

Marion County Public Schools

Hammett Bowen Jr. Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Hammett Bowen Jr. Elementary School

4397 SW 95TH ST, Ocala, FL 34476

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Traci Crawford

Start Date for this Principal: 8/3/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 is pending approval by the Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Hammett Bowen Jr. Elementary School

4397 SW 95TH ST, Ocala, FL 34476

[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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	81%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

At Hammett L. Bowen Jr. Elementary School, our mission is to build a school that will focus on success; a school that celebrates diversity while strengthening the common thread that binds us. Hammett L. Bowen Jr. Elementary School will become a model for a strong school and community program dedicated to building the "whole child."

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Hammett L. Bowen Jr. Elementary School, everyone works together to build relationships in order to provide rigorous and relevant learning for ALL students.

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
Crawford, Traci	Principal	The principal is the instructional leader of the school. He/She works with stakeholders to develop a common vision and mission for the school. He/She guides and works with the leadership team to analyze student data in order to monitor student progress to drive instruction and provide curriculum resources aligned to the Florida standards; develop a program that promotes professional development based on evaluations and feedback in order to retain an effective/highly effective staff; and build relationships with parents and the community.
Terrell, Tracy	School Counselor	The school counselor provides support for social emotional learning; provides experiences for students to explore career development; helps students to problem solve and cope effectively to become productive citizens within our community. The school counselor also supports students by monitoring attendance concerns.
Casciato, Cristina	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal primarily through his/her expertise in curriculum and analyzing student data to drive decision making for instruction. The assistant principal also supports the teachers by using evaluations and observations to determine staff needs in professional development and instructional support through mentoring, modeling, and coaching.
Boutwell, Sonia	Instructional Coach	The content area specialist for ELA provides expertise and assistance throughout the school by coaching, modeling, and/or mentoring identified staff; uses leading/lagging student data and/or staff surveys to provide professional development opportunities; and/or supports students by modeling instructional strategies.
Hunt, Brian	Instructional Coach	The content area specialist for mathematics provides expertise and assistance throughout the school by coaching, modeling, and/or mentoring identified staff; uses leading/lagging student data and/or staff surveys to provide professional development opportunities; and/or supports students by modeling instructional strategies.
McEarchern, Leann	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal primarily through his/her expertise in curriculum and analyzing student data to drive decision making for instruction. The assistant principal also supports the teachers by using evaluations and observations to determine staff needs in professional development and instructional support through mentoring, modeling, and coaching.
McDermott, Kristen	Other	Ms. McDermott serves as a parent liaison for Hammett L. Bowen Jr. Elementary School. She is the "bridge" that builds the relationships for stakeholders (teachers, parents, students, and the community) that supports educational programs, services and various student issues; works with the leadership team and administration in coordinating and arranging

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		various programs and services to meet the needs of students for our Parent and Family Engagement Plan.
Eggers, Allen	Dean	The student service manager works with the principal primarily to develop guidelines for proper student conduct and disciplinary policies as well as procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment conducive to learning. He/She maintains visibility and accessibility on the school campus and at school-related activities and events during work day. He/She also works together with the school counselor to support students with problem solving and coping effectively to be become productive citizens within our community.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/3/2017, Traci Crawford

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.*

3

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	61	113	117	129	148	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	696
Attendance below 90 percent	64	44	54	45	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	251
One or more suspensions	11	5	7	7	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	35	35	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	1	19	8	18	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	1	2	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/14/2020

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	122	112	147	148	147	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	819
Attendance below 90 percent	51	42	40	51	42	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	258
One or more suspensions	7	1	9	9	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	10	25	16	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	68	57	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184

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	15	17	29	31	24	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	122	112	147	148	147	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	819
Attendance below 90 percent	51	42	40	51	42	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	258
One or more suspensions	7	1	9	9	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	10	25	16	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	68	57	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184

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	15	17	29	31	24	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year		0	0	0	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	59%	47%	57%	51%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	56%	58%	57%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	53%	49%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	51%	63%	50%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	58%	62%	51%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	49%	51%	34%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	47%	53%	56%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	55%	44%	11%	58%	-3%
	2018	59%	46%	13%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	49%	13%	58%	4%
	2018	44%	43%	1%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	51%	45%	6%	56%	-5%
	2018	44%	46%	-2%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	49%	7%	62%	-6%
	2018	55%	48%	7%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	54%	6%	64%	-4%
	2018	46%	47%	-1%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	60%	45%	15%	60%	0%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	47%	44%	3%	53%	-6%
	2018	51%	49%	2%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	33	45	47	33	51	45	33				
ELL	38	57	60	48	60	47	27				
ASN	89	73		94	82						
BLK	61	54	36	51	69	60	42				
HSP	49	53	52	58	68	58	37				
MUL	67	71		43	57						
WHT	63	60	59	66	69	48	53				
FRL	51	52	55	55	68	50	39				
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	25	38	36	24	43	48	29				
ELL	27	30	22	33	40	41	15				
ASN	82			82							
BLK	43	38		39	44		54				
HSP	46	42	25	46	47	37	44				
MUL	57	57		52	57						
WHT	50	43	28	55	56	40	60				
FRL	42	41	29	44	49	41	51				
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	27	40	30	20	34	20	27				
ELL	21	52	54	29	27	20	20				
ASN	77			92							
BLK	55	56		41	58	55	47				
HSP	45	54	46	45	45	24	42				
MUL	56	20		69	40						
WHT	53	63	55	52	54	35	67				
FRL	42	52	50	44	54	43	39				

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	58
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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

Multiracial Students	
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	60
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	55
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.

The fifth grade scores showed the lowest performance in the content area of science. The contributing factors could be a lack of understanding of the standards, item specs, reading comprehension, and hands-on activities.

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

The third grade scores showed the greatest decline in the content area of ELA. The contributing factors could be a large percentage of students with disabilities, ELL language barriers, and a lack of understanding of the standards to support reading comprehension.

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.

The fourth grade math content area showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The contributing factors could be ELL language barriers and a lack of understanding of the standards and item specs.

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

The fourth grade scores showed the most improvement in the content area of ELA. There was a focus on understanding the Florida Standards using the item specs, using materials and resources that are aligned to the Florida Standards, protecting instructional time and protecting common collaborative planning.

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

Areas of concern are attendance and course failure in ELA or math.

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

1. Delivering quality instruction with materials and resources aligned to the Florida Standards will continue to be a priority.
2. Support all students with MTSS and differentiated instruction by using effective intervention and enrichment resources to improve performance.
3. Focus on our Parent and Family Engagement Plan to provide a variety of engaging activities.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Standards-based Instruction and Resources.
There was an increase in student performance based on the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) data. Working together, the administration/leadership team and the teachers will continue to analyze and respond to the data (lagging/leading). Only then can we continue to determine the needs of professional development to support instructional delivery and acquire resources and services aligned to the standards to increase our student achievement. In addition, the classroom setting will exhibit an environment conducive to learning to promote student success through positive discipline and increase attendance, based on relationships.

If teachers focus on the Florida Standards through standard focus boards and rigorous/relevant instructional delivery in all content areas, then student achievement on state/district assessments will improve a minimum of 3%.

Measurable Outcome: The current percentage levels of 3 and above are:
3rd Grade
ELA proficiency level 55%
Math proficiency level 56%

4th Grade
ELA proficiency level 62%
Math proficiency level 60%

5th Grade
ELA proficiency level 51%
Math proficiency level 60%
Science proficiency level 47%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Traci Crawford (traci.crawford@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Members of the administration/leadership team will collect and analyze various student data (iReady, DRA2, QSMA, CMSA, etc.) to ensure student performance. Results will provide information to guide professional development, the coaching cycle, and curricular support for teachers and paraprofessionals. Information (discipline/attendance data) will also be used to guide the school discipline and attendance programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Effective administrators inspect what is expected. As data is collected and observations occur, revisions in direct instruction and professional development opportunities will be implemented.

Action Steps to Implement

The majority of teachers will have a 50-minute common planning time 5 days/week.

Person Responsible Traci Crawford (traci.crawford@marion.k12.fl.us)

Content Area Specialists (CAS) will be funded to provide the coaching, modeling and professional development to teachers in ELA and math/science.

Person Responsible Cristina Casciato (cristina.casciato@marion.k12.fl.us)

The administration and content area specialists will work with both the teachers (MCPSONline and traditional platforms) on collaborative planning, PLC, and data dig meetings.

Person Responsible Leann McEarchern (leann.mcearchern@marion.k12.fl.us)

Funds will be allocated to purchase materials, human resources, and services aligned to the standards to support student achievement, school discipline and promote attendance.

Person Responsible Traci Crawford (traci.crawford@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional support outside of the school day will be provided to targeted students in need.

Person Responsible Leann McEarchern (leann.mcearchern@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus	MTSS Focus
Description and Rationale:	There was an increase in the overall student performance for learning gains based on the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) data.

Measurable Outcome: If teachers provide effective differentiated instruction to address student/subgroup needs, then proficiency levels will improve by 3% and the federal index gap of FSA scores will close and increase in the subgroups <41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Leann McEarchern (leann.mcearchern@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Members of the administration/leadership team will monitor the assessment of students throughout the year. The results will identify students' needs (trends, specific areas of weakness and support the selection of interventions). In addition, the results will provide information to guide instructional support (professional development, the coaching cycle, and curricular support for teachers and paraprofessionals).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our instructional focus needs to include all students, whether they are in need of interventions or enrichment to ensure success for all and meet and/or exceed the guidelines for the Federal index (<41%).

Action Steps to Implement

Funds will be allocated to purchase materials, human resources, and services aligned to the standards to support student achievement.

Person Responsible Traci Crawford (traci.crawford@marion.k12.fl.us)

The students will be progress monitored throughout the year.

Person Responsible Leann McEarchern (leann.mcearchern@marion.k12.fl.us)

Students who are assigned to both the MCPSONline and traditional platforms will receive differentiated interventions 30 minutes/day, 5 days/week during the MTSS block.

Person Responsible Cristina Casciato (cristina.casciato@marion.k12.fl.us)

The students will be assessed with the iReady, DRA2, and/or FLKRS diagnostic tools to get baseline data.

Person Responsible Leann McEarchern (leann.mcearchern@marion.k12.fl.us)

The administration/leadership team and teachers will monitor the "watch" list of our lowest 25th percentile in ELA and mathematics.

Person Responsible Traci Crawford (traci.crawford@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus	Family Engagement
Description and Rationale:	Based on information from our Annual Parent Survey and provided comments; we will continue to work on improving our parent and family engagement in order to increase learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	If we provide capacity building strategies to parents and families that address and promote family engagement in ELA, Math and Science, then we will see increased learning gains for intermediate students and increased foundational skills in the primary grades as measured by local assessment and data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Traci Crawford (traci.crawford@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Hammett L. Bowen Jr. staff will work together to build and maintain relationships with parents and the community to support our students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ongoing research shows that family engagement in schools improves student achievement, reduces absenteeism, and restores parents' confidence in their children's education. Students with involved parents or other caregivers earn higher grades and test scores, have better social skills, and show improved behavior.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will schedule a minimum of one parent-teacher conference per semester during the year for each student. Teachers will schedule parent teacher conference with a variety of options (phone calls, in person, and virtual) to provide flexible meeting times. Teachers will complete parent-teacher conference forms during the conference. Forms will be archived with student records.

Person Responsible Leann McEarchern (leann.mcearchern@marion.k12.fl.us)

The Hammett L. Bowen Jr. Elementary School administration and staff will host events using CDC guidelines and virtual platforms to promote our Parent and Family Engagement Plan. The activities are scheduled throughout the year and stakeholders will be vetted for participation. Our content area specialists will team with the administration and parent liaison to ensure these events are successful.

Person Responsible Kristen McDermott (kristen.mcdermott@marion.k12.fl.us)

The school will have multiple and flexible opportunities to build better relationships between school and home, by keeping parents better informed about their child's progress, and developing and/or monitoring a relevant plan for the student's future.

Person Responsible Kristen McDermott (kristen.mcdermott@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will introduce and review the Title I School-Parent Compact. During the review potential plans can be developed to support the student to promote overall school success.

Person Responsible Leann McEarchern (leann.mcearchern@marion.k12.fl.us)

Parents will have a better understanding of academic resources (iReady, additional support plan, 20-minute nightly reading, etc.) and be able to support students at school and home.

Person Responsible Sonia Boutwell (sonia.boutwell@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The administration/leadership team will monitor students data to make well-informed decisions regarding professional development, instructional delivery, and CAS support. The team will also work together to provide support to all stakeholders.

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.

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:

- A description and explanation of the school's curriculum
- Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress
- Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet
- Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact
- Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so
- Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children
- Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different options (online and paper based) of communication for our families such as scheduled meetings, phone calls, emails, ClassDojo/Remind App posts/messaging, Twitter posts, virtual meetings via Zoom/Microsoft Teams, the school's website, teacher web-pages, Skyward Family Access and our school marquee.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and school wide Improvement Plan surveys.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00