

Manatee County Public Schools

Bayshore 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Bayshore Elementary School

6120 26TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34207

<https://www.manateeschools.net/bayshoreel>

Demographics

Principal: Melinda Lundy

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Manatee County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Bayshore Elementary School

6120 26TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34207

<https://www.manateeschools.net/bayshoreel>

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	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	77%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

Bayshore Mission Statement:

Bayshore Elementary School's mission is to prepare each student to be an effective and self-directed contributor in a global society. We will accomplish this by developing each child's unique abilities and potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bayshore Vision Statement:

Bayshore Elementary School's vision is to inspire all student to become lifelong learners. We are champions for all kids, each day, as we sail towards a B!

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
Pletcher, Bernadette	Principal	Provide sound instructional leadership for teachers and nearly 700 students in three learning modes (Brick & Mortar, Hybrid and ELearning). Provide a safe learning environment for all and preciously manage the budget of Bayshore Elementary.
Hemingway-Primous, Samara	Assistant Principal	Support schools initiates, support teachers and the principal as well as plan with teams for instruction for Elearning. Use data to make informed instructional decisions. Ms. Hemingway-Primous manages drill schedules, testing coordination and duties deemed necessary that relate to job description of an Asst. Principal.
Cuffaro, Maria	Assistant Principal	Support schools initiates, support teachers and the principal as well as plan with teams for instruction for Elearning. Use data to make informed instructional decisions. Ms. Cuffaro is the lead on ELA instruction and undertakes any duties deemed necessary that relate to job description of an Asst. Principal.
Keogh, Joseph	Dean	Support teachers in planning, promote positive behaviors at the school, deal with discipline issues and report to the principal and MTSS/IST team all data related to discipline and school-wide strategies to improve discipline and our PBIS program.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Melinda Lundy

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.*

1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	96	103	112	131	105	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	662
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	58	44	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	34	41	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	58	44	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	34	41	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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

Friday 9/11/2020

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	101	102	109	141	119	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	47	36	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	47	36	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	101	102	109	141	119	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	47	36	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	47	36	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	35%	52%	57%	37%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	57%	58%	42%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	55%	53%	45%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	54%	63%	63%	42%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	68%	62%	37%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	53%	51%	32%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	26%	48%	53%	25%	42%	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	34%	51%	-17%	58%	-24%
	2018	34%	49%	-15%	57%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	30%	56%	-26%	58%	-28%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	56%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	33%	52%	-19%	56%	-23%
	2018	35%	52%	-17%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	60%	-4%	62%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	65%	-19%	64%	-18%
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	46%	60%	-14%	60%	-14%
	2018	52%	58%	-6%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	24%	48%	-24%	53%	-29%
	2018	34%	49%	-15%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
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	8	40	57	34	50	46					
ELL	28	43	62	50	56	54	17				
BLK	20	29		24	35						
HSP	30	43	59	54	54	44	19				
MUL	38	36		53	70						
WHT	51	52		65	59		39				
FRL	34	43	49	52	53	50	27				
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	12	32	39	19	30	26	14				
ELL	24	52	60	41	63	55	9				
BLK	19	27	25	22	42	40	25				
HSP	31	49	55	47	65	54	21				
MUL	40	35		48	41		42				
WHT	47	43		62	50		63				
FRL	34	44	44	48	55	41	29				

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	13	33	40	13	17	25	7				
ELL	22	32	42	33	28	22	7				
BLK	23	9		26	26						
HSP	30	41	47	43	36	26	13				
MUL	55	53		45	59						
WHT	47	50	63	41	34	38	43				
FRL	32	40	44	39	31	30	20				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	49
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	53
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	47
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.

Black African-American Students. Students in this area I do not believe were properly monitored throughout the year nor identified as struggling students in the lowest 25%. African American Students were a small population at Bayshore Elementary that may not had been identified as a sub group and monitored for growth and progress. These students were -14% as a subgroup. The expected outcome was 41% for the Federal Index. This is the 3rd year in a row this group has fallen into the Federal Income Subgroup.

The same is most likely true for ESE students. Due to changes in staff and the number of students identified ESE, Bayshore fell -4% behind this past year. I do not feel that a specific focus was on these students, nor was there fidelity in the instruction that they received due to behaviors and new staff. The lagging data was most likely not analyzed, nor was a plan of action for these students developed. With proper progress monitoring and analysis of the data we have we hope to be able to make significant gains with these students. Currently, we have a stronger VE teacher and resource team to help support and monitor these ESE students.

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

Black African-American Students. As mentioned before, African American Students were a small population at Bayshore Elementary were most likely not identified as a sub group and monitored for growth and progress. Not having been at Bayshore in the past years, it is difficult to properly identify what lead to this decline. Black African-American students have shown a 3 year decline. Currently, we are monitoring these students and making certain that targeted small group instruction is available and used frequently.

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.

Black African-American Students again had the biggest discrepancy (41%-27%=-14% gap). Without proper monitoring and having this sub group properly identified it would be hard to focus instructional efforts to increase this data and close the gap. As this is the second year that we are looking back at this data, it has become a focus for the leaders of the school and targeted small group instruction. We have a focus on these students.

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

White Students showed the greatest gain. We have taken more care to track all students, which by doing so, we saw an improvement. Constantly monitoring our L25 and our formative data, we know more about all students and their instructional strengths.

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

Black African-American students and Students with Disabilities (ESE)

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

1. Black African-American Students
2. Students with Disabilities-ESE students
3. Student Learning Gains in Reading and Math
4. Science Gains 5th grade

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Science Achievement Scores on 5th grade FCAT have had the most noticeable and drastic drop from the 2018 to the 2019 school year (10%). Additionally, the past two years have shown that Bayshore Elementary is far below the district and state averages. In 2018 Bayshore was 13% below the district average and 19% the state average. This gap became a bigger gap in the 2019 school year. Bayshore was 22% below the district average and 27% below the state average. All cause to focus much of our efforts on 5th grade Science Achievement

In the 20/21 school year 5th grade Science and ELA Achievement scores will increase to 45% and 50% respectively as measured by the Science SSA and the ELA FSA.

Measurable Outcome:

Seeing how the district and state averages have stayed nearly steady in Science Achievement, it is important to us that we at very least, meet the district average. This would mean that our Science Achievement would have to nearly double. Which is why we have set achievement levels in Math, ELA and Science at 50%. This would also allow us to compete with state achievement levels as well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bernadette Pletcher (pletcherb@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We have many strategies for promoting science achievement not only in 5th grade, but all grades K-5. For 5th grade, we have the core Science block carefully planned and implemented by highly qualified teachers in both Math and Science. In addition to STEM being in the specials rotation, and focusing on 5th grade standards, we have created an opportunity for Media that is in the specials rotation to focus on 3rd and 4th grade science standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

First, myself and one of the 5th grade science teachers have experienced a similar drop in science scores at our previous school. We found that when students had the opportunity to experience science they were able to write and respond to the experience and make sense of the standard to the proper depth needed to pass the FCAT Science.

Action Steps to Implement

- *SSA prep materials
- *Redesign of master schedule to provide more focused time for Science.
- *Using Item Specs for Science to introduce Science each day
- *Teaching critical standards in the STEM block
- *Science Acaletics resources used in Media Specials Time
- *Focus on Science in the Saturday School Schedule for 5th graders
- *STEM teacher teaching 3/4 standards to 4th grade students during STEM block.
- *Focused Science Labs set up for 5th graders every 2 weeks.

- *Incorporating Science standards into the core ELA instruction during Informative reading study
- *After School Tutoring and Saturday School will have a focus on Reading of Science Materials and passages. These will be high interest and include comprehension

Person Responsible Bernadette Pletcher (pletcherb@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Engagement is our focus for the current year. It is important to us to have student engage in the work and have a tangible product to show understanding. This can be accomplished through writing in response to reading, mini assessments, targeted small groups and rubrics. We have made the expected outcomes on our curriculum maps a must and non-negotiable. We will implement Saturday School and a school-wide tutoring initiative to make sure students are given multiple opportunities for success.

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.

Parents of preschool children who are transitioning from our VPK and other local early childhood programs are invited to a Back to School night in August. During the evening, teachers provided virtual orientation and tours of the school curriculum and facilities. Parents are invited to attend monthly virtual trainings and/or evening trainings offered throughout the school year by our ESOL Dept. This year at Bayshore we have a character word each month and use Character Strong. At the end of each month each teacher will pick a student that exemplifies this character trait and they will eat lunch with Administrators. Character Development and Social Emotional Learning are included in the Master Schedule, daily.

Videos are approximately 5 min. long. Students have already begun to use these strategies around campus. We are also a Positive Behavior school and use dojo points to award expected behaviors. Student misbehavior has decreased and teachers are able to use dojo in such a way they can communicate with parents.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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