

Sarasota County Schools

Bay Haven School Of Basics Plus



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	28

Bay Haven School Of Basics Plus

2901 W TAMIAMI CIR, Sarasota, FL 34234

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/bayhaven

Demographics

Principal: Chad Erickson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	54%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 is pending approval by the Sarasota County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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	12
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

Bay Haven School Of Basics Plus

2901 W TAMIAMI CIR, Sarasota, FL 34234

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/bayhaven

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	40%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	51%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Bay Haven School of Basics Plus provides an engaging educational environment through the collaboration of staff, students, families and community. This engagement is maintained through written contract commitments, family partnership, dedicated staff and a supportive PTO.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nowaski, Jeannette	Teacher, K-12	As a team leader, the responsibilities include: serving as an instructional leader, providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our leadership team and leading weekly PLCs. As a data team representative, the responsibilities include: providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our school-wide data team, leading their respective team through reviewing student data and facilitating conversation on how this student data drives effective instruction.
Boyd, Erin	Teacher, K-12	As a data team representative, the responsibilities include: providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our school-wide data team, leading their respective team through reviewing student data and facilitating conversation on how this student data drives effective instruction.
Houser, Megan	Teacher, K-12	As a team leader, the responsibilities include: serving as an instructional leader, providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our leadership team and leading weekly PLCs.
Sarazen, Bill	Teacher, K-12	As a team leader, the responsibilities include: serving as an instructional leader, providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our leadership team and leading weekly PLCs. As a data team representative, the responsibilities include: providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our school-wide data team, leading their respective team through reviewing student data and facilitating conversation on how this student data drives effective instruction.
Nickelson, Lorienne	Teacher, K-12	As a team leader, the responsibilities include: serving as an instructional leader, providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our leadership team and leading weekly PLCs.
Fehr, Farnaz	Teacher, ESE	As a data team representative, the responsibilities include: providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our school-wide data team, leading their respective team through reviewing student data and facilitating conversation on how this student data drives effective instruction.
Vieira, Jaime	Other	As a team leader, the responsibilities include: serving as an instructional leader, providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our leadership team and leading weekly PLCs.
Marchese, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	As a team leader, the responsibilities include: serving as an instructional leader, providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our leadership team and leading weekly PLCs.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Iglesia, Joselyn	Teacher, K-12	As a team leader, the responsibilities include: serving as an instructional leader, providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our leadership team and leading weekly PLCs. As a data team representative, the responsibilities include: providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our school-wide data team, leading their respective team through reviewing student data and facilitating conversation on how this student data drives effective instruction.
McQuaid, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	As a data team representative, the responsibilities include: providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our school-wide data team, leading their respective team through reviewing student data and facilitating conversation on how this student data drives effective instruction.
Burt, Angela	Teacher, ESE	As a team leader, the responsibilities include: serving as an instructional leader, providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our leadership team and leading weekly PLCs.
Headley, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	As a data team representative, the responsibilities include: providing input on school wide decisions, communicating information between the grade level/team and our school-wide data team, leading their respective team through reviewing student data and facilitating conversation on how this student data drives effective instruction.
Erickson, Chad	Principal	As a school leader the responsibilities are to: facilitate information between the district and site based level, facilitate meetings to review data, make school wide decisions, provide resources for instruction and support, provide feedback to drive school growth, engage community members for school support, maintain school climate and collaborate with all stakeholders to support staff and students.
Brusoe, Erica	Assistant Principal	As a school leader the responsibilities are to: facilitate information between the district and site based level, facilitate meetings to review data, make school wide decisions, provide resources for instruction and support, provide feedback to drive school growth, engage community members for school support, maintain school climate and collaborate with all stakeholders to support staff and students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/15/2013, Chad Erickson

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

2

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

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

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.

3

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

4

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	105	104	99	97	94	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	13	13	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	4	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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 9/1/2021

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	91	102	98	100	103	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	584
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	4	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				75%	68%	57%	77%	66%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	62%	58%	56%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	53%	53%	30%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				75%	73%	63%	78%	72%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	67%	62%	64%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	53%	51%	50%	51%	47%
Science Achievement				67%	65%	53%	72%	66%	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	85%	70%	15%	58%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	67%	4%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	68%	-1%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	80%	73%	7%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	73%	72%	1%	64%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	70%	3%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	67%	65%	2%	53%	14%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Each grade level will use i-ready to progress monitor student growth. The fall, winter and spring diagnostic data will be reviewed to determine proficiency, with proficiency meaning the student is working at grade level per the Curriculum Associates guidelines. The only exception to this would be the Science section for 5th grade. For this data, we will use the Sarasota County School Science benchmark assessment.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36%	62%	82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	67%	93%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	21%	43%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28%	45%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	43%	81%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	31%	50%
	English Language Learners	50%	50%	50%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40%	64%	83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	44%	75%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	35%	41%
	English Language Learners	0	0	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18%	38%	65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	28%	70%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	24%	29%
	English Language Learners	0	0	100%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76%	84%	89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	48%	74%
	Students With Disabilities	41%	45%	55%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23%	49%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8%	17%	41%
	Students With Disabilities	24%	36%	24%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58%	73%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62%	70%	81%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	22%	36%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39%	63%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	35%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	39%	22%
	English Language Learners	0	0	100%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52%	58%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	52%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	10%	
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41%	53%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	45%	68%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	20%	
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			67%
	Economically Disadvantaged			41%
	Students With Disabilities			12.5%
	English Language Learners			0%

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	30		36	30						
ELL	73			68							
BLK	52	29		38	14	10	36				
HSP	69			63							
MUL	61			66							
WHT	84	63	50	76	50	60	70				
FRL	55	42	36	41	37	21	37				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	41	41	44	46	52	44	36				
ELL	77			77							
BLK	65	63	63	49	60	52	48				

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
HSP	74	70		79	69		62				
MUL	57			57							
WHT	80	53	52	84	64	38	76				
FRL	66	60	57	58	58	50	54				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	52	42	25	47	43	33	17				
ELL	73			45							
BLK	62	40	19	50	43	35	55				
HSP	76	61	60	82	79		69				
MUL	69			85							
WHT	82	61	26	84	67	57	75				
FRL	67	48	29	67	54	47	57				

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	385
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	71
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
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	66
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	65
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	38
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?

Based on the 2021 FSA data- ELA and Science achievement scores were comparable to the state data, while Math proficiency levels continue to decline, with overall proficiency declining from 75% in 2019 to 66% in 2021. Percentage of students on level in ELA decline from 3rd to 4th grades and from 4th to 5th grades. This similar decline occurred between 3rd and 4th grades in Math only.

Grade level data from 2020/21- The Students with Disabilities subgroup is making less gains than other subgroups with greater than 10 students in both reading and math. The SWD subgroup gain range is 0-37% growth in math and 1-24% growth in reading. The Economically disadvantaged subgroup is making significant gains in reading and math as compared to other subgroups, with a range of 33-69% growth in math and 19-69% growth in reading.

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

-Reading: According to the progress monitoring data (i-ready) and state assessments (FSA), the students with disabilities subgroup is making fewer gains than the economically disadvantaged subgroup and/or the level of proficiency for this subgroup is continuing to decline.

Grade level progress monitoring data proficiency range:

SWD- 1% to 24%

Economically Disadvantaged- 19% to 69%

All students- 13% to 48%

FSA proficiency data:

2018 SWD Achievement 52% (compared to 57% all)

2019 SWD Achievement 41% (compared to 75% all)

2021 SWD Achievement 38% (compared to 74% all)

-Math: State assessments (FSA) and progress monitoring data (i-ready) show less proficiency as compared to other subject areas. Both subgroups of Lowest Quartile students and Students With Disabilities are noted as making less gains in this subject as compared to other subgroups/overall performance.

Grade level progress monitoring data:

SWD math proficiency range: 0% to 16%

Economically Disadvantaged math proficiency range: 33% to 69%

All students math proficiency range- 17% to 48%

FSA proficiency data:

2018 SWD Achievement 47%, LQ Achievement 50% (compared to 78% all)

2019 SWD Achievement 46%, LQ Achievement 45% (compared to 75% all)

2021 SWD Achievement 36%, LQ Achievement 39% (compared to 66% all)

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

In Reading, factors that may have impacted student performance for 2019 include less personnel support for students struggling and less SEL support to meet basic needs. These may have caused the reduction in proficiency from 77% ELA achievement (2018) to 75% (2019).

Compounded with Covid-related factors in 2020, such as virtual teaching and inconsistent student/staff attendance impacted the level and consistency of instruction. Teaching in new ways caused a change/reduction in instructional materials. These factors may have exacerbated an already declining proficiency, which dropped again from 75% in 2019 to 74% in 2021. New actions needed to combat this decline include additional personnel to serve varied needs, ongoing support from district ELA specialists and progress monitoring procedures to monitor student growth.

In 2018 overall Math achievement was 78%, but dipped to 75% in 2019. Factors that may have impacted students performance in 2019 include lack of consistent and rigorous curriculum/resources as well as lack of clarity in district planning, as the district was in a transition period between curriculum programs.

In 2021 overall Math achievement dropped again from 75% in 2019 to 66%. Factors that may have impacted students performance for 2020 include concurrent learning (virtual teaching, inconsistent attendance, change/reduction in materials). In math, the inability to teach concepts using manipulatives may have been a large factor, particularly for primary learners. New actions needed to combat this decline include personnel to serve varied needs, ongoing support from our district math specialists and progress monitoring procedures to track student growth.

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

According to state assessments, the most growth was noted in ELA. The least (but still significant) gain came from the Students with Disabilities subgroup, growing from 25% proficient to 44% proficient. Overall, the level of proficiency overall grew from 30% to 54% between 2018 and 2019.

According to progress monitoring data (i-Ready) the subgroup of Economically Disadvantaged students made the most gains at every grade level and in both reading and math. These gains were often 20 percentage points or more in proficiency.

Economically Disadvantaged reading proficiency range: 19% to 69%

Economically Disadvantaged math proficiency range: 33% to 69%

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

In 2019, the school wide lens was focused on the students working in the lowest quartile. This was a common point of discussion during quarterly data chats and weekly grade level meetings. Staff members identified which students were included in the lowest quartile group and held ongoing conversations about their progress. Additionally, after school tutoring and additional small group instruction was facilitated in specific skill-based groups and test taking strategies. The students working in the lowest quartile were included in these additional instructional offerings.

Also in 2019, all students received breakfast and lunch free of charge. This single factor made a large impact on our families struggling financially the most. In addition, many of these students were also

performing within the lowest quartile so they were able to receive specific small group instruction and were included in ongoing progress monitoring tracking.

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

The continued practice of identifying students working within a specific subgroup/need additional support will need to continue. Completing progress monitoring assessments will identify trends/needs to adjust instruction and allocate resources appropriately. Putting a face with the data allows all support staff to personalize instructional support. Ongoing data chats to follow up and track data will also be critical to keeping the momentum going.

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.

Continued learning (both site based and district offered) in the area of effective reading instruction specific to new/developing BEST standards will be necessary. Additionally, learning focused on progress monitoring implementation and the use data to drive instruction in ELA will be critical to the continued growth of students.

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

Planning time and coverage for teachers and support staff to review data quarterly will be needed, along with training as to effective instruction at a variety of levels (Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3) will be necessary to monitor and act on data from our students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: State assessment data indicates less growth in math as compared to reading. In 2019, ELA achievement as measured at 75%, while in 2021 it was measured at 74%. However, math achievement in 2019 was also 75% but dropped for 66% in 2021. State assessment also indicates a decrease in proficiency in all areas: achievement (75% in 2019 to 66% in 2021), learning gains (62% in 2019 to 45% in 2021) and lowest quartile (45% in 2019 to 39% in 2021).

Measurable Outcome: In the area of state assessments, the percentage of students reaching proficiency will grow by 4 percentage points. Based on 2021 data, this would show gains from 74% to 78%.

Monitoring: Each grade level has a data team representative. These representatives will guide grade level data discussions during weekly collaborative planning time, including the development (if needed) of common assessments (including but not limited to i-ready), identification of trends, development of adjusted techniques/supports/resources and monitoring of student data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Common assessments will support our team during collaborative planning and progress monitoring conversations. The trends noticed through progress monitoring will help drive our instructional techniques, identify needed resources and guide professional development for staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing common assessments will ensure that all parties are reviewing the same data and help identify trends. Using collaborative planning time to develop said common assessments and review grade level data will encourage discussion of highly effective strategies for all. Bringing these conversations together quarterly will help spread effective strategies school wide and vertically plan.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify data team to regularly review math data, lead grade level teams to develop common assessments and identify instructional trends.

Person Responsible Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Facilitate quarterly data chats to review school wide data and identify needed instructional shifts, along with needed professional development, resources and supports.

Person Responsible Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Complete teacher observations to monitor use of effective strategies and individualized instruction.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The subgroup of Students with Disabilities is noticed as making less gains than all other subgroups with 10 or greater students in the subject of ELA, as measured by both state assessments (ELA Achievement %) and grade level progress monitoring (i-Ready proficiency). In the area of state assessments, 2021 indicated that Students with Disabilities reached 38% proficiency as compared to black students (52%), multiracial students (61%), and white students (80%). In the area of grade level progress monitoring, subgroup tracking is some different but still tells of less proficiency for the SWD subgroup. Students with Disabilities proficiency ranged from 3% to 24% while the proficiency of Economically Disadvantaged students ranged from 19-69%.

Measurable Outcome: In the area of state assessments, the percentage of Students with Disabilities demonstrating proficiency will grow by 3 percentage points. Based on 2021 data, this would show gains from 38% to 41%.

In the area of progress monitoring, all grade levels will increase proficiency of Students with Disabilities by 5%. This ending mark would adjust by grade, but all grade levels will increase by the same 5 percentage points.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through collaboratively with our school-wide data team, ESE professional learning community and quarterly data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing the district created progress monitoring spreadsheet, all students will have at least three data points in ELA. This, paired with class grades, i-ready diagnostics and FSA scores will help determine needed instructional shifts as we move toward increased proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Monitoring common data allows for greater conversation of effective strategies and instructional needs. The grade level data teams will be able to notice grade-wide trends. The ESE PLC will identify specific student needs and determine if further individualized support is needed through IEPs. The quarterly data chats will allow a collective team to view student data on a school wide scale.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide training and information on how to utilize district progress monitoring data collections sheet. Utilize data when appropriate to demonstrate the power of the information.

Person Responsible: Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Facilitate ESE PLCs and quarterly data chats, relying on progress monitoring data (both district created and classroom provided) to guide next steps for support/adjustments in instructional strategies or resources.

Person Responsible: Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Lead teams through weekly review of grade level data, relying on progress monitoring data (both district created and classroom provided) to guide next steps for support/adjustments in instructional strategies or resources.

Person Responsible Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Provide, through site based experts and district specialists, necessary professional development based on noticed data trends and instructional needs (differentiated instruction, BEST standards, IEP goals, etc.)

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A positive and supportive environment is paramount to student success. Over time we have noticed an increase in behavior concerns, including bullying and threatening behavior. One example of this increase is the school reported 3 instances of OSS SESIR incidents in the 2019/2020 school year. During the 2020/2021 school the school reported 6 similar incidents.

Measurable Outcome: During the course of the 2021/2022 school year, Bay Haven will reduce the number of SESIR incidents from 6 to 3 through the use of PBIS strategies such as mentoring, data tracking, clear expectations and additional support personnel.

Monitoring: The school's PBIS team meets monthly. During these meetings the team will discuss students of concern and develop a plan of support to proactively support students and reactively (if necessary) adjust support. At least 2 PBIS team members are also members of the SWST team, so if the PBIS team agrees formal supports are needed the SWST team could also support with additional options.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Positive Behavior Intervention Support programs are researched based and support the whole campus of a school, as well as small group or individual students. Through clear expectations, added supports (mentoring) and collaboration students will be able to select appropriate choices that align with school expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Bay Haven was identified as a PBIS model school previously, but the data indicates that our program should continue to provide deliberate progress monitoring and support.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure school wide expectations are clear via the morning news show, school signage, parent communication and goal setting.

Person Responsible Luke Behringer (luke.behringer@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Lead grade level representatives in setting school wide goals empowering students to earn rewards for meeting behavior expectations. Meet monthly to check in on progress of the goals and determine possible needs.

Person Responsible Luke Behringer (luke.behringer@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Work with district support to plan and implement a mentoring program for students of varying needs. Share with staff to gain buy in. Work collaboratively with grade levels to gather students names. Progress monitor to determine student/mentor needs monthly.

Person Responsible Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Monitor student discipline data bi-weekly to determine students of concern or trends across grade levels and school using information such as district level Event/Discipline Reports and site-based Notice of Concerns. Provide information and/or professional development for staff based on data.

Person Responsible Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Post pandemic many of our students and families are struggling with basic social emotional skills. This was noticed last year with an increase in physical aggression incidents and conflict resolution as noted in site-based Notice of Concern forms and qualitative information from staff.

Measurable Outcome: Using surveys, we would like to increase our students' collective level of knowledge of basic Social Emotional skills. We will survey our teachers prior to providing support, then after as well. Additionally, we will track concerns using our site based Notice of Concern forms.

Monitoring: Staff pre/post surveys as well as site based Notice of Concern forms will be used to determine the impact of SEL in class lessons paired with support from additional staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: A multi-tired plan of support meets the most students needs. Pairing a contracted teacher to provide consistent in class SEL lessons with the support of staff such as our Behavior Specialist, School Counselor and Mental Health Therapist will meet the most needs to support the most students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Similar to strong Tier 1 curriculum instruction meeting the needs of most students educationally, providing 'tier 1' SEL lessons will meet the needs of most students. This will reduce some of the support load from our additional staff (listed above) to provide effective support, similar to a tier 2 or tier 3 intervention plan.

Action Steps to Implement

Secure funding for contracted SEL support

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

Plan research based topics and order of presentation using resource materials

Person Responsible Tammy Blake (tammy.blake@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Prepare and facilitate pre-surveys to staff for baseline data

Person Responsible Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Prepare schedule for classroom visits without impacting standards based instructional blocks

Person Responsible Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Monitor Notice of Concern data monthly and qualitative data quarterly. Complete post surveys at close of school year for comparative data.

Person Responsible Erica Brusoe (erica.brusoe@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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.

When comparing Bay Haven data to state wide data, Bay Haven is considered a very safe school, or Low threat. Our primary areas of concern were "bullying" and "threat/intimidation". Some steps we are taking the monitor any student behavior concerns are increased staffing, specific training and monitoring. Our staff has welcomed a Mental Health Therapist and a Behavior Specialist to our support team. These team members will join existing support staff (administration, SRO, school counselor, teachers) to discuss students demonstrating behavior concerns on a weekly basis. Based on the level of need, the support team will work with district support to form plans (FBAs, BIPs) and track data to develop individualized student plans. Additionally, contracted SEL instruction will be provided for all students to receive instruction on basic Social/Emotional awareness and skill practice.

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.

Bay Haven School of Basics Plus provides Parent and Family Engagement materials and trainings designed to provide assistance to parents and families in understanding challenging State academic standards, State and local academic assessments, how to monitor a child's progress, and how to work with educators to improve the achievement of their children at convenient, flexible times such as mornings and evenings as well as at-home/attendance zone visits to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students. Additionally, technology including social media and virtual meeting programs (Zoom, Teams, etc.) promote participation and awareness through live and recorded sessions to accommodate varying schedules. In addition, the district and school website contain links, resources, and materials, such as parent guides, study guides, practice assessments, student performance materials, and training to help parents and families work with their children to improve achievement.

The full text and summary of this Schoolwide Improvement Plan may be found online or as a hard copy by request. The Summary is available in English and Spanish.

Parent and families are regularly invited to attend Parent/Teacher Organization, School Advisory Council meetings to formulate suggestions and to participate, as appropriate, in decisions relating to the education

of their children. Bay Haven responds to any such suggestions as soon as practicably possible as evidenced by meeting minutes and notes. If this schoolwide improvement plan is not satisfactory to parents, parents/families are encouraged to submit such comments in writing so that the school can document and submit any parents' comments.

Parents/families are also encouraged to provide input to the school's:

- Positive Behavior Intervention Support team, which monitors school data and determines goals for students to meet when meeting school wide behavior expectations
- Green Team, which beautifies and maintains our schools gardens and green learning spaces for all students, such as our Food Forest.

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

Staff: These stakeholders are responsible for modeling characteristics for students, maintaining relationships with families and alerting administration when needs are noticed.

Students: These stakeholders are responsible for following behavior expectations and communicating needs from their unique perspective through daily interactions and formal platforms such as Student Council and SAC.

Parents/Families: These stakeholders are responsible for supporting the goals of the school through action and at home conversation, relaying concerns that need addressing to school staff and providing needed resources for students both at home and at school.

Community partners: These stakeholders are responsible for listening to the needs of the school, supporting when possible and communicating opportunities for partnership within and beyond the school walls.

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
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$12,227.02
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5000	7100-GRANTS & DONATIONS U.S.- CONTINUED	0071 - Bay Haven School Of Basics Plus	Other Federal		\$12,227.02
			<i>Notes: Contracted services for SEL lessons for K-5 provided through CARES Act funding</i>			
					Total:	\$12,227.02