Bay District Schools

Deane Bozeman School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Deane Bozeman School

13410 HIGHWAY 77, Panama City, FL 32409

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Dedicated to Building Success!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Dedicated to Building Success!

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Beach, Ivan	Principal	
Timmins, Kim	Assistant Principal	
Werning, Terrin	Teacher, K-12	
Brown, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Sims, Brandi	School Counselor	
Shelton, Lauren	School Counselor	
Clark, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
West, Christie	Assistant Principal	
Poiroux, Brandon	Administrative Support	
Campbell, Phillip	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Leadership Team (SLT) was selected from self-nominated staff involved in the educational process at Deane Bozeman School across all levels. The team has met multiple times during the summer months to review data, identify trends/areas needing improvement, and cooperatively develop the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to address the areas in need of improvement, which aligns with the district plan for improvement, during the upcoming school year.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SLT will meet regularly throughout the course of the school year to assess the progress of the SIP using state and district progress monitoring tools, as well as other means of assessing non-academic areas, such as surveys, discipline data, etc. If any modifications are deemed necessary, edits will be made as appropriate to the SIP to adjust for these needs.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	10%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	73%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	19	22	19	18	22	22	40	28	36	226
One or more suspensions	4	6	0	2	7	10	15	51	39	134
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	3	5	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	4	25	23	35	92
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	30	29	28	95
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	0	1	7	8	19	32	35	105

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	14	15	12	9	13	16	25	30	25	349
One or more suspensions	3	0	1	0	0	2	8	6	4	49
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	1	3	0	1	7	5	70
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	1	0	3	2	0	53
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	8	8	23	40	31	282
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	11	16	28	34	20	204
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	2	1	5	3	15	19	9	181

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	1	5	1	0	0	2	1	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	28

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	14	15	12	9	13	16	25	30	25	159
One or more suspensions	3	0	1	0	0	2	8	6	4	24
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	1	3	0	1	7	5	20
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	1	0	3	2	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	8	8	23	40	31	115
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	11	16	28	34	20	111
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	2	1	5	3	15	19	9	56

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	1	5	1	0	0	2	1	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	6

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	47	49	53	54	52	55	56		
ELA Learning Gains				45			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			40		
Math Achievement*	59	58	55	62	35	42	56		
Math Learning Gains				63			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			40		
Science Achievement*	67	56	52	62	55	54	65		
Social Studies Achievement*	77	65	68	86	55	59	83		
Middle School Acceleration	68	70	70	68	41	51	71		
Graduation Rate	91	80	74	93	54	50	94		
College and Career Acceleration	78	49	53	67	69	70	65		
ELP Progress		45	55		69	70			

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	542
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	91

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	702
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	93

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	50			
ELL	25	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	66			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	58			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	50			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	66			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	59			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	47			59			67	77	68	91	78	
SWD	24			37			42	51	50	70	8	
ELL	20			30							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	50			50			76	86			4	
MUL	49			53			74	100			4	
PAC												
WHT	46			60			67	76	70	80	8	
FRL	36			50			57	65	46	76	8	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	54	45	40	62	63	62	62	86	68	93	67	
SWD	30	38	31	39	50	52	47	69	50	96	45	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK												
HSP	51	62		56	67		71	86				
MUL	61	50		67	68		80	100				
PAC												
WHT	54	45	39	62	62	60	61	86	67	92	67	
FRL	45	45	40	51	58	61	57	80	56	90	66	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	56	49	40	56	43	40	65	83	71	94	65	
SWD	29	32	30	36	42	35	34	70	33	72	38	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	49	74		54	53		77	86				
MUL	68	50		59	50		55	100				
PAC												
WHT	56	47	37	56	43	38	65	82	69	94	66	
FRL	47	43	39	47	42	36	58	77	46	90	64	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	46%	48%	-2%	50%	-4%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	51%	48%	3%	47%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	48%	1%	47%	2%
09	2023 - Spring	43%	46%	-3%	48%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	55%	-10%	58%	-13%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	46%	-1%	47%	-2%
03	2023 - Spring	54%	47%	7%	50%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	70%	55%	15%	54%	16%
07	2023 - Spring	74%	53%	21%	48%	26%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	54%	11%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	59%	-9%	61%	-11%
08	2023 - Spring	87%	61%	26%	55%	32%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	53%	-4%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	69%	51%	18%	44%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	49%	-3%	51%	-5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	57%	-1%	50%	6%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	50%	-4%	48%	-2%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	61%	14%	63%	12%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	71%	17%	66%	22%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	61%	8%	63%	6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Given the current year data, the team identified ELA as the lowest performing area across all grade levels that were tested: Grade 3 (-3), Grade 4 (-12), Grade 5 (-19), Grade 6, (-6), Grade 7 (-5), Grade 8 (+-0), Grade 9 (-5), Grade 10 (+1). While there are many interconnected contributing factors that resulted in the drop in performance, some of the most prevalent factors that we identified were: new testing platform, attendance issues, new standards and curriculum (more of a focus on writing rather than content specific multiple choice items), alternative certification and inexperienced teachers in certain areas.

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

Given the current year data, the team identified ELA as the lowest performing area across all grade levels that were tested: Grade 3 (-3), Grade 4 (-12), Grade 5 (-19), Grade 6, (-6), Grade 7 (-5), Grade 8 (+-0), Grade 9 (-5), Grade 10 (+1). While there are many interconnected contributing factors that resulted in the drop in performance, some of the most prevalent factors that we identified were: new testing platform, attendance issues, new standards and curriculum (more of a focus on writing rather than content specific multiple choice items), alternative certification and inexperienced teachers in certain areas.

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.

Given the current year data, the team identified ELA as having the greatest gap as compared to previous year state averages: Grade 3 (-3), Grade 4 (-12), Grade 5 (-19), Grade 6, (-6), Grade 7 (-5), Grade 8 (+-0), Grade 9 (-5), Grade 10 (+1). This could be updated as we receive new data from the current testing year. As a whole we are approximately 4-5% behind the state average for ELA across all grade levels. While there are many interconnected contributing factors that resulted in the drop in performance, some of the most prevalent factors that we identified were: new testing platform, attendance issues, new standards and curriculum (more of a focus on writing rather than content specific multiple choice items), alternative certification and inexperienced teachers in certain areas.

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

Given the current year data, the team identified middle school math, 8th grade science, and biology as having the most improvement as compared to previous year averages: Math Grade 6 (+22), Grade 7 (+7), Grade 8 (+8), Science Grade 8 (+14), & Biology (+6). Some of the contributing factors we believe aided in this increase would be: calculators being allowed on all middle school assessments, strong experienced educators teaching these subject areas, strong PLC collaboration, intentional relationship building with students, utilizing the digital textbook as a resource and activity in the classroom.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Given the current year data, the team identified students with attendance issues above 10% (n=226) and one or more suspensions (n=134) as our top two areas of concern that affect the performance of students in the classroom.

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

ELA Achievement (all grade levels), Attendance, Teacher Mentorship/Development, Math Achievement (elementary/high school), Student/Teacher Relationship Development

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Deane Bozeman School's STAR PM3 data is above the district percent of students at or above proficiency in grades Kdg. and second grade. First grade is below district average by 1% but still above 50th percentile.
Kdg: 70% of students at or above proficiency compared to district average of 62%
Grade 1: 54% of students at or above proficiency compared to district average of 55%
Grade 2: 74% of students at or above proficiency compared to district average of 56%

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Deane Bozeman School's FAST ELA achievement proficiency in grades 4 and 5 were lower than the state average. Grade 3 scores were 5% above state average but had a 3% decline from the previous year.

Grade 3: 55% compared to the state's 50%
Grade 4: 44% compared to the state's 57%
Grade 5: 50% compared to the state's 55%

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

DBS will score at or above the 50% as measured by STAR Reading assessment in May. It is also our goal to be be above the District average in all grades.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

It is the vision of Deane Bozeman School that 100% of our students will be at or above grade level. In order to work towards this vision, our goal will be for each grade level (3-5) to have at least 50% of students score a 3 or higher on the ELA FAST PM3 assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The data from FAST PM1 and PM2 will be analyzed to monitor progress in grades K-5. The iReady diagnostic will be administered in the fall and winter. We will utilize this diagnostic as an instructional tool to plan for instruction, plan for interventions and monitor progress. PLCs will review work samples, formative assessments and district common summative assessments frequently to track progress and plan for interventions. MTSS T3 progress will be monitored and discussed monthly at MTSS T3 meetings with administration, interventionist, guidance counselor and grade level teachers. Classroom walkthrough data will be utilized to monitor instruction and student progress.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Timmins, Kim, timmikh@bay.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

DBS will implement the district adopted Houghton Mifflin Harcourt curriculum with fidelity during the 90 minute uninterrupted reading block. We have an additional 30 minute intervention block built in to the schedule to provide interventions through small group Bay District Schools CRP approved instructional resources to provide additional instruction to master grade level benchmarks.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Students will need additional support to master grade level essential benchmarks. By building in an additional 30 minute intervention block, we will be able to provide daily systematic small group interventions to reteach and accelerate student learning. Researcher John Hattie concludes that RTI has an effect size of 1.29.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Create a master schedule to include a 30 minute intervention/enrichment time to provide 30 minutes of additional small group ELA instruction in grades K-5.	Timmins, Kim, timmikh@bay.k12.fl.us
Schedule ESE Intervention Teachers, Academic Interventionists, Instructional Paraprofessionals to support the needs of students during intervention and core academic instruction.	Timmins, Kim, timmikh@bay.k12.fl.us
PLCs will monitor student progress frequently using progress monitoring student data, formative assessments, common assessments and student work/writing samples. PLCs will identify and provide small group instruction during intervention block based on identified needs.	Poiroux, Brandon, poirobe@bay.k12.fl.us
Bozeman administration will be trained and utilize Cognia's Effective Learning Environment Observation Analysis tool for classroom walkthroughs.	Beach, Ivan, beachji@bay.k12.fl.us
Interventionists will assist with identifying prerequisite skills that struggling learners need to be successful with grade-level benchmarks. Interventionists will support the classroom teachers with planning and providing appropriate instruction during the 90 minute ELA block and the 30 minute intervention block.	Timmins, Kim, timmikh@bay.k12.fl.us