Deane Bozeman School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deane Bozeman School

13410 HIGHWAY 77, Panama City, FL 32409

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ivan Beach

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
2020-21 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%)
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 is pending approval by the Bay 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

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay 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.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Beach, Ivan	Principal	
Timmins, Kim	Assistant Principal	
West, Christie	Assistant Principal	
Poiroux, Brandon	Assistant Principal	
Rudd, Pam	School Counselor	
Kirvin, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
Brannon, Sandra	Teacher, ESE	
Wade, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	
Snyder, Christina	Teacher, K-12	
McNeil, Destree	Teacher, K-12	
Brown, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Wiggins, Peggy	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, 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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

101

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,549

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

14

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

24

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	57	56	61	75	71	76	143	164	158	199	166	128	117	1471
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	20	10	17	12	22	27	26	37	33	27	20	272
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	3	1	2	5	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	5	17	14	4	9	57
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	5	15	21	9	8	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	13	21	26	28	53	35	25	30	234
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	15	30	39	30	40	15	11	7	196
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	6	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	1	3	3	10	13	14	28	28	17	16	134

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	3	0	1	0	1	1	1	4	4	22	7	2	0	46
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	5	1	6	1	3	3	24

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/2/2021

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	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

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	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

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				63%	73%	61%	57%	70%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	64%	59%	56%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	58%	54%	52%	55%	52%
Math Achievement				65%	70%	62%	70%	70%	61%
Math Learning Gains				56%	57%	59%	63%	59%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	56%	52%	55%	62%	52%
Science Achievement				61%	65%	56%	62%	62%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				84%	86%	78%	85%	83%	77%

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	79%	61%	18%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	58%	13%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2021					
	2019	82%	56%	26%	56%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
06	2021					
	2019	59%	56%	3%	54%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	52%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
08	2021					
	2019	68%	59%	9%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
09	2021					
	2019	57%	58%	-1%	55%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
10	2021					
	2019	53%	53%	0%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	84%	62%	22%	62%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	76%	59%	17%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2021					
	2019	75%	54%	21%	60%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
06	2021					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
07	2021					
	2019	66%	59%	7%	54%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	42%	48%	-6%	46%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	53%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	57%	51%	6%	48%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	66%	71%	-5%	67%	-1%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	85%	74%	11%	71%	14%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	83%	74%	9%	70%	13%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	67%	64%	3%	61%	6%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	65%	62%	3%	57%	8%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

NWEA/MAP Assessment is the progress monitoring tool that was used to collect data. This progress monitoring tool was not used for high school this past year.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58.18	59.64	58.92
	Economically Disadvantaged	51.72	53.33	51.72
	Students With Disabilities	52.94	52.94	47.05
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62.75	81.35	63.63
	Economically Disadvantaged	65.51	75.75	67.85
	Students With Disabilities	64.70	68.42	62.50
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44.77	46.47	48.57
	Economically Disadvantaged	32.35	34.28	36.36
	Students With Disabilities	31.81	30.43	34.78
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38.80	40.84	42.85
	Economically Disadvantaged	32.35	34.28	36.36
	Students With Disabilities	31.81	30.43	34.78
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	58.46	59.09	59.42
	Economically Disadvantaged	51.28	51.28	52.50
	Students With Disabilities	36.84	36.84	36.84
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	61.53	63.63	50.00
	Economically Disadvantaged	51.28	53.84	59.42
	Students With Disabilities	47.36	47.36	47.36
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	58.10	57.74	60.27
	Economically Disadvantaged	41.66	45.75	46.87
	Students With Disabilities	22.22	11.76	22.22
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	58.10	57.74	60.27
	Economically Disadvantaged	44.44	45.45	50.00
	Students With Disabilities	22.22	17.64	27.77
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61.76	62.68	62.68
	Economically Disadvantaged	48.57	48.57	48.57
	Students With Disabilities	26.08	33.33	27.27
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	57.35	58.20	58.20
	Economically Disadvantaged	48.57	48.57	48.57
	Students With Disabilities	34.78	38.09	36.36
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52.73	53.37	54.16
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.98	42.85	42.42
	Students With Disabilities	26.31	26.47	27.27
	English Language Learners	M/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	54.19	54.83	54.66
	Economically Disadvantaged	32.89	32.43	31.88
	Students With Disabilities	31.57	33.33	39.39
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53.74	53.33	53.42
	Economically Disadvantaged	38.46	40.90	40.32
	Students With Disabilities	30.76	32.43	32.35
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43.62	43.7	43.53
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.85	32.83	31.74
	Students With Disabilities	50.	31.57	31.42
	English Language Learners	N/A	50.	50.
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	42.55	42.33	42.85
	Economically Disadvantaged	37.87	38.09	37.7
	Students With Disabilities	25.	23.07	23.68
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	42.55	42.33	44.36
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.36	38.09	39.34
	Students With Disabilities	30.0	28.20	28.94
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

	Grade 12			

English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	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	29	32	30	36	42	35	34	70	33	72	38
HSP	49	74		54	53		77	86			
MUL	68	50		59	50		55	100			
WHT	56	47	37	56	43	38	65	82	69	94	66
FRL	47	43	39	47	42	36	58	77	46	90	64

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

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	60
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	662
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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 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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	59
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Most subgroups and core content areas made small gains in progress monitoring MAP data. In first grade math, from winter to spring testing, there was a decrease of seventeen points. Third grade math also dropped from winter to spring testing from 62 to 50 points. Sixth grade made gains throughout overall. Seventh grade English was consistent. In math for seventh grade, there were little to no gains in progress monitoring data.

For statewide assessments, in the area of ELA and for 3rd-7th grade, we were above the district and state averages. In the content area of Math, 3rd-8th grade was above the district and state level. In ELA for 9th and 10th grade, Bozeman was at or above the state and district level. In Science, we were above the state and district for all three tested levels. History/Civics had the same statewide trends.

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

After reviewing the data, in elementary, grade five in the areas of reading and math demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. At the secondary level, ELA for grades 8, 9, and 10 and high school math subjects specifically, Algebra 1 and Geometry.

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

As a school, we feel students in all grade levels struggled with circumstances beyond their control for the past three years. Last year, a significant amount of our students missed many days of instruction due to the nationwide pandemic and quarantining protocols. The year previously, students closed the year with distance learning. In the year 2018, our students faced a devastating category five hurricane, Michael.

These struggles caused our students to miss many weeks if not months of instructional time. We are still battling the pandemic and working diligently to help meet students at their needs and continue teaching students on a virtual platform if/when they are quarantined. In secondary, teachers are using mini boot camps for statewide reassessments to help to meet graduation requirements. Students from elementary to high school have the opportunity to receive free tutoring in all subject areas as needed. This past summer, students who were credit deficit or struggled academically in the 2020-2021 school year were able to attend summer school to help to bridge gaps in learning. In addition to these actions to improve student learning, elementary has a full-time interventionist that will help meet student needs in all subject areas. In secondary, we have a graduation coach for the first time, full-time on our campus.

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

Elementary levels in both reading and math were above state and district scores. Sixth grade made gains throughout overall. For statewide assessments, in the area of ELA and for 3rd-7th grade, we were above the district and state level. In the content area of Math, 3rd-8th grade was above the district and state level. In ELA for 9th and 10th grade, Bozeman was at or above the state and district level. In Science, we were above the state and district for all three tested levels. History/Civics had the same statewide trends. Our biggest school-wide gain was in the area of science.

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

In secondary, teachers are using mini boot camps for statewide reassessments to help to meet graduation requirements. Students from elementary to high school have the opportunity to receive free tutoring in all subject areas as needed. The school also implemented school-wide behavior expectations and interactive notebooks across all core curriculum areas.

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

The programs we are offering and tutoring opportunities will help to accelerate learning across grade levels. For grade levels K-8th grade, students are involved in a new virtual learning opportunity through the i-Ready program. This program is designed to progress monitor students as well as guide their learning to meet state standards for reading and math. We have a new curriculum for ELA and new online learning for science and social studies. It is our hope that with fidelity and implementation of these new resources, we will accelerate learning and help students bridge learning gaps from the previous years.

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.

The professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders has been offered by Bay District Schools through many training opportunities monthly. There was a new textbook adoption for English and all levels are being trained on how to guide instruction and meet student needs.

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

The district has provided us with a Triad Team to help meet the emotional needs of all learners and reach students in crisis. Meeting the emotional needs of learners is at the forefront of our minds in order to reach the whole child.
The additions of the graduation coach and interventionist are also key in fostering our students academic needs. With these additions, we are excited to see the improvement and also see it sustanained.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In review with the School Improvement Team, it is our determination that the area of greatest need is high school mathematics, specifically Geometry and Algebra 1. These were our two lowest areas based on statewide assessment. Both areas were below the district and state level.
Measurable Outcome:	Deane Bozeman School hopes to increase achievement three percentage points as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.
Monitoring:	Students in these two subject areas will be completing district-wide common assessments and measuring growth within their district level PLC teams.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ivan Beach (beachji@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy implemented for this Area of Focus will be the use of interactive notebooks in all grade levels in the area of mathematics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The purpose behind an interactive notebook is to help students organize and synthesize information given to them in class. The reasoning behind interactive notebooks originated with instructional strategies such as note taking, concept mapping, and organization of information as well as brain research about how students learn best. Interactive notebooks combine all of this research into one instructional method to promote student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will document through lesson planning the use of interactive notebooks.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Black (blackck@bay.k12.fl.us)

Administration will send out monthly EWS reports to check concept understanding in the area of math.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 20-21 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.
Monitoring:	Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) will meet weekly to review data, discuss educational practices and progress monitor student learning at all grade levels across the campus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ivan Beach (beachji@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All grade levels have a new ELA textbook adoption series that is aligned to the Florida BEST standards of instruction to implement an interactive notebook. Teachers will be implementing this new textbook resource as well as using the Bay District Schools Pacing Guide to instruct in the area of ELA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The purpose behind an interactive notebook is to help students organize and synthesize information given to them in class. The reasoning behind interactive notebooks originated with instructional strategies such as note taking, concept mapping, and organization of information as well as brain research about how students learn best. Interactive notebooks combine all of this research into one instructional method to promote student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

All curriculums will implement interactive notebooks or other curriculum organizational tools to aide in student mastery of standards as monitored by lesson plans.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Black (blackck@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.

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

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

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

#3. 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.
Monitoring:	Guidance and administration will train staff on BUCK Expectations. We will display Buck Expectations posters in all classrooms and high traffic areas. All levels will utilize the Low Level Referral System in order to decrease the number of referrals. Administration will monitor disciplinary referrals monthly through the use of our EWS reports as well as in our monthly MTSS data chat meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christie West (westcl@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 as well as the EverFi curriculum for secondary 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 in the 2017-2018 school year as well as the mental health crisis the nation has encountered after two years into a global pandemic.

Action Steps to Implement	
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	Christie West (westcl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Monthly (secondary) and quarterly (elementary) behavior incentives.	
Person Responsible	Christie West (westcl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Implement monthly data chats at each level.	
Person Responsible	Christie West (westcl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Utilize triad team for social skills groups, behavior interventions and home visits.	
Person Responsible	Ivan Beach (beachji@bay.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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. The work of the PLC team would also include monthly monitoring of our Lowest 25% students and ways to increase achievement across all areas.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome would be to increase the graduation rate and acceleration points by 5% at the middle/high school level and increase performance on standardized testing in our L25 by 5% as measured by the FSA/EOC data.
Monitoring:	All PLCs will conduct deliberate and focused meetings in order to increase student achievement in all academic areas. Teachers will use progress monitoring data as well as common assessment data aligned to standards to ensure desired outcome on state testing.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christie West (westcl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All curriculums will implement interactive notebooks or other curriculum organizational tools to aide in student mastery of standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Gardner (1993) there are eight different types of intelligences; linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical, spatial, bodily/kinesthetic, naturalistic, interpersonal and intrapersonal. Though students tend to be strong in some intelligence areas and weak in others, it is important for them to be exposed to all types of intelligences. Teachers can use the interactive notebook to plan lessons to reach a broad spectrum of intelligences. There is research on the brain that indicates the importance of note taking and teaching students according to their learning styles.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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.

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

Classrooms will incorporate technology into their instruction using a variety of tools and programs.

Person Responsible	Brandon Poiroux (poirobe@bay.k12.fl.us)

Utilize graduation coach to target at-risk students. PLC teams will also utilize the graduation coach for mentoring students who are identified.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

After a close look at the SafeSchoolsforAlex data, we discovered that our highest area of concern that will be monitored during this school year will be the Drug/Public Order Incidents. The School Improvement Team determined that a large majority of these incidents are under-age vaping related incidents. In order to try to reduce the incidents in this area, we will meet monthly on the discipline data and determine where the school's hot spot areas are and try to be gain a larger presence in these areas to reduce the incidents in these areas. The school will also bring more awareness to this problem on our announcements for secondary students. The ITV crew will create mini videos to help bring awareness. The school will also give rewards to students that report students that are vaping to try to reduce incidents.

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.

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 real-time 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, Everbridge, 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.

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

We have a strong presence of stakeholders that contribute to promoting a positive culture and environment at Deane Bozeman School. Our community stakeholders that promote a positive culture and environment are Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative, Innovations Bank, Panhandle Educators Credit Union and Centennial Bank. These wonderful stakeholders are involved in many teacher appreciation lunches that we facilitate monthly to show our teachers and staff how much we appreciate them and all they do on a daily basis. These appreciation lunches help teachers feel motivated and remain a positive presence for our students daily. In addition to staff lunches, these stakeholders also donate monetarily to help Deane Bozeman show appreciation to our students through celebrations for behavior, attendance and classroom performance. Our district also has a mentoring program, Elevate Bay, that partners at-risk youth with a community member to help create a positive relationship in that student's life. Additionally, we have a community member that meets with our youth each Monday during all lunches through a program called Next Generation. Next Generation helps to influence students to be a positive light around campus and to lead by example. This program has been in our school for several years now and is thriving and helping to create a positive culture at Deane Bozeman.

In addition to many community stakeholders, we have a strong parent presence on our campus. Deane Bozeman works diligently to communicate with parents regarding events and support we need to help foster a strong school climate and environment. Many parents volunteer to serve our teachers at our luncheons and volunteer in classes. These stakeholders also play a vital role in our School Advisory Council. The SAC meets four times a year, but also communicates regularly events that are happening on campus. They evaluate our School Improvement Plan and help to keep our school growing and maintaining excellence in all we do. They also approve supplies and resources to help our teachers in their classrooms and to foster a love for learning. Many school projects and resources that are funded are through the work of the SAC.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$269,794.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		150-Aides	0541 - Deane Bozeman School	Other Federal		$88,342.00
		Notes: Paras-6, these paras will help meet the needs of our L25 students and help monitor growth in the areas of ELA and math					
		120-Classroom Teachers	0541 - Deane Bozeman School	Other Federal		$181,452.00
		Notes: Teaching Units-these teachers are working directly with our ESE student population to help meet the learning gains of our L25 students.					
		500-Materials and Supplies	0541 - Deane Bozeman School	School Improvement Funds		$0.00
		Notes: These funds will be used to help teachers reach all learners through the use of interactive notebooks. These funds will help to offset cost of supplies associated with the notebooks.					
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				$0.00
					Total:	$269,794.00