Horizons Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Horizons Elementary School

1700 FOREST LAKE DR, Davenport, FL 33837

schools.polk-fl.net/horizonshawks

Demographics

Principal: Amy Heiser Meyers

Start Date for this Principal: 11/11/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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 Polk 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.](http://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

Horizons Elementary School

1700 FOREST LAKE DR, Davenport, FL 33837

schools.polk-fl.net/horizonshawks

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	89%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	86%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

The mission of Horizons Elementary is to provide learning experiences
that result in high achievement for our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Horizons Elementary recognizes that in an ever-changing society we must continue to learn how to best
educate our students. We will provide students with a curriculum that is rigorous and relevant so that the
learning environment is optimized. Horizons Elementary students will be given every opportunity to soar
above the horizon to success.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the
school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Heiser Meyers, Amy	Principal	
Jackson, Hope	School Counselor	
Jadallah, Mahboobah	Instructional Coach	
Klupp, Stephen	Instructional Coach	
banks, katie	Teacher, ESE	
gordon, jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
lux, jessica	Psychologist	
Fernandez, Debra	Dean	
Kindle, Henreta	Instructional Coach	
Holloman, Jacqueline	Instructional Coach	
Shea, Shana	Teacher, K-12	
Edwards, James	Assistant Principal	
Braid, Tandy	Instructional Media	
Nelson, Stacy	Assistant Principal	
fowler, yolanda	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 11/11/2018, Amy Heiser Meyers

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
85

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	193	216	215	231	222	212	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1289
Attendance below 90 percent	27	35	16	26	28	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	7	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	21	28	27	60	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
Course failure in Math	17	10	16	6	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	34	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	30	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Dec 2019 STAR Level 1	0	1	39	49	40	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174
Dec 2019 Mathematics Level 1	0	14	26	35	32	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	1	10	21	40	43	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/11/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	186	197	184	217	209	202	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1195
Attendance below 90 percent	9	37	24	21	18	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	6	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	42	24	43	91	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	243
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	53	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

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	14	5	13	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	1	0	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	
Number of students enrolled	186	197	184	217	209	202	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1195
Attendance below 90 percent	9	37	24	21	18	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	6	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	42	24	43	91	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	243
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	53	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

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	14	5	13	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	1	0	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	46%	51%	57%	50%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	51%	58%	55%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	49%	53%	60%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	57%	63%	50%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	56%	62%	61%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	47%	51%	62%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	47%	53%	47%	46%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	47%	52%	-5%	58%	-11%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	48%	-6%	58%	-16%
	2018	53%	48%	5%	56%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	41%	47%	-6%	56%	-15%
	2018	45%	50%	-5%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	44%	56%	-12%	62%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	58%	56%	2%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	56%	0%	64%	-8%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	38%	51%	-13%	60%	-22%
	2018	47%	56%	-9%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	36%	45%	-9%	53%	-17%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	21	25	20	26	44	55	21				
ELL	33	41	45	38	37	44	26				
ASN	50			42							
BLK	43	40	35	40	42	46	23				
HSP	46	46	47	47	45	44	39				
MUL	32	42		37	25						
WHT	53	53	60	62	59	40	57				
FRL	43	42	45	45	46	43	37				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	42	52	48	41	50	48	35				
ELL	47	58	61	55	53	36	40				
BLK	53	59	57	43	58	62	31				
HSP	54	60	56	60	58	41	47				
MUL	36			43							
WHT	60	64	63	65	72	58	50				
FRL	52	59	60	55	59	48	43				

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
SWD	27	44	50	32	53	43	16				
ELL	38	52	58	46	70	73	24				
BLK	43	61	65	41	56	63	41				
HSP	51	56	56	54	67	65	41				
MUL	33			25							
WHT	55	47	80	50	51	45	66				
FRL	48	54	60	50	62	61	41				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	365
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	46
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	34
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 lowest area of performance was in science. Only 39% of students demonstrated a proficiency level for science based on both 2019 Florida State Assessment and second district quarterly assessment for 2019-2020 school year. Low ELA achievement level and staff changes greatly contributed to stagnant improvement in science.

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

ELA proficiency had the greatest decline. Based upon the FSA STAR correlation the percent of students scoring proficient for ELA dropped from 46% on the 2019 ELA FSA to 43% on the 2019 December Star Reading Assessment. Students may have lacked knowledge of the importance of Star testing and development of personal learning goals.

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.

ELA proficiency had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state average for ELA proficiency on the 2019 ELA FSA was 57% compared to the average of 43% on the 2019 December Star Reading Assessment. Students may have lacked knowledge of the importance of Star testing and development of personal learning goals.

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

Math was the area of the greatest growth. Based on the 2019 December Star student proficiency rose from 48% on the Math FSA to 55% on the 2019 December Star Math Assessment. We used an increase in targeted and push in interventions to help struggling students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

One potential area of concern is student attendance. We have 12% of our students missing more than 90% of the school year.

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

1. ELA
2. Science
3. Math
4. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will be adding targeted interventions to help bridge the gap between below level readers and their peers. The school's proficiency on the December Star Reading Assessment was 14 percent lower than the state average on the 2019 ELA FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	We are striving to increase our ELA proficiency and ELA learning gains to 51 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Heiser Meyers (amy.heiser-meyers@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction by the classroom teacher, push-in interventions by instructional support staff using LLI, LIPS, and Literature Circles, ELL students will be pulled out for targeted interventions using Literature Circles.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction is able to provide students with differentiated instruction, to decrease the gap between them and their peers. Literature circles provide students with an engaging opportunity to reflect on comprehension and practice critical thinking skills throughout the reading of the passage.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Targeted LLI interventions led by ELA interventionists and classroom teachers.
2. Literature circles provided by ELA coaches, paras, and teachers.
3. Pulled out literature circle small groups provided by ESOL teacher and Para.
4. Extended contract targeted interventions.
5. Pulled out LIPS interventions.
6. Increasing home literacy by providing families books to read with their children at home.
7. Curriculum planning, creating literature circles using stem questions, while developing school wide communications on upcoming instruction.
8. Data chats using weekly assessment data.

Person Responsible	Amy Heiser Meyers (amy.heiser-meyers@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We are going to use benchmark tracking, spiral review, and targeted interventions to help student increase proficiency in science. Our school is 14 percent lower than the state average.
Measurable Outcome:	We are striving to increase our Science proficiency to 45 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacy Nelson (stacy.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing engaging exploration activities to offer students first hand discovery of science concepts. Using benchmark tracker tool to chart students' progress and mastery. Using interactive science notebooks and increasing vocabulary previewing. Weekly small group interventions led by the classroom teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Comprehending complex science text requires an increased understanding of tier 2 and 3 science vocabulary. Engaging science exploration allows students to more fully reflect on science content. Students are provided an opportunity to explain their understanding while teacher help guide students through common misconceptions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Vocabulary Instruction and spiral review
2. Using the five day instructional model for STEMscopes.
3. Purchasing consumable materials for science labs
4. Use of formative assessments to redirect misconceptions.
5. Standards based spiral review.

Person Responsible Stacy Nelson (stacy.nelson@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will be increasing targeted interventions to help fill gaps in under performing students in math. The school's proficiency on the December Star Math Assessment was 8 percent lower than the state average on the 2019 Math FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	We are striving to increase our math proficiency and math learning gains to 53 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Edwards (james.edwards@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction by the classroom teacher, push-in interventions by instructional support staff for 4th and 5th grade, targeted students are being pulled out of specials once a week for math interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction is able to provide students with differentiated instruction, to decrease the gap between them and their peers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Engaging small group instruction provided by the classroom teacher during math class using hands on manipulatives.
2. Small group instruction provided by Math interventionist during math class
3. Small group support provided for SWD in self contained classrooms.
4. Extended contract targeted interventions.
5. Purchasing new technology to help support the districts Freckles computer based math tutorial program.

Person Responsible	James Edwards (james.edwards@polk-fl.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We are going to use interventions matrix to diagnose possible causes and student needs related to absenteeism. If students are not in school, they cannot learn.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to decrease absenteeism by 10 percent, as well as decrease the amount of early check-outs and late arrivals by 25 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Henreta Kindle (henreta.kindle@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are working with our school-based social worker to derive an incentive-based program to encourage families to have their students in school. We also have an administrator or instructional support staff responsible in monitoring the attendance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When students have a positive environment to come and stay at, they will want to be here more consistently.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Behavior Interventionist will work with teachers to make classroom environments friendly and inviting.
2. We have a morning greeting, where students will be able to pick how they will be greeting their teacher each morning.
3. We will have monitoring of student attendance, check outs, and late arrivals.
4. Parent communication and counseling.
5. Students who have perfect attendance for the month, they will have the opportunity to win a gift certificate or other award.

Person Responsible	Henreta Kindle (henreta.kindle@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Continued implementation of CHAMPS. Also, the ESSA data information that is provided through progress monitoring will be observed to ensure those students (SWD, ELL, Multiracial) are making learning gains.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Horizons Elementary School seeks to create opportunities for families, staff, and other stakeholders to be engaged in school improvements and the educational process through the use of collaborative discussions, problem solving meetings, informational meetings, social media, celebrations, our school's website, family and staff engagement events, and parent, student, and staff member surveys. Every year we form an official School Advisory Council to help guide our school to improve our school's culture of learning, environment and instruction.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$221,021.10
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$96,719.00
			Notes: 2 Reading Interventionist			
	6150	510-Supplies	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,463.29
			Notes: ELA Parent Nights			
	6400	100-Salaries	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$98,300.00
			Notes: 2 Reading Coaches			
	5100	100-Salaries	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$15,385.00
			Notes: Para for in class interventions.			
	5900	100-Salaries	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$3,203.83
			Notes: Tutoring			

	6150	100-Salaries	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$5,949.98
			Notes: *Family Engagement Events*			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$107,020.30**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$42,471.00
			Notes: *Math Interventionist*			
	6400	100-Salaries	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$50,352.00
			Notes: *Math Coach*			
	5100	100-Salaries	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$12,734.00
			Notes: *Para for in class interventions.*			
	6150	510-Supplies	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,463.30
			Notes: *Parent Night Supplies*			
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance**				**$50,652.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$47,652.00
			Notes: *Behavior Interventionist*			
	6150	510-Supplies	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$3,000.00
			Notes: *Student Agendas*			
					Total:	**$378,693.40**