

Bay District Schools

New Horizons Learning Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	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: 7/29/2020

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
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* 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
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 was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	Yes	%
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 was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pongratz, Gordon	Principal	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	James Harmon: consistent behavior model implementation, intake meetings for students on academic and behavior expectations.
Mitchell, Helen	Assistant Principal	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.
Hinson, Denise	Instructional Coach	Denise Hinson: instructional coach/Media Specialist; works with new teachers, trains teachers on MAP, FSA testing; coordinates testing schedule.
Grady, Brittney	School Counselor	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.
Nelson, Helen	School Counselor	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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/29/2020, Gordon Pongratz

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.*

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

19

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
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* 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
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 .	

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	14	18	24	24	25	11	4	120	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	12	14	13	1	3	64	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	19	18	16	4	4	82	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	1	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	2	7	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	21	19	17	10	3	86	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	22	20	19	10	4	87	

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	6	14	22	22	21	10	4	99	

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	1	1	2	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	5	1	2	19	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/27/2020

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	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

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	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

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	
	(0)	(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
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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%	0
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%	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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	2
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%	0
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%	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	33
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	2

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.

We will continue from the 2019-2020 SIP and acknowledge that Integration of Knowledge and Key Ideas are still two sub-skill areas that we want to continue to focus on due to the fact of COVID and the closing of the schools.

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

No evidence of decline, but want to continue to focus on 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.

The greatest gap the previous year that we worked to close was 6th grade: Key Idea's; 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 continue to delve into text. 7th grade: improvement was shown by at least 1% in all areas except Language and editing text; 8th grade: grown of a least 1% in integration of knowledge.

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

We are graded on a school improvement rating - despite the Hurricane in 2018-19 school year, we moved from unsatisfactory to maintain with a rating of 36% overall. Our ELA learning gains jumped to 44% over all. We know that attendance and suspensions are 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Increasing the learning gains in ELA, to include reading and writing across the curriculum.

Measurable Outcome:

To increase the percent of students making learning gains in ELA on all district and state assessment by 5%, and to incorporate an overall focus on improving literacy skills across the curriculum through writing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gordon Pongratz (pongrr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. All homerooms will be reading for 10 mins, which can include but not be limited to independent reading, teacher reading to students with questions to gather comprehensive information, jigsaw reading an article, and/or each student read a part of a story and share out.
2. Tiger Talks: Students will respond to a question twice a week by restating the question and answering it in complete sentences. We will start with a few sentences and build to 3-5 paragraphs by the end of the year. Tiger Talks are uploaded in Canvas.
3. Tiger Writes: Students will respond to science and history questions every 4.5 weeks in those respective classes. They will respond to questions by restating the question, answering the question and using supportive evidence to back up their answers.
4. We will continue the use of coordinate literacy strategies cross-curriculum, higher order thinking questions and interactive activities to increase rigor.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

These strategies were used in the 2018-2019 school year and despite Hurricane Michael in the fall of 2018, our Spring FSA scores showed great gains. The resources we will continue to use is the EL program using grade level work, PLC notes, PD sign-in sheets, CWT, lesson plans Guidance notes of student attendance and CSTs

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers have been trained on Canvas and will begin day one teaching their students how to access the curriculum from Canvas. As often as the district will allow, we will continue professional development training to support Canvas. Teachers will also reach out to those BayLink students and parents on their roles as they work through the curriculum.
2. PLCs will met weekly to discuss classroom behavior data (point sheets), academic data and their IEP caseload information.
3. Guidance will review attendance quarterly and establish steps towards CSTs
4. Recognize students who have good and improved attendance as well academics quarterly.
5. CWTs gathering data.

Person Responsible

Gordon Pongratz (pongrr@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus	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.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	To decrease the percentage of students 10% receiving either ISS or OSS during the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gordon Pongratz (pongrr@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	BDS360 assignments will continue in ISS for each student based on their DR behavior.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	BDS360 is a district approved digital program with built in scenarios on behaviors and social/emotional strategies. In homeroom we will utilize Maslow's needs hierarchy working with students on their individual needs to include their social and emotional needs, as well as point sheets.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continuous monitoring of BDS360
2. Data from point sheets to be reviewed by PLCs
3. Data review of suspensions with Leadership team.
4. Addition of the Triad team to work with students individually and in small groups based on discipline and mental health needs.
5. Fridays will be our fun Fridays designated for fun activities based on a reward system.
6. OSS re-entry paperwork
7. Baker-Act re-entry meetings
8. Title 1 nights provide families with agency connections and support.
9. Mentors for additional support for our students academically, physically and emotionally. (We will be limited this year)

Person Responsible Gordon Pongratz (pongrr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Academics:

- 1. CWT**
- 2. PLC minutes**
- 3. Canvas lesson plans**
- 4. Media Center will sponsor morning activities, to include a reading incentive program.**

Behavior:

- 1. Identify those students who continue to receive OSS.**
- 2. Incorporate re-entry meetings with parents/students when returning from BAKER-Acts.**
- 3. Incorporate re-entry meetings with parents/students when returning from OSS**
- 4. Utilize lunch detention as an alternative to ISS.**
- 5. Incorporate BDS360 in ISS for all students work on assignments as determined by their doctor.**
- 6. Point sheets will be 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)**
- 7. Social work, Triad team will work with students in small groups based on their behavior**
- 8. School-wide DP is focused on behavior.**

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.

First, we have a very supportive faculty and staff and New Horizons. They believe in making sure every child feels safe, helps them work on their behavior which allows the student to then be successful with their academics. We have a fabulous Mentor Room, where parents can sign their child up for a Mentor. Mentors meet with students once a week, bringing lunch and spending time. The Mentor Room also supplies families with food when needed, clothes, and hygiene products. At Thanksgiving and Christmas we provide our needy families with a dinner consisting of a turkey, veggies, potatoes, etc.

During the school year of 2018-19, our district suffered a Cat 5 hurricane. When we were able to return, we worked with our families that were hit with the devastation with necessary supplies, clothes, food and mental health support through the district. This past spring, with the pandemic forcing us to be out of school, our teachers made daily/weekly calls to the students helping them with their assignments. They worked with the parents to see if they needed anything and we provided food bags and clothes.

In a normal environment, we provide several Title 1 parent nights with fun activities for the families to include the faculty and staff.

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	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00