

Bay District Schools

Lynn Haven Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

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: 6/1/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
2019-20 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%)
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 was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Lynn Haven Elementary School

301 W 9TH ST, Lynn Haven, FL 32444

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	70%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cannon, John	Principal	Oversee school's operations.
Alford, Tonya	Teacher, K-12	
Morel, Casey	Teacher, K-12	
Shepherd, Deena	Teacher, K-12	
Worcester, Angie	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	
Perry, Laura	Teacher, K-12	
Todd, Erica	Teacher, K-12	
Swigler, Jeanette	Teacher, K-12	
Wiles, Charles	Paraprofessional	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/1/2018, John Cannon

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.*

4

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	86	76	83	89	88	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	487
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	12	3	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	1	2	4	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	4	1	0	0	0	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	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/24/2020

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	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	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	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	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	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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(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	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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				
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%	0
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%	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	58
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	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	57
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	57
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.

MAP and FSA mathematics. FSA math scores from 2018 to 2019 are stagnant. Winter MAP math scores were varied. Some grade levels did not appear to be on target to meet expected growth. We lost almost six weeks of instruction due to the hurricane. ELA has been a stated focus in last year's SIP. We wonder what results continued (uninterrupted!) instruction and Spring MAP/FSA would have yielded.

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

FSA/MAP math gains. Research shows that the impact of an interruption in instruction will have long term impacts on math performance, which will take multiple years to resolve learning loss. A new ELA curriculum was instituted last year, which impacted math planning and instructional time.

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 and 5th grade math proficiencies and learning gains lag behind state performance levels. However, we were able to improve our math low quartile performance. We believe that with focus and effort, we will improve our math learning gains and proficiencies.

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

Office Discipline Referrals have dropped from 345 in 2017-18 to 130 in 2019-20. A deliberate focus on the climate and culture of the school by all school staff and families has heavily impacted this change. Morning meetings, character education curriculum, PLC/MTSS work, and PBIS work (including CICO, PROMISE room, mentoring) have been major contributors to these improved numbers. BDS mental health team, our SRD, community involvement, and high quality paraprofessional assistance have been positive contributors as well.

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

We have decreased ODRs nearly 55% over the past two years. There are 44 students with attendance below 90%. We have zero course failures in math, but 5 FSA Level 1 students in 5th grade. This is suggestive of a disconnect between instruction and standards.

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

1. Data driven Standards based instruction, informed by vertical planning
2. Math focus
3. Continued refinement of our MTSS processes
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Area of focus: Standards based mathematics instruction.
 Rationale: We are experiencing stagnant math scores. We have used a Standards based instruction approach previously to improve our ELA outcomes with good success.

Measurable Outcome: State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve:
 FSA Mathematics Level 3 and above performance = 70% (up from 66% in 2019)
 FSA Mathematics Learning Gains performance = 65% (up from 49% in 2019)
 FSA Mathematics Lowest Quartile performance = 65% (up from 39% in 2019)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence based strategy: Beginning with the end in mind; a thorough, ongoing study of the math standards, curriculum, assessments, and student performance data during the PLC process and during select faculty meetings

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Rationale for evidence based strategy: Standards based instruction is an evidence based practice for improving student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

Aug. 3 and 4 PLC day focused on Mathematics Standards study/Canvas planning.

Person Responsible John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

All grade levels' PLC work will revolve around Standards based math instruction.

Person Responsible John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Faculty meetings in September, October, and February are dedicated to vertical planning/articulation with clearly defined outcomes/objectives.

Person Responsible John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

We will implement a Tier 2 focus during MTSS; the last MTSS meeting of every month will be dedicated to Tier 2 instruction.

Person Responsible John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Administrative walkthroughs will be focused on math pacing guides (Standards based instruction).

Person Responsible John Cannon (cannojc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

MTSS - we will continue our regular monthly meeting schedule, which has two MTSS data chats per grade level per month. Our focus on high quality tier one instruction will help us refine data collection and decision making processes to better serve our kids' academic, behavioral, and attendance needs.

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.

At Lynn Haven Elementary, we have invested a lot of time and energy in providing social/emotional support for our students, their families, and our staff. For the past two years, teachers and staff have regularly conducted morning meetings with their classes, effectively delivering high quality character education with all our students, from Pre-K to 5th grade. As a result of our efforts in putting this strong core into place, we have been able to reduce office discipline referrals by almost 55% since 2018. We regularly celebrate students who demonstrate good character via our Soaring Eagle of the Month recognitions for all classes as well as our weekly Eagle PRIDE award winners. We have recently been designated a PBIS model school by the University of South Florida. We have been proactive in our use of social media to celebrate our accomplishments and the accomplishment of our students; we regularly celebrate volunteers of the month, substitutes of the month, celebrations of our community partners, and celebrations of our positive behavior initiatives are good examples of this. We have been able to cultivate and nurture strong relationships with our local churches, the City of Lynn Haven, the Elevate Bay mentoring group, the Rotary Club of Lynn Haven, and other local organization through outreach activities.

Looking forward, we are planning to keep our environment positive and supportive for all through our newly provided district social workers. We also plan to keep our student mentoring program strong, providing frequent support and encouragement to our struggling learners. Our teachers have a firm belief in the power of parent involvement, and have, for the past two years, conducted a minimum of two formal parent conferences per year. We also plan to continue to emphasize student determination in all things by emphasizing Carol Dweck's Growth Mindset research.

Lynn Haven Elementary has 5Essentials survey data from the Spring of 2020 that designates us as "well organized" for continued improvement. We have high levels of trust between our teachers, administrators, students, and families, and we are focused on keeping these relationships strong to keep our culture and environment positive and welcoming!

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: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00