

Bay District Schools

# Lynn Haven Elementary School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

# 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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 80%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: C (48%)<br>2016-17: C (51%)<br>2015-16: C (45%)<br>2014-15: B (57%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>16</b> |

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

### 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 Accel 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**

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  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | Positive behavior recognitions   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | To continue to promote and sustain a positive school climate.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | We desire to attain PBIS model school status.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Hire a Positive Behavior Coordinator using T1 funding.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | To provide a constant focus on positive behavior.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Track and report monthly behavior data.</li> <li>2. Conduct and coordinate daily CICO.</li> <li>3. Coordinate and promote positive behavior celebrations.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | [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 |