

Bay District Schools

Lynn Haven Elementary School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	24

Lynn Haven Elementary School

301 W 9TH ST, Lynn Haven, FL 32444

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

Demographics

Principal: John Cannon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 9/28/2021.

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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	71%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 9/28/2021.

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 seek to be 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 seek to be 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cannon, John	Principal	
DeMoss, Maegan	Assistant Principal	
Alford, Tonya	Teacher, K-12	
Peacock, Cindy	Teacher, PreK	
Garrett, Karrie	Teacher, K-12	
Perry, Laura	Teacher, K-12	
Shepherd, Deena	Teacher, K-12	
Worcester, Angie	Teacher, K-12	
Bauer, Kathy	Instructional Coach	
Merrill, Cheryl	School Counselor	
Miller, Ashley	Teacher, ESE	
Nelson, Betsy	Instructional Media	
Halford, Shawnda	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, 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.*

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

580

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	99	103	100	82	103	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	580
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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

Thursday 6/17/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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	
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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				67%	55%	57%	58%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	59%	58%	42%	49%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	57%	53%	31%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				66%	56%	63%	67%	57%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	54%	62%	53%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	42%	51%	31%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				63%	53%	53%	53%	50%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	74%	61%	13%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	58%	10%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	56%	0%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	75%	62%	13%	62%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	59%	-1%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	53%	8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

MAP

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	89	70	68
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	84	65	73
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53	62	67
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44	39	49
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76	73	60
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	66	69
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	89	85	78
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	82	81	87
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	88	77	66
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	82	67	64
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	88	85	78
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	38	42		48	50		33				
BLK	19			29							
HSP	57			67							
MUL	67			60							
WHT	59	42	25	70	29	31	47				
FRL	44	28		51	12		27				
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				

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	293
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	
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	24
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
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	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	43
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	32
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ODRs are down, from 345 in 2018 to 108 in 2021.

Attendance is up, from 92.4% ADA in 2018 to 92.7% in 2021 (we were at 95.59% when the shutdown occurred in 2020).

Our MAP academic data compares favorably with other high performing schools in the district in ELA, Math, and Science.

All grade levels except 2nd regressed on MAP ELA from Fall to Spring. There was some regression in Math (except 2nd, 3rd, and 4th) but not as pronounced as in ELA.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

MAP and FSA mathematics. FSA math scores from 2018 to 2019 are stagnant. Fall 2020 to Spring 2021 MAP math scores showed some improvement in some grades and regression in others. 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 in 2018, then again lost nine weeks of instruction in 2020 due to the pandemic. We wonder what results of FSA math 2021 will look like given our stated focus on math. We wonder what impacts the new ELA curriculum, iReady, and the implementation of a fully inclusive school will yield.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Lost instructional time due to the hurricane and the pandemic.

We need to continue to analyze data and meet the needs of our students. We are excited about the new diagnostic, predictive, and instructional resources available in math via iReady.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ODRs have dropped from 130 in 2019-20 to 108 in 2020-21. Attendance is on the rise as well.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

A deliberate focus on the climate and culture of the school by all school staff and families were factors to these improvements. 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.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will continue to use the PLC process and the MTSS process to analyze data and to drive instruction.

We plan to utilize iReady data to continually guide these processes.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We have paired with the Florida Inclusion Network to provide beginning of the year training on inclusion and ongoing support as well.

Our district has adopted iReady as an academic monitoring tool and academic support.

BDS has hired a new math specialist.

BDS Re-establishing Expectations training has taken place, and we all now have a common understanding of a variety of research and evidence based best practices that we all use.

The SBLT will continue to drive the direction of the school.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Our new School Based Instructional Specialist.

We are now a full Inclusion school. No more self contained ESE classrooms. ESE teachers, Inclusion teachers, Regular Education teachers, Special Area teachers are all vested in the success of the kids.

We are blessed with dedicated, consistent para support at all grade levels.

We will continue to use vertical planning in various forms to benefit us all.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The Florida State Assessment measures students' ability to demonstrate mastery of state standards in ELA. Students scoring a Level 3 or above are considered to meet grade level mastery of state standards measured on the FSA.
 Based on the current released data 23% of the third grade students tested scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 29% percent of third grade students tested scored a Level 2 on 2021 FSA ELA. This represents a total of 52% of third grade students that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.
 Based on the released data 25% of tested fifth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 32% of tested fifth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 57% of tested fifth grade students scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

Students in grade 3 will demonstrate an increase of at least 3 percent increase in the percentage of proficient students on the 2022 FSA ELA. This will increase proficiency from 48% to 51%.
 Students in grade 5 will demonstrate an increase of at least 3 percent increase in the percentage of proficient students on the 2022 FSA ELA. This will increase proficiency from 43% to 46%.

Monitoring:

Student progress will be monitored through teacher observation, formative and summative assessments, diagnostic assessments and progress monitoring probes. Teachers will meet weekly in PLCs to discuss and monitor student progress and classroom data. Student progress will also be monitored through iReady Diagnostic assessments three times per year and more frequently through Growth Monitoring Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:

Bay County has adopted a new state approved ELA Curriculum , Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, which is correlated with the new FL BEST Standards. This curriculum is designed to provide quality instruction on the new BEST standards through a gradual release model starting with whole group lessons then allowing students to interact with the text and practice the skills in small group and individualized activities. In addition the curriculum includes Table Top lessons designed to differentiate instruction in small groups and enables grade level texts to be accessible to all learners. In addition, the curriculum includes Table Top lessons for ELL students allowing them to access and interact with grade level texts and skills as well. Along with the implementation of the HMH curriculum, students' progress will also be monitored through iReady. Students will participate in diagnostic assessments in Fall, Winter and Spring. This diagnostic data will be used to identify students that need additional support and interventions. In addition students will be assigned individualized lessons to address learning deficits. Students will participate in growth monitoring assessments more frequently in order to determine student progress and needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Into Reading core adopted instructional materials for K-5 English Language Arts. The series was reviewed and approved by the FLDOE for inclusion on the State Adopted List at time of adoption and purchase. To improve instruction and learning, BDS teachers incorporate explicit, direct instruction (effect size of .60) and scaffolding (effect size of. 82) based on Hattie's research (Visible Learning: John Hattie 2017)

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in Houghton Mifflin Harcourt virtual training facilitated by district ELA Instructional Specialists. This series of training will guide teachers in the implementation of the curriculum. Follow-up

trainings will be conducted both virtually and in person by the district's ELA Instructional Specialists.

Teachers will meet in PLCs to analyze formative and summative assessment data along with iReady diagnostic and growth monitoring data. Administrators will take part in these PLC meetings to ensure that the curriculum is being instructed with fidelity and that students are receiving necessary support and interventions.

For any student who has not responded to a specific reading intervention delivered with fidelity and with the initial intensity provided (time and group size), reading intervention instruction and/or materials may be changed based on student data. Diagnostic assessments will be required to identify specific needs (areas of strengths and weaknesses.) Further, schools are supported with district MTSS Staff Training Specialists and meet monthly to review student data, progress, and intervention materials. Additionally, schools follow the Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan and MTSS decision tree which indicates research based and evidence-based materials available for targeted interventions (Tier 2). If student data does not show progress at Tier 2 then adjustments will be made (teacher: student ration; time in intervention; intervention materials; instruction).

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Standards based mathematics instruction. Fluctuating math scores. We know this approach will yield positive outcomes. We reviewed FSA, MAP, and classroom grades over multiple years to make this decision.

Measurable Outcome: 70% of our FSA tested 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders will score at Level 3 or above in mathematics.

65% of our 4th and 5th graders will achieve a Learning Gain in mathematics.
65% of our Low Quartile will achieve a Learning Gain in mathematics.

Monitoring: Admin will review lesson plans regularly. Ongoing data analysis will occur during PLCs and MTSS with support from our Instructional Specialist using iReady progress monitoring three times per year, common District assessments, and grades as data points.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: The UChicago Impact 5Essentials framework will continue to be emphasized by leadership within the school and will place emphasis on collaboration through sharing and implementation of best practices, both in structured and unstructured settings. This Framework is based on 25 plus years of data collection and research on effective schools correlates.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The UChicago Impact 5Essentials framework will continue to be emphasized by leadership within the school and will place emphasis on collaboration through sharing and implementation of best practices, both in structured and unstructured settings. This Framework is based on 25 plus years of data collection and research on effective schools correlates.

Action Steps to Implement

Aug. 2 iReady training for all instructional staff.

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

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

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

PLC work will revolve around Math Standards and the analysis of the multiple data points available. PLC notes will be submitted to the school's I drive

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

Faculty meetings in Oct, Feb are dedicated to vertical planning/articulation with clearly defined outcomes/objectives.

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

Intervention schedule adjustments will be made as needed.

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

Tier 2 and Tier 3 will be a focus during MTSS meetings, which will occur the second and fourth week of the month

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

Administrative walkthroughs will focus on adherence to our math pacing guides.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Primary areas of concern based on ORD data are Defiance/Insubordination/Non-compliance, Classroom Disruption, and Inappropriate Behavior/Language.

We are currently PBIS Silver Status (we want Gold). We will create a schoolwide incentive store. We will survey students by grade level to see what they items they would want in our planned school store.

We will continue the use of morning meetings and character education via the Peace First curriculum to continue to facilitate and even more Supportive Environment for our students, staff, and families.

We will expand our mentoring initiative to include as many students as are willing to have mentors as positive role models.

We will continue to report on and display ODR data in faculty newsletters, on our ITV system, and in our SAC meetings.

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.

We are entering our fourth year of teaching character education via the Peace First curriculum. We have for the past three years intentionally consulted the UChicago Impact 5Essentials framework of research to make decisions and prioritize our work. Morning meetings occur every day in every class where the character education is delivered, and it has a service learning component built in to strengthen the tradition

of serving others that has been a part of Lynn Haven Elementary for many, many years.

In 2018, the SBLT re-invigorated the school with an initiative we called Eagle PRIDE - held together daily by our daily pledge we recite together as one on the morning announcements: "At Lynn Haven Elementary, I am a PeaceMaker, I am Respectful, I Include others, I am Determined, I Excel in school and life. I have Eagle PRIDE!" This initiative has changed the culture of the school, and we have drastically improved our School Climate Data results; our families, our faculty and staff, and our students have expressed great satisfaction with how we are "doing" school, saying that they feel students are challenged to do their best, that they are safe, and they trust us with their children. Last year, we used this newfound unity to submit record low discipline data and achieve PBIS Model School status, Silver designation (one of SIP goals), and we were awarded the Persistence award this year from USF as well. Intertwined into this is service to others, and we are now also an EarlyAct school in conjunction with Rotary International.

Our school counselors have been irreplaceable in the transformation of our school. They are both members of the administrative PLC, and have spearheaded a student mentoring initiative that continues to grow. They have helped recruit mentors from all directions - churches, the community, the City of Lynn Haven, our elementary school faculty and staff, Elevate Bay, and even peer mentors. They both intentionally schedule classroom guidance with all teachers, using curriculum explicitly chosen to benefit each class and its unique needs. They also facilitate student leadership groups throughout the year that produce entertaining videos for the school to watch and talk to younger classes on demand about what Eagle PRIDE means and how to be a leader in school and beyond.

We are weekly emphasizing the importance of our Eagle Eyes safety patrol on the morning announcements, and the group of students on this team is as large as it has ever been, around 30 children daily. These students help escort our younger ones in the mornings to their waiting areas before the bell rings and serve in many other helpful capacities.

We also are continuing to benefit from a federal grant funded mental health Triad of social workers and counselors who assist with supporting the social and emotional health of all our kids, from counseling, to group therapy, to check in check out daily.

Administration has been recognized as a top performer in BDS at emphasizing the home/school connection via social media and our Everbridge notification system; Everbridge has simultaneous email/phone/texting capabilities. We will continue to communicate with parents frequently about important events and safety precautions using these vehicles as well as PeachJar paperless email notification.

In Bay District we are fortunate to have a BDS Police Force which allows every elementary school in the District to have a continual police presence on campus via our School Safety Office, Duane Gorey, who is the best in the business when it comes to establishing a positive presence and maintaining positive interactions with our families.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Administration, faculty, staff, our Climate and Culture paraprofessional, BDS staff, families, volunteers, and students are daily contributors. We also enjoy the involvement of community partners such as the Rotary of Lynn Haven, the City of Lynn Haven, several surrounding churches, Elevate Bay mentors, Beef O Brady's, Whataburger, Publix, Winn Dixie, Golden Corral, Domino's, McDonald's, our invaluable PTO, and other schools, including Southport Elementary, Tyndall Academy, Tommy Smith Elementary, Mowat Middle School, and Mosley High School.

All these stakeholders believe in the power of Eagle PRIDE and in the service of others. Each serves others in their roles within the school, whether it is gifts of their resources, their vocal support, or the gift of themselves.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00