89 (0)	71 (0)	104 (0)	520 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	14 (25)	12 (27)	7 (16)	10 (16)	7 (18)	22 (19)	72 (121)
One or more suspensions	1 (4)	4 (5)	2 (3)	4 (3)	0 (5)	8 (3)	19 (23)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	1 (7)	2 (2)	2 (2)	0 (9)	1 (1)	6 (21)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (4)	10 (16)	20 (23)	33 (43)

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	74%	61%	13%	58%	16%
	2018	71%	57%	14%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	58%	10%	58%	10%
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	56%	56%	0%	56%	0%
	2018	49%	50%	-1%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	62%	13%	62%	13%
	2018	72%	63%	9%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	59%	-1%	64%	-6%
	2018	69%	59%	10%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	56%	54%	2%	60%	-4%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	54%	7%	53%	8%
	2018	52%	54%	-2%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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 2017-18
SWD	41	56	46	55	48	42	42				

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
BLK	56	67		64	44						
HSP	58	45		67	73						
WHT	68	62	63	66	47	32	59				
FRL	66	64	58	63	47	43	55				
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				
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				

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	57
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	402
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	58
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	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
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	57
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.

Our math low quartile is our low performance area. We lost a month of instruction due to storm, making it difficult to pace instruction. Additionally, our low students struggle to retain math facts. Student attendance was off in the months after the storm, and student transiency as well; our low quartile students also tended to struggle with attendance. Resources to reach these kids are needed. Despite all this, we are trending upward.

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

Math learning gains fell four points. There was the storm; attendance was impacted by its after effects. Intervention resources are lacking. We wonder if teaching testing conventions would have helped.

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.

4th grade math achievement had the greatest gap (58% for LHES as compared to 64% for the state = -6%), which is about in line with the BDS average of 59%. The storm hindered us. We also think that the lack of student retention of basic facts hinders us, along with a lack of intervention resources. We wonder about whether ability grouping was a factor. This is a new trend for 4th grade.

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

Our ELA low quartile increased from 31% to 57%! Mentoring was a new initiative for us that know worked. We also instituted morning meetings in all grades that created an atmosphere where students felt safe to learn; this structure also contributed to our ability to successfully build academic/ social collaboration skills. We were acreful to be transparent and gain buy in when schoolwide goal setting with staff, families, students. We purposefully reset our MTSS process, which led to more productive PLC work. We also followed through all year on our SIP goals.

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

N/A

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

1. We desire a revised Master Schedule with dedicated intervention times for each grade level.
2. We desire to achieve PBS model schools status.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Master Schedule is reconfigured such that all grade levels have an identified 30 minute intervention block.
Rationale	We need to be intentional about our focus on teacher delivered interventions.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA low quartile gains: 83% Math low quartile gains: 69%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Master schedule adjustment to include common intervention blocks for all grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We need to be intentional about our focus on teacher delivered interventions.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SBLT creates the Master Schedule 2. School implements the Master Schedule including intervention blocks in conjunction with existing MTSS structures 3. Reach out to other successful schools for advice/input/resources (West bay, Cherry Street, Patronis, Tyndall, etc) 4. Administration and teachers will monitor the progress of low quartile kids monthly and make necessary adjustments. 5.
Person Responsible	John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Positive behavior recognitions
Rationale	To continue to promote and sustain a positive school climate.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We desire to attain PBIS model school status.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Hire a Positive Behavior Coordinator using T1 funding.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To provide a constant focus on positive behavior.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Track and report monthly behavior data. 2. Conduct and coordinate daily CICO. 3. Coordinate and promote positive behavior celebrations. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

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.

Please see the attached Title 1 Parent and Family Involvement Plan.

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.

Given the natural disaster that recently hit our area, we are employing social workers, mental health counselors, telehealth counselors, behavior interventionists, ISS staff, mentors, a comprehensive check in/check out system, Peace First as our Character Education curriculum, and the pursuit of PBIS model school status.

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

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 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.

Principals, school counselors, and social workers are made aware of available resources from various funding sources during district provided meetings throughout the school year. The needs of students and their families identified during parent-teacher conferences, MTSS meetings, IEP meetings, social worker visits, etc. are addressed by the school counselor and/or social worker by coordinating services and programs provided by federal, state, and local funds within the school system and the community. Students in MTSS tiers II and III are monitored frequently to determine the impact of services and adjustments are made accordingly.

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

NA

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Master Schedule is reconfigured such that all grade levels have an identified 30 minute intervention block.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Positive behavior recognitions	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00