Hammett Bowen Jr. Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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

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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	90%

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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

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
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.**:**

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.
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.
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.
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	Reading 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.
Quiles, Miriam	Parent Engagement Liaison	The home school liaison is the "bridge" that builds the relationships for stakeholders (teachers, parents, students, and the community) that supports

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		educational programs, services and various student issues; works with the leadership team and administration in coordinating and arranging various programs and services to meet the needs of students for our Parent and Family Engagement Plan.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/3/2017, Traci Crawford

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Total number of students enrolled at the school

859

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

9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	119	115	131	134	140	184	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	823
Attendance below 90 percent	31	38	32	32	24	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	5	3	1	3	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	25	20	17	45	25	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
Course failure in Math	11	18	12	20	20	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	31	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	33	37	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	18	16	27	21	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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 7/12/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	47%	56%				59%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	56%	61%				58%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	51%	52%				52%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	60%	54%	60%				62%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	71%	62%	64%				68%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	52%	55%				53%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	42%	51%				48%	47%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	55%	44%	11%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	49%	13%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	51%	45%	6%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	56%	49%	7%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	60%	45%	15%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	47%	44%	3%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	20	47	46	27	49	55					
ELL	44	57	47	48	67	71	32				
ASN	84			100							
BLK	42	53	53	46	69	69	33				
HSP	48	57	45	52	65	59	52				
MUL	50	36		50	71						
WHT	63	72	74	70	77	61	50				
FRL	45	53	41	48	70	60	38				

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				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
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	92
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	52
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	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 2022 all subgroups met the <41% index, except for our students with disabilities. The 2021-2022 i-Ready progress monitoring shows that our ELL and students with disabilities
subgroups in all grade levels and need the most support for all content areas.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 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 53% compared to 58% at the state level for ELA and they earned 51% compared to 53% 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 their lack of understanding of the standards to support reading comprehension. This year the content area specialists will push into the classrooms using the co-teach/inclusion support to provide modeling and coaching. Teachers will participate in collaborative planning twice a week have more optional opportunities after school.The paraprofessionals who support the students in the ESE and ESOL programs 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 K-5 B.E.S.T. standards, core curriculum resources, district curriculum maps, 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 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The third and fourth grade scores in ELA and/or mathematics content areas showed the most improvement. This year there was an 10% gain in third grade ELA for a score of 53%, 3% gain in fourth grade mathematics for a score of 59%, and a 5% gain in fourth grade ELA for a score of 62%.

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

This year 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 while participating in collaborative planning twice a week.

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 the new K-5 B.E.S.T. standards, Savvas core curriculum resources, and district curriculum maps during collaborative planning/professional development to align lesson plans for instructional delivery. Before and 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 K-5 B.E.S.T. will be a continuous focus. The instructional staff will work together to develop relevant and 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. In addition, the students will have access to IXL (ELA/ mathematics), REFLEX (math facts), FRX (fractions), more opportunities for parent engagement activities focusing on understanding the benchmarks and helping students at home.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	If teachers collaboratively focus on Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards and Florida's State Academic Standards for Science 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%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	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. ELA 3rd 56% (5% or above) • 4th 65% (+3% or above) • 5th 56% (+3% or above) Math 3rd 56% (+3% or above) • 4th 65% (+3%) • 5th 70% (+3%) Science 5th 54% (+7% or above) The current percentage levels of 3 and above are: 3rd Grade ELA proficiency level 51% Math proficiency level 53% 4th Grade ELA proficiency level 62% Math proficiency level 59% 5th Grade ELA proficiency level 53% Math proficiency level 67% Science proficiency level 47%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Members of the administration/leadership team will collect and analyze various student data (iReady, District Progress Monitoring Assessments (DPMA), Benchmark Assessments (BA) 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.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Traci Crawford (traci.crawford@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Targeted staff members will participate in collaborative planning with the support of the leadership team, in order to support the B.E.S.T. standards. 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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this	During the collaborative planning, teachers and the leadership team will work on unwrapping the benchmarks to develop effective lesson plans and instructional delivery strategies. This practice will help make sure lesson plans are aligned with the B.E.S.T Standards.

specific strategy.
Describe the
resources/criteria
used for selecting this
strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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). There will be additional opportunities to collaboratively plan after school later in the year, if funding is available.

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 under the direction of the assistant principal of curriculum and principal..

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	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 %. Areas of focus will be on all subgroups. However, there will be an emphasis on students with disabilities and English Language Learners.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective 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 the new progress monitoring scores will close and increase in the subgroups <41%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Members of the administration/leadership team will monitor the assessment of students throughout the year using a watch list. 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: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	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. All school stakeholders will use the "watch list" information to compare leading and lagging data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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 the "watch lists," grades, progress monitoring meetings, assessments, student self-monitoring, standards checklists, 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** | Cristina Casciato (cristina.casciato@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, REFLEX, FRAX, IXL (ELA & mathematics), District Progress Monitoring Assessments (DPMA), Benchmark Assessments (BA), FAST assessment, STAR assessments, unit assessments, grades, etc.

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

Teachers and students will receive support from the CAS for ELA (i.e. modeling, coaching, mentoring, unwrapping the B.E.S.T. standards, providing assistance obtaining instructional resources, data digs, questioning strategies, facilitating collaborative planning, professional development, participating in parent engagement events/activities, etc.).

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

Teachers and students will receive support from the CAS for mathematics/science (i.e. modeling, coaching, mentoring, unwrapping the B.E.S.T. standards, providing assistance obtaining instructional resources, data digs, questioning strategies, facilitating collaborative planning, professional development, participating in parent engagement events/activities, etc.).

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

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

There is a continuous effort to consult with our teachers, students, families, and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. It is understood that the school's 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 are requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the MCPS Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and school wide Improvement Plan surveys.

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

There are many school stakeholders who contribute and make an impact to promote a positive school culture and environment here at Hammett L. Bowen, Jr. Elementary School.

• Students impact the culture and environment by being engaged in learning.
• Parents make an impact with their partnership with the school to ensure successful student learning.
• Teachers provide the delivery of instruction through the development of engaging and relevant lesson plans
and activities/assignments.
• The administrators ensure that the school environment is conducive to learning and are instructional leaders.
Instructional leadership is based on data driven decision to support the building capacity of the instructional staff and resources.
• The business partner supports the school through career awareness and by providing funding are supplemental resources.
• The community provides volunteer hours and donations of funds and/or supplemental resources