

Bay District Schools

New Horizons Learning Center



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

New Horizons Learning Center

3200 MINNESOTA AVE, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gordon Pongratz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* 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 Bay 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

New Horizons Learning Center

3200 MINNESOTA AVE, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay 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.

Our mission at New Horizons Learning Center is to provide an exceptional special education program in a safe and positive-behavior supportive environment that meets that the unique learning needs of every student and partners with families as well as the community to foster students' academic, social, and emotional growth for success beyond graduation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become an exceptional special education school that empowers students to become successful in the classroom and community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pongratz, Gordon	Principal	Helen Marshall, Guidance Counselor: intake meetings for students on academics and behavior expectations; daily counseling and intervention, complete academic plans for each grade level; response team support and participation.
		Brittney Simmons, Guidance Counselor; intake meetings for students on academics and behavior expectations; daily counseling and intervention, complete academic plans for each grade level; response team support and participation.
		James Harmon: consistent behavior model implementation, intake meetings for students on academic and behavior expectations.
		Denise Hinson: instructional coach; works with new teachers, trains teachers on MAP, FSA testing; coordinates testing schedule.
		Lisa Rubenstein: provides support to teachers regarding crisis intervention; helps maintain Positive Behavioral Intervention plans with teachers.
		Helen Mitchell, Assistant Principal: initiate and facilitate PLC and team meetings based on the needs of the district, staff/students; serves as advisory member of content and grade group PLC teams; performs ongoing data collection and analysis to determine academic and behavior needs of our school; assist all teachers/paraprofessionals with professional development.
Gordon Pongratz, Principal: initiate and facilitate PLC and team meetings based on the needs of the district, staff/students; serves as advisory member of content and grade group PLC teams; performs ongoing data collection and analysis to determine academic and behavior needs of our school; assist all teachers/paraprofessionals with professional development.		
Harmon, James	Teacher, K-12	
Rubenstein, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Mitchell, Helen	Assistant Principal	
Hinson, Denise	Instructional Coach	
Grady, Brittney	School Counselor	
Nelson, Helen	School Counselor	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	22	28	26	17	2	6	118	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	19	20	7	2	4	76	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	17	18	23	9	1	1	79	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	3	3	1	3	18	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	18	21	22	12	1	6	92	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	19	20	25	11	1	5	92

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	2	3	0	6	23

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

20

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/23/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	25	21	8	9	4	20	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	28	22	5	7	2	9	105
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	1	2	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	29	28	9	8	4	15	123

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	31	25	9	9	4	16	127	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	25	21	8	9	4	20	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	28	22	5	7	2	9	105
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	1	2	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	29	28	9	8	4	15	123

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	31	25	9	9	4	16	127	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	57%	56%	0%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	49%	51%	0%	44%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	35%	42%	0%	35%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	58%	51%	0%	58%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	53%	48%	0%	50%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	50%	45%	0%	48%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	74%	68%	0%	68%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	76%	73%	0%	77%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	17 (0)	22 (0)	28 (0)	26 (0)	17 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)	118 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 (28)	16 (25)	19 (21)	20 (8)	7 (9)	2 (4)	4 (20)	76 (115)
One or more suspensions	10 (32)	17 (28)	18 (22)	23 (5)	9 (7)	1 (2)	1 (9)	79 (105)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (0)	3 (0)	3 (1)	3 (4)	3 (4)	1 (1)	3 (2)	18 (12)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	12 (30)	18 (29)	21 (28)	22 (9)	12 (8)	1 (4)	6 (15)	92 (123)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
06	2019	12%	56%	-44%	54%	-42%
	2018	4%	51%	-47%	52%	-48%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	7%	54%	-47%	52%	-45%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	0%	59%	-59%	56%	-56%
	2018	14%	58%	-44%	58%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	58%	-58%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	6%	53%	-47%	55%	-49%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	3%	59%	-56%	54%	-51%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	7%	48%	-41%	46%	-39%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	0%	51%	-51%	48%	-48%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%
2018	8%	64%	-56%	65%	-57%
Compare		-8%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	4%	74%	-70%	71%	-67%
2018	10%	76%	-66%	71%	-61%
Compare		-6%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	74%	-74%	70%	-70%
2018	53%	73%	-20%	68%	-15%
Compare		-53%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	64%	-64%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	64%	-64%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	62%	-62%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25	49	75	16	27	20	31	7		74	5
BLK	25	36		20	31						
WHT	29	52		19	34		36	13		71	7
FRL	20	43	70	13	21	20	26	4		80	5
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

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	316
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	89%

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%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	33
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	30
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Despite the fact that Bay District Schools went through a major hurricane, with all the trauma that comes with it, New Horizons doubled their ELA school improvement percentage. Our assessment

data still shows thought that Integration of Knowledge and Key ideas are still two sub-skills areas that our students performed the weakest in.

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

There was no decline, but our weakness remains in Integration of Knowledge and Key ideas.

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.

In the individual grades, the greatest gap when compared to the state average was: 6th grade: Key Ideas;

7th grade: Key Ideas and Craft; 8th grade: key ideas and integration of knowledge.

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

For 6th grade: Language and editing text remained the same (6th grade ELA/Reading teachers did a lot of delving into text) 7th grade: improvement was shown by at least 1% in all areas except Lang. and editing text; 8th grade: growth of at least 1% in integration of knowledge.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

We are graded on a school improvement rating - despite the Hurricane, we moved from unsatisfactory to maintaining with a rating of 36% overall. Our ELA learning gains jumped to 44% over all. Looking at our EWS data, attendance and discipline/suspensions are still an issue.

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

1. Behavior
2. Attendance
3. Academics
4. Qualified Teachers
5. Social Emotional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	To increase the percent of students making learning gains in ELA on all district and state assessments by 5%, and to incorporate an overall focus on improving literacy skills across the curriculum.
Rationale	Continuing to focus on strengthening the sub-skills key ideas and integration of knowledge and ideas through our Literacy Cross-Curriculum program. PLCs are working in grade groups, bringing their academic and behavior data to focus on. IEPs, BIPs, etc are being monitored by the PLCs also to include their data.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Focusing on the ELA subskills, we will increase our ELA gains for:: our overall population from 44% to 49%, students with disabilities from 44% to 49%, our economically disadvantaged from 40% to 45%, our white population from 49% to 54%, our Black/African American population from 33% to 38%, our male population from 46% to 51% and our females from 38% to 43%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Gordon Pongratz (pongrr@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use of coordinated literacy strategies cross-curriculum, higher order thinking questions/ interactions and interactive activities to increase rigor, Achieve 3000 for our reading classes which supports the new EL program will help all of our sub-groups continue to increase their scores.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies in the 2018-19 school year, despite the hurricane and showed great gains. Evidence is shown in our student scores, and the resources we will continue to use are: Achieve 3000 diagnostics in the reading classes determines where students are and the articles used are available to meet the students where they are; the new EL program is on grade work and is supported by Achieve 3000, PLC notes, PD sign-in sheets, CWT, Teacher lesson plans, Guidance notes of student attendance and CSTs.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monthly, teachers will attend a professional development training specifically designed to aid in and increase the use of writing and reading strategies across curriculum, as well as implementing higher order thinking and increased rigor. 2. PLCs will meet by grade level two times a month; they will bring their classroom behavior data (point sheets), academic data, as well as their IEP caseload information. 3. Teacher Data Chats with their students will include attendance, behavior (Point Sheets, BIP) along with academics 3. Based on individual/small group needs, paras will pull out students for more intensive work. 4. Guidance will review attendance quarterly and establish steps towards CST, following district attendance policies and/or parent contact. 5. Recognize students who have good and improved attendance. 6. Classroom Walk-through to gather data related to the implementation of higher order thinking, literacy skills cross-curriculum and increased rigor. 7. Achieve 3000 is used in our reading classes and the new EL curriculum in our 6-8 ELA classes. 8. 90 minute study hall provided once a week.
Person Responsible	Gordon Pongratz (pongrr@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	To decrease the percentage of students 10% receiving either ISS or OSS during the 2019-2020 school year.
Rationale	Reducing student suspension rates will improve our attendance, graduation rates, state test scores, and promote school wide expectations of being safe, responsible, successful, respectful, and accountable.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	2018-19 total ISS DRs dropped 8% from the previous year. While defiance and disrespect was our highest again last year, it did drop 1% from previous year. Comparing the first 4.5 weeks last year to this year, defiance and disrespect is down 44%. Overall referrals from last year to this year during the first 4.5 weeks is down from 140-114 referrals; males are down from 118 to 109 referrals and females down from 22 to 12; whites are down from 98 to 71, and Black/African Americans are down from 46 to 44. 2018-19 OSS was down 7% from 2017-18.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Gordon Pongratz (pongrrgr@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	BDS360 assignments are being utilized in ISS for each student based on their DR behavior as well as in Homeroom classes each morning for their SEL goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	BDS360 is a district approved digital program with built in scenarios on behaviors and social/emotional strategies.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continuous monitoring of BDS360 2. Data from point sheets to be reviewed by grade level PLCs 3. Data Review of suspensions with leadership team 4. OSS Re-entry paperwork 5. Baker-Act re-entry meetings 6. District set social/character skill lessons are being utilized in homeroom everyday. 7. Fridays are our fun Fridays designated for clubs and afternoon student chosen activities. 8. Title 1 nights provide families with agency connections and support. 9. Motivational speaker is scheduled for late November. 10. Family fun STEM night in the Spring. 11. Mentor Room for additional support for our students academically, physically and emotionally.
Person Responsible	Gordon Pongratz (pongrrgr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Academics:
1. CWT

2. PLC minutes
3. Lesson plans
4. Media Center is sponsoring morning activities, a reading incentive program and will be hosting a Battle of the Books.

Behavior:

1. identify those students who continue to receive OSS.
2. Incorporate re-entry meetings with parents/students when returning from OSS
3. Incorporate re-entry meetings with parents/student when returning from Baker-Acts.
4. Utilize lunch detention as an alternative to ISS
5. Incorporate BDS360 in ISS for all students to work on assignments as determined by their DR.
6. Utilize BDS360/Strong Kids curriculum for social/emotional skills in homeroom each day.
7. Point sheets tracked daily with positive rewards if students' meet their points for such things as Fun Friday or quarterly fun activities. (Point sheets look at behavior, attendance, academics)
8. Social worker and Crises Interventionist will work with students in small groups based on their behavior.
9. School-wide DP is focused on behavior.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

See the attached Title 1 Parent and Family Engagement Plan.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Students at New Horizons attend the same school from 6th to 12th grade unless the IEP team meets and decides that other placement would be more appropriate. All new students meet with our Behavior Specialist and Guidance before starting school to dispel any misconceptions and to lay out the foundation of the expectations of our program. Services will be provided by our Social Worker, school counselors, mental health counselors, Telehealth counselors, PROMISE paras and mentors from our Mentor Program; and the implementation of check in/out programs, character education (BDS 360/ District SEL program) programs, and PBIS.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The Leadership Team tracks student behavior and academic trends through data analysis and contingent upon emerging student needs, including academic, behavior or physical issues, the team will access the school and community resources to meet the needs of the student to return them to a classroom environment, ready to learn.

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part A funds are coordinated with federal, state, and local funds and services to provide high quality supplemental instruction and support services for educationally disadvantaged students at schools with 66% or more students qualifying for the Free/Reduced Lunch Program. The purpose of Title I funding is to implement programs and services that ensure that all children have a fair, equal and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging state academic achievement standards and state academic assessments. Title I, Part A funds and various other funds are coordinated and integrated to provide services for private schools, local neglected and delinquent institutions, and Homeless Programs.

Title II

Funds from Title II, Title I Part A, Title III, and various state and local allocations are used for the following activities:

- Providing professional development activities
- Carrying out programs and activities that are designed to improve the quality of the teacher force
- Hiring highly qualified teachers, including teachers who become highly qualified through State and local alternative routes to certification, and special education teachers, in order to reduce class size, particularly in the early grades.

Title III

The Title III/ESOL program provides assistance to students, parents and teachers for students whose first language is not English.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Principals, school counselors, and social workers are made aware of available resources from various funding sources during district provided meetings throughout the school year. The needs of students and their families identified during parent-teacher conferences, MTSS meetings, IEP meetings, social worker visits, etc., are addressed by the school counselor and/or social worker by coordinating services and programs provided by federal, state, and local funds within the school system and the community. Students in MTSS tiers II and III are monitored frequently to determine the impact of services and adjustments are made accordingly. The Guidance Counselors work individually and on a group basis to promote student awareness of academic and career opportunities. In addition, the Guidance Counselors coordinate with Haney Vocational School and Gulf Coast State College for student enrollment in pre and post-graduation training. Our staff take high school students annually to both campuses to show each student their options for post-secondary education.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Counselors talk to students about Haney.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To increase the percent of students making learning gains in ELA on all district and state assessments by 5%, and to incorporate an overall focus on improving literacy skills across the curriculum.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To decrease the percentage of students 10% receiving either ISS or OSS during the 2019-2020 school year.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00