

Marion County Public Schools

Hammett Bowen Jr. Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

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: 7/30/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
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 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	85%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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 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	Position 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.
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.
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 be become productive citizens within our community. The school counselor also supports students by monitoring attendance concerns.
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.
Hunt, Brian	Math 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.
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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/30/2021, 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

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

751

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

7

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

7

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	93	119	122	129	170	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	764
Attendance below 90 percent	52	37	32	45	66	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256
One or more suspensions	7	5	1	4	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	17	20	27	32	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
Course failure in Math	19	13	18	33	35	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	7	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	23	19	22	29	31	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Wednesday 6/30/2021

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	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	

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	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	

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				59%	47%	57%	49%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	56%	58%	43%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	52%	53%	29%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	51%	63%	50%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	58%	62%	52%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	49%	51%	40%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	47%	53%	52%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	55%	44%	11%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	49%	13%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	45%	6%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	56%	49%	7%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	45%	15%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	47%	44%	3%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:

- English Language Arts, Grades 1-5: i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Mathematics, Grades 1-5: i-Ready Diagnostic-Math Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Science, Grade 5: Grade 5 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16 / 15%	32 / 28%	63 / 55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 14%	17 / 24%	37 / 53%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	3 / 17%	7 / 39%
	English Language Learners	2 / 14%	2 / 14%	2 / 14%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19 / 18%	30 / 27%	60 / 53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 12%	15 / 22%	36 / 52%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 20%	7 / 39%	10 / 59%
	English Language Learners	2 / 14%	1 / 7%	1 / 7%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32 / 30%	34 / 30%	54 / 46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14 / 24%	13 / 21%	25 / 40%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 18%	2 / 11%	5 / 28%
	English Language Learners	2 / 12%	2 / 12%	2 / 11%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14 / 13%	19 / 17%	38 / 32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 9%	7 / 11%	13 / 21%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 6%	3 / 17%	5 / 28%
	English Language Learners	2 / 12%	1 / 6%	1 / 6%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	51 / 45%	34 / 29%	49 / 42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21 / 36%	14 / 23%	20 / 34%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 13%	2 / 8%	3 / 13%
	English Language Learners	6 / 32%	1 / 5%	1 / 5%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15 / 13%	12 / 10%	27 / 23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 15%	3 / 5%	9 / 16%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	2 / 8%	3 / 14%
	English Language Learners	2 / 11%	2 / 10%	2 / 10%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55 / 35%	52 / 32%	61 / 39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23 / 26%	22 / 25%	25 / 30%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 9%	2 / 9%	2 / 10%
	English Language Learners	1 / 6%	1 / 6%	1 / 6%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36 / 23%	32 / 20%	62 / 39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28 / 33%	28 / 33%	28 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 18%	3 / 13%	2 / 10%
	English Language Learners	1 / 6%	1 / 6%	1 / 6%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49 / 43%	32 / 25%	33 / 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20 / 32%	15 / 22%	14 / 20%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 13%	1 / 6%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37 / 32%	31 / 25%	61 / 50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16 / 25%	13 / 19%	29 / 45%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	1 / 6%	4 / 25%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	91 / 80%	88 / 74%	82 / 71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47 / 75%	43 / 66%	38 / 60%
	Students With Disabilities	10 / 67%	9 / 60%	8 / 53%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	33	23	18	39	43	40				
ELL	47	56		57	60		58				
ASN	77			92							
BLK	42	50		28	56		54				
HSP	55	59	45	59	60	50	56				
MUL	57			50							
WHT	61	55	50	61	71	55	70				
FRL	48	51	31	52	61	53	63				
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				

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
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				

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
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	60
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	51
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?

Based on the previous ESSA data for 2019 all subgroups met the <41% index. The 2020-2021 i-Ready progress monitoring shows that our ELL and students with disabilities subgroups in all grade levels need the most support for all content areas.

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

The third grade scores for both ELA and mathematics show the greatest need for improvement. Our students earned 50% compared to 54% at the state level for ELA and they earned 43% compared to 51% at the state level for mathematics. This was also projected through the QSMA data throughout the previous year.

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

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. This year the content area specialists will push into the self-contained classrooms to provide modeling and coaching. The paraprofessionals who support the students for ELL will also have time to work with the content area specialists. In addition, targeted ELL students will have access to the Imagine Learning program. All staff will have access to professional learning opportunities for the Florida and K-2 B.E.S.T. standards, core curriculum resources, and instructional strategies. Funds have also been provided to hire a home-school liaison to empower parents with learning at home.

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

The fifth grade scores in all state assessed content areas showed the most improvement. This year there was an 11% gain in ELA for a score of 62% compared to 54% for the state, a 16% gain in mathematics for a score of 70% compared to 51% for the state, and a 16% gain in science for a score of 63% compared to 47% for the state.

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

This year the fifth grade teachers continued to work closely together in their departments. The team has experience and has a background knowledge of the standards. In addition, the content area specialists supported the teachers and students based on ongoing progress monitoring.

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

This year the teachers will continue providing MTSS in order to provide differentiated instruction. The teachers will focus on standards aligned instruction during collaborative planning. After school tutoring will be provided to targeted students for additional support.

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 administration will survey the staff for professional development needs, monitor leading/lagging student data in all content areas, and monitor instructional delivery through observations. In addition, the content area specialists will provide expertise and assistance throughout the school by coaching, modeling, and/or mentoring identified staff. The administration will also reach out to the district as needed to secure professional development.

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

Tier I instruction aligned to the current sets of standards (Florida & K-2 B.E.S.T.) will be a continuous focus. The instructional staff will work together to develop engaging lesson plans for effective instructional delivery in collaborative planning twice a week. Targeted students will be provided opportunities for academic support outside of the school day. Students will also have daily support 30-minutes a day based on individual needs with differentiation through MTSS, the i-Ready program (ELA/mathematics), and the Imagine Learning for targeted students served in the ESOL program.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>If teachers collaboratively focus on the K-2 B.E.S.T. Standards and the Florida Standards to develop engaging lessons and rigorous/relevant instructional delivery in all content areas, then student achievement on state/district assessments will improve a minimum of 3%.</p> <p>The overall proficiency scores the fourth and fifth grade students in the core content areas will increase by 13% or above based on the previous overall grade level data with a minimum overall outcome of 56%. The third grade outcome will be based on their overall achievement level. The 5th grade outcome will be based on their overall achievement level compared to the previous year's science QSMA.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>ELA 3rd 56% (6% or above) • 4th 56% (+6% or above) • 5th 60% (+3% or above) Math 3rd 56% (+13% or above) • 4th 56% (+13%) • 5th 59% (+3%) Science 5th 63% (+4% or above)</p> <p>The current percentage levels of 3 and above are:</p> <p>3rd Grade ELA proficiency level 50% Math proficiency level 43%</p> <p>4th Grade ELA proficiency level 57% Math proficiency level 56%</p> <p>5th Grade ELA proficiency level 62% Math proficiency level 70% Science proficiency level 63%</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Members of the administration/leadership team will collect and analyze various student data (iReady, QSMA, quarterly grades, etc.) to ensure student performance. Results will provide information to guide professional development, the coaching cycle, and curricular support for teachers and paraprofessionals.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Traci Crawford (traci.crawford@marion.k12.fl.us)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Targeted staff members will participate in collaborative planning with the support of the leadership team, in order to support the content standards of the state. During planning sessions, teachers will use student artifacts to drive instruction in order to meet the needs of all students and teachers related to meet the state standards.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>During the collaborative planning, teachers and the leadership team will work on unwrapping the standards to develop effective lesson plans and instructional delivery strategies. This practice will help make sure lesson plans are aligned with the K-2 B.E.S.T Standards and the FSA standards.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

The majority of teachers will have a 50-minute common planning block 5 days/week. Two of those blocks will be reserved for collaborative planning with leadership support each week (Tuesdays and Thursdays).

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 the content areas of ELA, mathematics, and science.

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

The administration and content area specialists will work with the teachers on collaborative planning, PLC, and data dig meetings.

Person Responsible Brian Hunt (brian.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us)

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

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data, there is a continued need to provide differentiated instruction with multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS), for multiple subgroups in order to meet the ESSA subgroup achievement of <41 %.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers provide effective differentiated instruction and MTSS 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%.
Monitoring:	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).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Traci Crawford (traci.crawford@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The students' performance will be tracked several ways. Teachers will track student performance by using formative and summative assessments. The administration will work with teachers to track student performance through PMP meetings. In addition, the administration will create a data hall to track and monitor targeted student performance on district/state assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All stakeholders will use the high effect size of tracking student performance. In order to support MTSS, student performance must be tracked on a regular basis by administration, staff, and students. Data needs to be collected and analyzed to make well informed decisions for instructional delivery (on-below-above level) for all subgroups.

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. Examples include grades, progress monitoring meetings, assessments, student self-monitoring, standards check lists, etc.

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

Students will receive differentiated interventions 30 minutes/a day, 5 days/week during the MTSS block. 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)

The students will be assessed with various diagnostic tools to get baseline data and assessed periodically to track performance throughout the remainder of the year. Examples include i-Ready, QSMA, unit assessments, grades, etc.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org/), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

N/A

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.

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 the right to request opportunities to formulate academic ideas
- Explain the right to participate in the education decision making process
- Allow for feedback and open discussion.

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

Hammett L. Bowen, Jr. Elementary School works to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students in a variety of ways. Our parent and family activities (orientation, open house, etc.) offer opportunities to promote engagement between the community, parents, and students. During the first few weeks of school, teachers implement "getting to know you" activities and focus on procedures to build a sense of community within the

classroom. Teachers are required to have a minimum of two parent–teacher conferences during year. The leadership team facilitates and coordinates various outreach support, activities and events with community members, the school’s business partners and the staff. The students are able to participate in several clubs (safety patrols, National Honor Society, Yearbook Club, HBE Media Club, etc.)

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00