Educational Horizons Charter

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Educational Horizons Charter

1281 S WICKHAM RD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

http://www.educationalhorizons.net

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Turner

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (83%) 2015-16: A (77%) 2014-15: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

N/A

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

Educational Horizons Charter

1281 S WICKHAM RD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

http://www.educationalhorizons.net

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)
Elementary School KG-6	No	29%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	34%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Educational Horizons Charter School will provide students with educational opportunities using Montessori methods and philosophy of learning skills for college and career readiness and lifelong learning. We emphasize the small learning community school in which students are personally responsible for their actions and exhibit courtesy and respect for all people and property.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Educational Horizons Charter School we expect to meet the high standards of student achievement in a diverse learning environment that focuses on the individual student. Incorporating Montessori education with state standards and district requirement, we promote independent and academic success with the rigor of critical thinking skills needed for 21st Century success. In conjunction with families and home, we share the responsibility of teaching and monitoring students progress in a nurturing and safe environment.

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
Turner, Cheryl	Principal	Administrator for school manger of faculty and staff. Contribute and oversee creation of SIP. To collect ideas from stakeholders, staff, PTO, parents, community, and school governing board for SIP. Share final SIP with all involved.
Tapp, Aileen	Teacher, ESE	To serve as teacher for ESE and Gifted. Also to serve as Title IX representative for the school. Serve as MTSS and ESOL representative as well as Student in Transition representative. Contribute to creation and editing of SIP.
Needle, Eileen	Administrative Support	To serve as Administrative Assistant in many ways including attendance, scheduling, student services and family support. Contribute to creation of SIP with editing and student data.
Murphy, Heidi	Teacher, K-12	To serve in the classroom representing grades K-2 and serve as the Education Leadership person for the district. Carry the message of curriculum back to teachers. Also to serve on Threat Assessment Team. Contribute to creating SIP and help with editing.
Barber, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	To serve in classroom and represent grades 3-6. Also to be the chairperson for School Advisory Council. Contribute to creating SIP and editing.

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	26	25	23	21	8	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	6	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

12

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/15/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	9	11	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	85%	62%	57%	85%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	60%	58%	70%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	57%	53%	0%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	89%	63%	63%	95%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	83%	65%	62%	82%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	53%	51%	0%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	57%	53%	0%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	26 (0)	25 (0)	23 (0)	21 (0)	8 (0)	13 (0)	13 (0)	129 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ()	1 ()	6 ()	2 ()	0 ()	2 ()	1 ()	14 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

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
03	2019	82%	64%	18%	58%	24%
	2018	100%	63%	37%	57%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	100%	61%	39%	58%	42%
	2018	67%	57%	10%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		33%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	56%	17%
	2018	82%	54%	28%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2019	0%	60%	-60%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	100%	61%	39%	62%	38%
	2018	100%	62%	38%	62%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	100%	64%	36%	64%	36%
	2018	93%	59%	34%	62%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	60%	13%
	2018	82%	58%	24%	61%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
06	2019	0%	67%	-67%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	68%	-68%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	56%	17%	53%	20%
	2018	64%	57%	7%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
WHT	82	64		91	88		75				
FRL	79	45		79	82						

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
WHT	84	78		94	74						
FRL	81	82		94	82						

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
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
WHT	81	71		96	85						
FRL	73			91							

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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

English Language Learners	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	80
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	71
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

Our ELA achievement growth only showed an increase of 2% from (2018) 83% to(2019) 85%. The ELA learning gain went down from (2018) 70% to (2019) 66%. The math achievement goal went down from (2018) 93% to 89% (2019).One contributing factor is that grade 6 students did not factor into this score, due to low number of students (under 10).

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

There was a decline when we look at the same grade comparison of grade 3 ELA. The 2018 group scored 100% at level 3 and above. The 2019 group scored 82% at level 3 and above. The grade 5 students also showed a decline in ELA. The 2018 group scored 82% at level 3 and above. The 2019 group scored 73% at level 3 and above. In Math there was a decline when we look at the same grade comparison for grade 5. The 2018 group scored 82% at level 3 and above. The 2019 group scored 73% at level 3 and above. Our grade 5 class last year had a 20% population of ESE students. They will be our current grade 6 students and comprise 23% of our population for that grade.

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 students scored higher than the state in all categories and sub categories.

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

Science Achievement showed the biggest gain as our grade 5 students scored 73% proficient (2019) compared to 64% proficient (2018). The larger class population may have had a positive effect on this score. We also added a second teacher in the combined grade 5 and 6 classroom due to the larger population. This allows for a teacher devoted to Reading and ELA.

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

Looking at the current population, we see that 15% of the population (2 students) scored a Level 1 in ELA or Math. Of that, one of the students also has attendance lower that 95% for last year.

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

1. Collaborating and problem solving ways to meet all student needs.
2. Meeting academic needs of students in grades 3-6 and students at risk in grades K-2.
3. Understanding the MTSS process to meet all student needs.
4. Meeting Social and Emotional needs of all students.
5. Increase student achievement on state assessment.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Understanding and utilizing the MTSS process to the fullest
Rationale	The purpose of a school improvement plan is to strategically move and improve school data both qualitatively and quantitative with multiple means. The Multi Tiered System of Support (MTSS) is defines as "an instructional framework that includes universal screening of all students, multiple tiers of instruction and support services, and an integrated data collection and assessment system to inform decisions at each tier of instructions." Understanding and using this system with fidelity will increase student achievement in all grades across all curriculum.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase student achievement across the curriculum and work toward 90% of students scoring a 3 or higher in ELA, Math, and Science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheryl Turner (turner.cheryl@educationalhorizons.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increase our collaboration with problem solving and MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Support) for all students. Give Universal support to 80% of the student population, Targeted support to 15% of the population and Intensive support to 5% of the population.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Provide high quality instruction both academically and behaviorally with varying intensity to meet student needs. Monitor students with research based assessments frequently and make decisions based on outcomes. Reflect and adjust current practices as needed to meet needs.
Action Step	
Description	1. Devote Professional Development time to the MTSS process with faculty and staff. 2. Educate staff on the 4-step problem solving model. 3. Participate fully in IPST and data collection meetings. 4. Encourage Collaborations between grade level and ESE teachers. 5. Develop high quality instruction for all students based on differentiation and needs. 6. Make connections between Montessori philosophy of learning and differentiated instruction. 7. Educate families and community on the MTSS and problem solving process. 8. Reflect and adjust as needed to meet the three tiers of instruction.
Person Responsible	Cheryl Turner (turner.cheryl@educationalhorizons.net)

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).

Our school will continue to work towards building a stronger security plan. We need to focus on the suggestions and changes to promote more secure and safe school. We will continue to work on training

and hiring teachers with Montessori experience and certification. We will continue to train teachers in the area of safety and mental health for our school and students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Understanding and utilizing the MTSS process to the fullest				$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	6511 - Educational Horizons Charter	General Fund		$500.00
			Notes: Money will be used to train staff and faculty on problem solving and MTSS. Time will be given on In-service and Professional Development Days and Friday early release days.			
					Total:	$500.00