

Sarasota County Schools

# Bay Haven School Of Basics Plus



2020-21 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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (65%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</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, <a href="#">click here</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 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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

## 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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	40%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

### School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	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 the 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.**

At Bay Haven School of Basics Plus, all students will grow academically, physically, and emotionally in a caring, engaging and structured environment.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	Communicate information between assigned grade level team and administration
Fehr, Farnaz	Administrative Support	Communicate information between assigned grade level team and administration
Nickelson, Lorienne	Teacher, K-12	Communicate information between assigned grade level team and administration
Nowaski, Jeannette	Teacher, K-12	Communicate information between assigned grade level team and administration
Sarazen, Bill	Teacher, K-12	Communicate information between assigned grade level team and administration
Morin, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Communicate information between assigned grade level team and administration
Houser, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Communicate information between assigned grade level team and administration

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Monday 7/15/2013, Chad Erickson

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

42

### Demographic Data



<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (65%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</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, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	91	102	98	100	103	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	584
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	4	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

**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	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

**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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 9/15/2020

**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	
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	

**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	
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	

## 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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	71
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

## 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 Students with Disabilities showed a 36% proficiency. Contributing factors may have included unfamiliarity with new Science curriculum and a need for specified time for in-class Science instruction, supported by supplemental Science Lab instruction.

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

In the 2018 school year, Math Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile White students performed at 57%. In the 2019 school year, this same subgroup performed at 38%. Staffing adjustments in the ESE department and a transition to new math teaching methods may have been factors for this decline.

**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.**

As compared to the state, Bay Haven students in 3rd grade math scored 80% where Florida scored 73%. This is a gap of 18%. Some factors that may have contributed to this positive data could be lower class size and highly effective collective efficacy strategies utilized during Professional Learning Communities (team meetings).

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

4th grade ELA Achievement grew the most from the 2018 school year (66%) to the 2019 school year (71%). This 5% growth was our greatest improvement overall. Some new actions taken included designating SWST team members to support specific grade levels on a regular basis and an increased focus on the use of highly effective collective efficacy strategies during PLCs.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Science Achievement for Students with Disabilities (36%)  
Math Learning Gains for White Students in the Lowest Quartile (38%)

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

1. Science Achievement for Students with Disabilities (36%)
2. Math Learning Gains for White Students in the Lowest Quartile (38%)
3. ELA Achievement for Students with Disabilities (41%)
4. Parental Involvement
5. Student Engagement

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Science Achievement for Students with Disabilities showed a 36% proficiency. This lower level of proficiency indicates a need for adjustment at all grade levels, as the 5th grade test score is a cumulative indicator of instruction at all grade levels.

**Measurable Outcome:** During the 2020-2021 school year, Science Achievement for Students with Disabilities will improve by 5%, from 36% proficiency to 41% proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Chad Erickson (chad.erickson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- 1) Specified time at each grade level for Science instruction with homeroom teacher
- 2) Specified time at each grade level for supplemental, hands-on science instruction with Science Lab teacher
- 3) ESE teachers to attend monthly PLCs to review Science data (county benchmarks and state assessments) for progress monitoring and to collaboratively plan instruction
- 4) 2) Additionally, the students performing in the lowest quartile will be discussed during quarterly data chats as an additional level of review and monitoring.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The decreased proficiency level in this area, based on state assessment data, indicates an area of need. Resources that will be utilized for instructional planning will include Criteria for progress monitoring will include include Sarasota County benchmark assessment data, in-class formative and summative assessment data, Science Lab formative and summative data, and other resources provided by our district curriculum, Pearson Elevate.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- 1) Provide all grade levels with specified Science instruction block
- 2) Provide all grade levels with assigned time to attend Science Lab for supplemental instruction
- 3) Support intermediate grades as they complete district level benchmark assessments
- 4) Schedule ESE teachers and support staff to attend monthly PLC for Science specific planning and data review

**Person Responsible** Chad Erickson (chad.erickson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	In the 2018 school year, Math Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile White students performed at 57%. In the 2019 school year, this same subgroup performed at 38%. Staffing adjustments in the ESE department and a transition to new math teaching methods may have been factors for this decline.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	During the 2020-2021 school year, Math Learning Gains of students performing in the Lowest Quartile will increase from 38% to 43%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Chad Erickson (chad.erickson@sarasotacountyschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>1) For this area, there will be an increased focus on the collective efficacy during PLCs. Teams will utilize the district GPS planning tool to create standards-based formative and summative assessments, as well as review these data points for progress monitoring, alongside information provided by i-Ready, to identify trends and share high impact strategies that led to student mastery.</p> <p>2) Additionally, the students performing in the lowest quartile will be discussed during quarterly data chats as an additional level of review, progress monitoring and opportunity for action steps to be initiated.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Collective Efficacy is a high impact strategy that provides opportunities for collaboration of resources and expertise, allowing teachers to share highly effective teaching strategies to reach all students. Data Chats are another highly effective strategy that provides multiple support personnel to review student needs and work collaboratively to address the whole child.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of  
Focus  
Description  
and  
Rationale:**

During the 2019 school year, ELA Achievement for Students with Disabilities was at a 41% proficiency level.

**Measurable  
Outcome:**

During the 2020-2021 school year, ELA Achievement for Students with Disabilities will increase by 5%, to an overall proficiency of 46%,

**Person  
responsible  
for  
monitoring  
outcome:**

Chad Erickson (chad.erickson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:**

- 1) For this area, there will be an increased focus on the collective efficacy during PLCs. Teams will create and plan formative and summative data, as well as review progress monitoring information from i-Ready to identify trends and high impact strategies that led to student mastery as evidenced by these assessments.
- 2) Additionally, the students performing in the lowest quartile will be discussed during quarterly data chats as an additional level of review and monitoring.
- 3) ESE teachers to attend monthly PLCs to review ELA data for progress monitoring and to collaboratively plan instruction

**Rationale  
for  
Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:**

Collective Efficacy is a high impact strategy that provides opportunities for collaboration of resources and expertise, allowing teachers to share highly effective teaching strategies to reach all students. Data Chats are another highly effective strategy that provides multiple support personnel to review student needs and work collaboratively to address the whole child.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Bay Haven School of Basics Plus is a magnet school with a parent volunteer component of 10 hours per family in our family contract agreement. During 2019-2020 school year, our data indicated a decrease in volunteerism. Parent volunteers positively impact our school and student learning through student relationships, teacher support and overall school culture.

**Measurable Outcome:** During the 2020-2021 school, 75% of Bay Haven families will contribute 5 hours of volunteerism.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Chad Erickson (chad.erickson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Through steady communication, families will be notified of their current level of volunteer hours. Staff members will be on hand to support the logging of hours. Regular communication will be distributed with volunteer options, including off site opportunities and weekend schedules.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Volunteerism is a core component of Bay Haven's school culture, as the hours contributed benefit multiple areas on campus, build relationships with students and support teachers to provide more effective in-class instruction. Resources that will be used to communicate volunteer updates include letters, email, Blackboard Community Engagement, social media and personal phone calls.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- 1) Ensure all families have access to log their upcoming volunteer hours
- 2) Communicate an update of hours per family along with volunteerism options to choose from
- 3) Progress monitor volunteerism per quarter and provide follow up communication to all parties

**Person Responsible:** Chad Erickson (chad.erickson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	During the 2020-2021 school year, student engagement became more complicated and multi-faceted with the introduction of concurrent learning. Student engagement is one of the greatest factors that can lead to student achievement.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	During the 2020-2021 school year, classroom observation data (walk throughs) and small group student conversation information will be used to monitor student engagement. During the school year, 80% or more classroom walk throughs will evidence a high level of student engagement (90% or more of the class is engaged). Engagement can be evidenced by participation in class academic conversation (with teacher or peers), completion of assigned tasks, following of expected routines, etc.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	[no one identified]
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Using the PRIDE rubric and district provided look-fors, school administration will identify ratio of students engaged in learning during regularly performed classroom walk throughs/ observations. This visual indicator will help identify engaging teaching practices to be discussed during post-conference conversations. Additionally, qualitative data will be gathered monthly as administration meets with a random but representative group of students to hear their perspective on engaging practices happening on campus and opportunities for growth.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Concurrent teaching is a new platform for all staff this year. Pairing quantitative data and qualitative data will provide a full picture of student engagement on campus. This will provide opportunities to share effective techniques with staff and hold personal conversation for growth if needed.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Science Achievement for Students with Disabilities (36%)- Collective efficacy of PLCs with ESE team inclusion, quarterly data chats for progress monitoring, dedicated time in master schedule for science instruction and supplementation**

**Math Learning Gains for White Students in the Lowest Quartile (38%)- Collective efficacy of PLCs, quarterly data chats for progress monitoring**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Maintaining a positive school culture is a core value of Bay Haven. We accomplish this through a collaboration with a variety of school based groups and community stakeholders. The school based groups include our Positive Behavior Support Team (uses data driven information and research based strategies to support students and families), team leaders and Sunshine Committee (share concerns, problem solve and plan celebrations to keep morale high). Community and parent groups include School Advisory Committee (reviews school data, collaborates to reach goals and problem solve) and Parent Teacher Organization (funds specific school needs or requests, plans celebrations to acknowledge staff and relays information between parents and the school) and the University of South Florida (students in the Elementary Education program receive opportunities for teaching practice during all levels of their internship and our students gain additional academic support in the classrooms) All groups, both site based and community based, work to support our school's mission and vision collaboratively which helps maintain our positive school culture.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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

### **Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>