

Marion County Public Schools

Hammett Bowen Jr. Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Hammett Bowen Jr. Elementary School

4397 SW 95TH ST, Ocala, FL 34476

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
Rivera, Juan	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.
Kaminski, Kelly	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	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.
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.
Franco Cruz, Karla	Parent Engagement Liaison	The family engagement liaison for Hammett L. Bowen, Jr. Elementary School is the "bridge" that builds the relationships for stakeholders (teachers, parents, students, and the community) which supports educational programs, services and various student issues; works with the administrative leadership team and in coordinating and arranging various programs and services to meet the needs of students for our Parent Family Engagement Plan.
Mills, Maurlene	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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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.
Gonzalez, Janny	Other	The teacher of interventions provides expertise and assistance throughout the school with MTSS processes and intervention programs, based on leading/lagging student data. The intervention teacher will also provide intervention support to targeted students throughout the year.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

Throughout the year, information is presented to the School Advisory Committee (SAC) comprised of the school leadership team, staff, community stakeholders, and parents. SAC members provide input related to areas of concerns, making revisions, as appropriate, followed by staff review and approval by the SAC. Areas to be addressed are based on student data and district surveys.

SIP Monitoring

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

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be monitored in conjunction with the administration of district and state assessments. Overall student achievement as the achievement of targeted ESSA subgroups will be closely monitored through disaggregated data from district and state assessments. Data for students with the greatest achievement gap, including retentions, lowest 25%, and students with disabilities will be separately disaggregated and reviewed with the SAC, and grade-level collaborative planning teams. Grade-level collaborative planning teams will participate in data digs targeting students with the greatest achievement gaps, while also monitoring all students for continued growth. Pertinent information resulting from these activities will be shared with the SAC with the SIP being adjusted as needed.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	90%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	45	36	33	32	23	23	0	0	0	192	
One or more suspensions	17	24	27	26	28	5	0	0	0	127	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	20	16	4	35	9	9	0	0	0	93	
Course failure in Math	17	7	3	16	20	10	0	0	0	73	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	48	23	32	0	0	0	103	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	46	24	38	0	0	0	108	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	10	21	31	43	48	0	0	0	173	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	26	31	26	49	43	0	0	0	180

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	1	1	11	0	1	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	31	38	32	32	24	33	0	0	0	190	
One or more suspensions	5	3	1	3	10	9	0	0	0	31	
Course failure in ELA	25	20	17	45	25	23	0	0	0	155	
Course failure in Math	11	18	12	20	20	44	0	0	0	125	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	31	41	0	0	0	106	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	37	35	0	0	0	105	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	16	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	15	18	16	27	21	27	0	0	0	124

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	31	38	32	32	24	33	0	0	0	190	
One or more suspensions	5	3	1	3	10	9	0	0	0	31	
Course failure in ELA	25	20	17	45	25	23	0	0	0	155	
Course failure in Math	11	18	12	20	20	44	0	0	0	125	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	31	41	0	0	0	106	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	37	35	0	0	0	105	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	16	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	15	18	16	27	21	27	0	0	0	124

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	52	44	53	54	46	56	57		
ELA Learning Gains				61			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			44		
Math Achievement*	58	50	59	60	50	50	57		
Math Learning Gains				71			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			50		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	54	46	54	49	53	59	65		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					49	52			
Graduation Rate					41	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	57	59	66			55		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	266
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	2	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	47			
HSP	49			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	50			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	1	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	52			
HSP	55			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	52			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	52			58			54					55
SWD	21			28			21				4	
ELL	40			48			32				5	55
AMI												
ASN	82			88							2	
BLK	50			52			43				4	
HSP	47			53			46				5	51
MUL	58			56							2	
PAC												
WHT	52			63			64				4	
FRL	46			51			52				5	58

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	54	61	54	60	71	64	49					66
SWD	20	47	46	27	49	55	0					23
ELL	44	57	47	48	67	71	32					66
AMI												
ASN	84			100								
BLK	42	53	53	46	69	69	33					
HSP	48	57	45	52	65	59	52					65
MUL	50	36		50	71							
PAC												
WHT	63	72	74	70	77	61	50					
FRL	45	53	41	48	70	60	38					64

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	57	58	44	57	66	50	65					55
SWD	16	33	23	18	39	43	40					
ELL	47	56		57	60		58					55

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	77			92								
BLK	42	50		28	56		54					
HSP	55	59	45	59	60	50	56					54
MUL	57			50								
PAC												
WHT	61	55	50	61	71	55	70					
FRL	48	51	31	52	61	53	63					52

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	55%	49%	6%	54%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	48%	13%	58%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	44%	39%	5%	50%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	53%	17%	61%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	50%	10%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	43%	10%	51%	2%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The third grade scores showed the lowest performance in the content area of ELA. The contributing factors could be a lack of understanding of the standards through clarifications and examples and reading comprehension.

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 through clarifications and examples to drive the instruction of 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 third grade math content area showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The contributing factors could be the achievement gap of the students with disabilities, ELL language barriers, and a lack of understanding of the standards, based on the the clarifications and examples.

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

The fifth grade scores showed the most improvement in the content area of mathematics. There was a focus on understanding Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards using the clarifications and examples, using materials and resources that are aligned to Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards, maximizing instructional time and protecting common collaborative planning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, 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 school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Delivering quality instruction with materials and resources aligned to the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards will continue to be a priority.
2. Support all subgroups through MTSS and differentiated instruction by using effective intervention and enrichment resources to improve performance. We will focus on SWD as this subgroup is below the 41% for the federal index and the ELL subgroup because there has been a trend of low performance.
3. Focus on our Parent and Family Engagement Plan to provide a variety of engaging activities related to school success and capacity building.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective 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 progress monitoring data. By May 2024, 40% of families will attend one or more family engagement events/opportunities that are linked to learning.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 Hammett L. Bowen Jr. Elementary School administration and staff will host events 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 to ensure these events are successful.

Person Responsible: Juan Rivera (juan.rivera@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: The parent-teacher conferences will occur by the end of the year.

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

Person Responsible: Kelly Kaminski (kelly.kaminski@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Events will occur by end of the school year, per the school calendar.

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

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

By When: Compacts will be collected at the end of the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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 overall 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 percentage scores of Levels 3, 4 and 5 in English Language Arts, mathematics, and science will increase.

- ELA overall scores 58% (+3% or above)
- Math overall scores 63% (+3 or above)
- Science 5th 57% (+3% or above)

Learning Gains

- ELA learning gains will increase by 5%.
- Math learning gains will increase by 5%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Members of the administrative 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 learning, coaching cycles, and curricular support for teachers and paraprofessionals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Targeted staff members will participate in collaborative planning with the support of the administrative leadership team, to facilitate effective instruction based on the B.E.S.T. standards. During planning sessions, teachers will use student artifacts to drive instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the collaborative planning, teachers and the leadership team will work on unwrapping the benchmarks to develop effective lesson plans and instructional delivery strategies, ensuring lesson plans are aligned with the B.E.S.T Standards.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 administrative leadership support team 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: Juan Rivera (juan.rivera@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will occur throughout the year.

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: Juan Rivera (juan.rivera@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will occur throughout the year.

The administration and content area specialists will work with the teachers on collaborative planning, Professional Learning Community (PLC) focus, and data dig meetings.

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

By When: This will occur throughout the year.

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

Person Responsible: Kelly Kaminski (kelly.kaminski@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will occur throughout the year.

#3. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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 (below <41% federal index) and English Language Learners (trending low performance).

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 decrease and increase the performance of the subgroups.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Members of the administrative 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 Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The students' performance will be tracked several ways. Teachers will track student performance using formative and summative assessments. The administration will work with teachers to track student performance through Progress Monitoring Meetings (PMP). In addition, the administration will create a data portfolio 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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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 the administrative leadership team, 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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)

By When: Throughout the school year.

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: Juan Rivera (juan.rivera@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Students will receive differentiated interventions 30 minutes/a day, 5 days/week during the MTSS block. The administrative leadership team and teachers will monitor the "watch list" of our lowest 25th percentile in ELA and mathematics.

Person Responsible: Kelly Kaminski (kelly.kaminski@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the school year.

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: Juan Rivera (juan.rivera@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Teachers and students will receive support from the CAS for ELA (i.e. modeling, coaching, mentoring, unwrapping the B.E.S.T. standards, helping obtain 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)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Teachers and students will receive support from the CAS for mathematics/science (i.e. modeling, coaching, mentoring, unwrapping the B.E.S.T. standards, helping obtain 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)

By When: Throughout the school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

During the second semester, the principal completes a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) to determine the needs of the school. In addition, there is a review of various information (student data, district surveys, instructional programs, human resources, services, etc.). Once Title I funds are awarded, they are

allocated based on the CNA and Achieve 2026, the MCPS strategic plan, to ensure the funds are aligned and focused on students' needs.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

UFLI, the district adopted K-2 Tier I phonemic awareness and phonics program, will continue to be implemented and added to grade 3 this year. The program follows a scope and sequence of the skills and concepts that children need to acquire to become competent, confident readers. The 90-minute reading block will include the 30-minute program.

The CAS for literacy and the intervention teacher will provide ongoing professional development along with modeling and coaching as needed, based on the professional learning survey and classroom walkthroughs performed by the administrative team.

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

The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below Level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment. The third grade level is currently at 44 percent proficiency.

The Multi-tiered Systems of support (MTSS) program is being revised. Interventions for MTSS will be assigned to targeted students based on the results of the 2023 FAST PM3, the 2023 PM1 scores, and intervention screener results. Proficient readers will be assigned enrichment interventions through integration of reading through the content areas of science and social studies.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

In grade K-2, using the STAR progress monitoring system, 50% of the students will be on track to meet ELA proficiency targets.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In each 3-5th grade, using the FAST progressing monitoring system, 50% of all students will meet ELA proficiency targets.

Monitoring

Monitoring

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

All data from the programs will be monitored monthly. Fidelity checks will be conducted monthly through binder checks and classroom visits.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Boutwell, Sonia, sonia.boutwell@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

The evidenced-based programs align with the district's K-12 Reading plan and are on the MTSS Intervention Continuum document.

Rationale:

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

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

The evidence-based programs address the areas of student needs. (Foundational Skills, Phonics/Decoding, Fluency, Vocabulary/Comprehension)

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
All instructional staff members will be trained on the district adopted interventions.	Crawford, Traci, traci.crawford@marion.k12.fl.us
Instructional staff members will be will be trained on the focus of of each intervention program.	Hallam, Zayda, zayda.hallam@marion.k12.fl.us
The CAS for literacy will provide coaching and modeling to teachers to insure that programs are implemented properly.	Boutwell, Sonia, sonia.boutwell@marion.k12.fl.us
The administrative leadership team will analyze student data to determine professional learning focus and drive instruction.	Rivera, Juan, juan.rivera@marion.k12.fl.us
Instructional staff members will participate twice a week in collaborative planning.	Kaminski, Kelly, kelly.kaminski@marion.k12.fl.us
Instructional staff members will have the opportunity to participate in after school collaboration 5-hours per week from September 11 - March 9.	Crawford, Traci, traci.crawford@marion.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Information on the Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS) also known as the School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be shared throughout the year. It will be posted on the school webpage/ website and printed information will be available upon request. Information will be shared at the Annual Title I meeting and throughout the year at the School Advisory Committee (SAC) meetings and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) meetings. Staff members, parents, community members and the school business will receive notices for meeting dates and times for them to attend the meetings. The family engagement liaison is bilingual and will provide support on helping parents understand this information.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Throughout the year, stakeholders will have opportunities to engage with school staff through scheduled calendar events. These events include open houses, parent conferences, student recognition, holiday activities, academic activities, etc. In addition, stakeholders may request meetings with various staff members to address concerns.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

A master schedule has been developed to support common planning for collaboration. The instructional staff will have time to participate in professional learning communities, develop engaging lesson plans, and analyze data to drive instruction. Based on the previous year's assessment data and ongoing progress monitoring, the administrative leadership team will target students to participate in tutoring before and after school. Services provided outside the school day (AM/PM) provide students with academic support on below grade level skills, on grade level skills, and enrichment coursework to maintain or fill in academic instructional gaps. In addition, we implemented full inclusion, based on our students' ESE service needs. The administration will allocate funding to provide resources, bring in district support for co-teaching, support facilitation and professional learning. Our goal is to support our students with ESE services in all tiered instructional levels. ELL will also be support through ESOL services, tutoring, and the Imagine Learning program for language acquisition support.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A