
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Deane Bozeman School

13410 HIGHWAY 77, Panama City, FL 32409

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ivan Beach

Start Date for this Principal: 5/18/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Deane Bozeman School

13410 HIGHWAY 77, Panama City, FL 32409

[no web address on file]

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)
Combination School PK-12	No	73%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	10%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

As collaborative stakeholders, our mission is to produce life-long independent learners. All students will be engaged in rigorous instruction through a disciplined and supportive environment that prepares them for college and career success in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Deane Bozeman School will equip students with the character and skills necessary to become productive and responsible community members.

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
Beach, Ivan	Principal	
West, Christie	Assistant Principal	
Timmins, Kim	Assistant Principal	
Rudd, Pam	School Counselor	
Shelton, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	
Kirvin, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
Poiroux, Brandon	Teacher, K-12	
Brannon, Sandra	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 5/18/2020, Ivan Beach

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.*

7

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

103

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	58	54	62	62	73	67	162	146	139	195	128	120	108	1374	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	7	6	9	12	25	14	13	36	15	11	13	175	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	20	1	3	22	18	31	56	27	23	11	212	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	13	29	6	22	77	
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	1	3	9	8	6	12	45	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	16	21	38	15	17	22	160	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	37	24	18	79	33	12	9	216	

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	0	1	0	4	32	20	17	50	32	14	27	199	

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		8	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	9	6	1	0	35
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	2	8	4	2	2	26

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/18/2020

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	54	64	70	65	63	62	154	131	150	147	139	115	113	1327	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	8	6	2	5	1	2	31	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	6	34	33	35	33	29	28	22	226	

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	4	5	4	2	3	1	0	19

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	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	10	3	2	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	13	5	4	4	33

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	54	64	70	65	63	62	154	131	150	147	139	115	113	1327
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	8	6	2	5	1	2	31
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	6	34	33	35	33	29	28	22	226

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	4	5	4	2	3	1	0	19

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	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	10	3	2	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	13	5	4	4	33

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	63%	73%	61%	49%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	64%	59%	50%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	58%	54%	47%	56%	51%
Math Achievement	65%	70%	62%	60%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%	57%	59%	57%	59%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	56%	52%	53%	58%	50%
Science Achievement	61%	65%	56%	50%	67%	53%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	84%	86%	78%	83%	79%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey															
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	79%	61%	18%	58%	21%
	2018	81%	57%	24%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	58%	13%	58%	13%
	2018	70%	51%	19%	56%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	82%	56%	26%	56%	26%
	2018	55%	50%	5%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		27%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
06	2019	59%	56%	3%	54%	5%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
07	2019	57%	54%	3%	52%	5%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	51%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	68%	59%	9%	56%	12%
	2018	68%	58%	10%	58%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
09	2019	57%	58%	-1%	55%	2%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
10	2019	53%	53%	0%	53%	0%
	2018	46%	52%	-6%	53%	-7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	84%	62%	22%	62%	22%
	2018	89%	63%	26%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	59%	17%	64%	12%
	2018	82%	59%	23%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	75%	54%	21%	60%	15%
	2018	65%	57%	8%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
06	2019	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
	2018	62%	52%	10%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
07	2019	66%	59%	7%	54%	12%
	2018	74%	59%	15%	54%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	42%	48%	-6%	46%	-4%
	2018	71%	48%	23%	45%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	53%	16%
	2018	69%	54%	15%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	57%	51%	6%	48%	9%
	2018	56%	49%	7%	50%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	71%	-5%	67%	-1%
2018	63%	64%	-1%	65%	-2%
Compare		3%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	74%	11%	71%	14%
2018	95%	76%	19%	71%	24%
Compare		-10%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	74%	9%	70%	13%
2018	79%	73%	6%	68%	11%
Compare		4%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	64%	3%	61%	6%
2018	63%	64%	-1%	62%	1%
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	62%	3%	57%	8%
2018	65%	62%	3%	56%	9%
Compare		0%			

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	39	46	41	38	44	37	38	67		89	35
HSP	56	55		64	39			93			
MUL	55	60		57	45			82			
WHT	63	59	52	65	57	47	62	83	64	89	71
FRL	56	56	52	59	54	47	54	82	47	88	64

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	32	44	43	49	51	40	38	77		100	14
HSP	58	68		82	67		62				
MUL	35	52		50	31		70				
WHT	58	56	51	70	64	57	62	86	57	80	59
FRL	51	55	47	65	61	54	58	86	49	72	52
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	25	41	43	33	59	58	21	63		81	15
HSP	55	33		60	53						
MUL	50	53		69	82						
WHT	48	50	48	60	58	54	49	83	58	85	48
FRL	45	50	50	56	57	50	43	78	51	81	40

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	705
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
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	65
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	60
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.

Our Math lowest 25% performed the lowest as a whole. Interruption in instruction due to Hurricane Michael may have been a contributing factor.

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

Our Math lowest 25% showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The 18-19 school year was a transitional year with a 6 week break in instruction along with an influx of students that could have contributed to the decline in student performance.

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.

Our Math lowest 25% had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The 18-19 school year was a transitional year with a 6 week break in instruction along with an influx of students that could have contributed to the decline in student performance.

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

ELA achievement showed the most improvement. We implemented after school tutoring focusing on ELA strategies for Elementary and Middle School students.

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

Attendance below 90% is an area of concern for all three levels.

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

1. Learning gains for the lowest 25% in Math
2. Learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA
3. Graduation and acceleration points in high school
4. Learning gains in ELA and Math
5. Social and Emotional Behaviors

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 18-19 assessment data and expected regression of skills from an extended break from traditional school based instruction, we identified the learning gains for the lowest 25% as areas of concern in the areas of math and ela.

Measurable Outcome: Students in the lowest 25% within each grade level will meet/maintain their learning gains in ELA and Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ivan Beach (beachji@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional Learning Communities is an evidence-based strategy this is fully implemented at all levels at Bozeman.

Marzano describes the PLC concept as "one of the most powerful initiatives for school improvement I have seen in the last decade."

Marzano, R (2003) What works in schools : Translating research into action. Alexandria, VA ASCD

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: John Hattie concluded that the best way to improve schools was to organize teachers into collaborative teams that clarify what each student must learn and the indicators of learning the team will track, to gather evidence of that learning on an ongoing basis, and to analyze the results together so that they could learn which instructional strategies were working and which were not. Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to student achievement. New York: Routledge.

Action Steps to Implement

All PLCs will conduct deliberate and focused meetings in order to increase student achievement in all academic areas.

Person Responsible Kim Timmins (timmikh@bay.k12.fl.us)

PLC teams will identify most at-risk students and will determine mentors for each identified student.

Person Responsible Kim Timmins (timmikh@bay.k12.fl.us)

All curriculums will implement interactive notebooks to aide in student mastery of standards.

Person Responsible Christie West (westcl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Classrooms will deliver standards-based instruction using a variety of resources in order to teach to the full rigor of the standards and ensure student mastery of standards taught.

Person Responsible Ivan Beach (beachji@bay.k12.fl.us)

PLC groups will implement learning walks as a professional development tool in order to increase student learning (as necessary).

Person Responsible Ivan Beach (beachji@bay.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will develop/conduct Fall/Spring data chats with students. This will include MAP data, FSA data, EOC data, and classroom performance data.

Person Responsible Ivan Beach (beachji@bay.k12.fl.us)

Classrooms will incorporate technology into their instruction using a variety of tools and programs. (ie: Canvas, Achieve 3,000, Math 180, Zearn, Smarty Ants, etc.)

Person Responsible Kim Timmins (timmikh@bay.k12.fl.us)

Ensure BayLink students on an IEP/504 get accommodations utilizing ESE push-in teachers.

Person Responsible Christie West (westcl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Ensure grade book assessment descriptions are standards based.

Person Responsible Ivan Beach (beachji@bay.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Research indicates that children who are mentally healthy tend to be happier, show greater motivation to learn, have a more positive attitude toward school, more eagerly participate in class activities, and demonstrate higher academic performance than less mentally healthy peers (Hyson 2004; Kostelnik et al. 2015).

Measurable Outcome: Deane Bozeman School will implement BUCK expectations in order to decrease discipline referrals by 5 percent.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ivan Beach (beachji@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of social skills groups, PBIS strategies, Strong Kids curriculum to support the social and emotional needs of our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We have a district initiative to focus on the whole child to include social/emotional needs due to the natural disaster that our community encountered last school year and as a result of the heightened awareness of school violence that has plagued our nation.

Action Steps to Implement

Guidance and administration will train staff on BUCK Expectations.

Person Responsible Christie West (westcl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Display Buck Expectations posters in all classrooms and high traffic areas.

Person Responsible Christie West (westcl@bay.k12.fl.us)

All levels will utilize the Low Level Referral System in order to decrease the number of referrals.

Person Responsible Ivan Beach (beachji@bay.k12.fl.us)

Monthly (secondary) and quarterly (elementary) behavior incentives.

Person Responsible Ivan Beach (beachji@bay.k12.fl.us)

Conduct bi-weekly homerooms for all levels to implement “Wisdom Wednesdays.” Topics to include: compliance of district mask mandates, Focus App, Goal Setting, Character Education)

Person Responsible Christie West (westcl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Implement monthly data chats at each level.

Person Responsible Kim Timmins (timmikh@bay.k12.fl.us)

Utilize triad team for social skills groups, behavior interventions and home visits.

Person Responsible Kim Timmins (timmikh@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Graduation and Acceleration Points in High School is another area of priority that will be addressed and monitored in conjunction with the ELA/Math focus.

Intended outcome would be to increase the graduation rate and acceleration points by 5% at the high school level.

Action Steps:

-All PLCs will conduct deliberate and focused meetings in order to increase student achievement in all academic areas.

-All curriculums will implement interactive notebooks or other curriculum organizational tools to aide in student mastery of standards.

-Classrooms will deliver standards-based instruction using a variety of resources in order to teach to the full rigor of the standards and ensure student mastery of standards taught.

-PLC groups will implement learning walks as a professional development tool in order to increase student learning.

-Teachers will conduct Fall/Spring data chats with students. This will include MAP data, 18-19 FSA data, EOC data, and classroom performance data.

-Classrooms will incorporate technology into their instruction using a variety of tools and programs. (ie: Achieve 3,000, Math 180, Zearn, SmartyAnts, etc.)

-Utilize graduation coach to target at-risk students and assign mentor.

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.

To keep students informed of the school's mission and vision, posters are placed around the school hallways, in the individual classrooms and the school website. In addition, the school website includes additional information such as the school calendar and information about the different programs offered at the school. We also have a strong social media presence that all stakeholders are invited to monitor. Teachers create and send home newsletters to keep parents informed about activities and lessons in the classroom. Parent Portal is a realtime information system that keeps both parents and students informed of student attendance, grades and additional individual academic information. Teachers communicate with parents through notes home, phone calls, Class DoJo, and email to communicate any issues that may arise in the classroom. The school uses the school-wide automated system, LINK, that will call residences to inform parents of school wide information, or in cases of emergency. SAC (School Advisory Council) serves as a bridge for parents and community members to have a stake in the academic success of all students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0541 - Deane Bozeman School	School Improvement Funds		\$800.00
			<i>Notes: School Improvement funds will cover the cost of behavior reward initiatives.</i>			
					Total:	\$800.00