
Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Horizon West Middle

8200 TATTANT BLVD, Windermere, FL 34786

horizonwestms.ocps.net

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Thomas

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 35% |
| 2020-21 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: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade |
| 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 | |

* 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 Orange 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Horizon West Middle

8200 TATTANT BLVD, Windermere, FL 34786

horizonwestms.ocps.net

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">24%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">64%</p> |

School Grades History

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <p>Year</p> | <p>2020-21</p> |
| <p>Grade</p> | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

To ensure that every student has a promising and successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students 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 | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Thomas, Michelle | Principal | Principal- focuses on overall instructional practices throughout the school with an emphasis on Math, Leadership Team, and Support Services. |
| Flanagan, Kevin | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal (Digital Curriculum)- focuses on integration of technology into instructional practices with an emphasis on Social Studies, Language Arts, and Fine Arts Curriculum |
| Bell, Kelley | Other | Focus on safe school environment, student mental health, social emotional learning, and directs threat assessment team. |
| Cameron, Mallory | Instructional Technology | Focuses on digital instructional strategies as a member of the Digital Leadership Team. Provides technical support to teachers through professional development and resource allocation. |
| Farrell, Chloe | School Counselor | Lead Guidance Counselor 8th grade counselor SAFE Team Member Discipline Team Member Assists in coordinating SEL schoolwide plan |
| Grnya, Steve | Staffing Specialist | ESE Placement Specialist- focuses on ESE instructional strategies and supports ESE students, parents, and teachers. |
| Logan, Judy | Teacher, K-12 | Testing Coordinator. Supervises all district and state testing. Gathers and shares data of student progress with relevant team members. |
| Martinez Evans, Elika | Reading Coach | Reading and Writing Coach- Focuses on reading and writing instructional practices as the Language Arts Department Chairperson. |
| Moody, Christie | Instructional Media | Media Specialist--Provides support for academic resources for both students and teachers. Curates media resources to support academic progress. Manages digital resources including students laptops to maximize student resources. |
| Ryan, Chad | ELL Compliance Specialist | Curriculum Compliance Focuses on ELL instructional strategies school-wide and supports ELL students, parents, and teachers. |
| Stanley, Tiffany | Instructional Coach | Instructional Coach--Support new teacher training program. Creates and implement the professional development plan for the school year. Supports instructional coaching with all teachers. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Hargrett, Nicole | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal (Facilities)- focuses on daily campus operations pertaining to campus safety, building and grounds upkeep, facility rentals, after school activities and instructional practices with an emphasis on Science, Reading, DIT and World Language |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Michelle Thomas

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.*

53

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

67

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,320

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 | 426 | 412 | 442 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1280 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 58 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 28 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 21 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 56 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 48 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 44 | 56 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/30/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 427 | 449 | 396 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1272 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 27 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 18 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 55 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 62 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 |

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 | 54 | 48 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 |

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

2020-21 - 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 | 427 | 449 | 396 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1272 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 27 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 18 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 55 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 62 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 |

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 | 54 | 48 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 |

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | | 52% | 54% | | 52% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | 52% | 54% | | 50% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 45% | 47% | | 42% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | | 55% | 58% | | 53% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | 55% | 57% | | 51% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 50% | 51% | | 44% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | | 51% | 51% | | 51% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | | 67% | 72% | | 68% | 72% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Student data was collected through iReady results and district PMA results.

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 164/43% | 219/56% | 253/60% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 41/38% | 53/47% | 59/50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/9% | 64/37% | 83/44% |
| | English Language Learners | 50/29% | 64/37% | 83/44% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 91/24% | 168/43% | 241/59% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23/21% | 47/41% | 62/53% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/10% | 2/10% | 4/20% |
| | English Language Learners | 35/20% | 54/32% | 86/46% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Grade 7 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 178/50% | 202/55% | 215/54% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 44/43% | 50/45% | 47/43% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/8% | 2/7% | 3/10% |
| | English Language Learners | 52/33% | 67/39% | 69/38% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 141/40% | 180/48% | 210/54% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 31/31% | 37/22% | 46/42% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/4% | 2/7% | 7/25% |
| | English Language Learners | 45/29% | 64/38% | 76/43% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Civics | All Students | 312/78% | 344/83% | 357/87% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 92/74% | 105/81% | 103/83% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 9/56% | 8/42% | 9/47% |
| | English Language Learners | 94/67% | 86/59% | 96/66% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 207/57% | 258/63% | 238/63% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 59/56% | 79/63% | 69/62% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 4/21% | 2/11% |
| | English Language Learners | 59/45% | 70/47% | 63/48% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 131/45% | 167/49% | 141/51% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 42/48% | 56/45% | 45/49% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/6% | 2/9% | 4/24% |
| | English Language Learners | 41/36% | 49/37% | 63/47% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 226/47% | 299/72% | 306/75% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 61/49% | 87/67% | 86/71% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/25% | 10/50% | 7/37% |
| | English Language Learners | 61/44% | 86/59% | 96/66% |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 24 | 48 | 46 | 29 | 43 | 43 | 35 | 42 | | | |
| ELL | 52 | 65 | 63 | 60 | 60 | 58 | 53 | 74 | 63 | | |
| ASN | 77 | 62 | | 76 | 63 | | 70 | 86 | 81 | | |
| BLK | 61 | 58 | 27 | 51 | 42 | 50 | 59 | 84 | 62 | | |
| HSP | 58 | 64 | 63 | 65 | 61 | 54 | 57 | 75 | 69 | | |
| MUL | 69 | 73 | | 50 | 60 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 59 | 33 | 79 | 60 | 50 | 75 | 80 | 84 | | |
| FRL | 54 | 58 | 53 | 55 | 49 | 44 | 47 | 69 | 68 | | |
| 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 |

| 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 |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 64 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 59 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 642 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 96% |

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| 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 | 61 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 74 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Black/African American Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 55 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 62 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 63 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 66 |
| 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 | 55 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The sub group data indicates that students with dis abilities, and ELL students are performing below the main student population. Smaller gaps exist between economically disadvantaged students and the general student population. Math scores are lagging behind language arts scores in all areas with the exception of accelerated math classes (high school level courses taken in the middle school)

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Students with disabilities and ELL students lag across grade levels in all indicators. Students underperform compared with general population by a minimum of 10 percentage points in most categories.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Blended learning negative impacted ELL students who might already struggle with language acquisition. Full face to face instruction will increase appropriate modelling for all students. Students with limited language skills seem to struggle with the content rich vocabulary required for standards based mastery. While students continued to develop conversational and basic academic vocabulary, the detailed content rich vocabulary increased struggles to reach full mastery of the standards. A greater focus on developing content specific vocabulary through the flipped classroom model or cross curricular activities would increase student mastery of the standards in most content areas.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

We only have one year of data as a new school and lack of testing last year. Our strongest area was civics. Student performance was 79% on grade level for this subject.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

This was our first year of testing. Teachers focused on standards based common assessments to develop skills and track master throughout the school year. Regular data meetings took place with the civics team to determine areas of need and regularly triage student.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

A rotational model will be used in math supplementary course to provide instructional tailored to student needs through IXL and iReady. Reading instruction will be closely tied to language arts instruction through PLC common planning and cross curricular activities. Teachers will conduct data meetings with individual students to track progress towards standards mastery. Administration and leadership team will meet regularly with PLC by content to assess overall progress towards mastery for each of the content standards. Administration, leadership team, and PLC content will plan best practice intervention strategies for student growth opportunities.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will be tiered experiences based on teacher's self identification and leadership team recommendations. All teachers will participate in the SEL training provided through the district model. At a school level entry level teachers (those with less than 3 years experience) will have additional professional development in ELL strategies to develop best practices in acceleration and accommodations for students developing language skills. Further professional development will be provided for the flipped model, data analysis, using data to drive instruction, effective common assessments, and backwards design. These professional development opportunities will be on an as needs basis.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

A member of the leadership team will be assigned to each department to assist in lesson development, data analysis, and effective use of collected data. Evaluating administrators will conduct data chats with assigned departments to assist in creating effective acceleration techniques and instructional methods to meet all student needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Throughout the duration of the pandemic, school personnel including counselors, teachers, and Safe Coordinator indicating an increase in student anxiety, stress, and social/emotional distress. Students would require assistance in navigating the changes to the school environment while maintaining academic progress. We also reported an increase in students seeking outside mental health assistance.

Measurable Outcome: Student and staff surveys. surveys conducted in the spring will indicate an increase by 10% in areas related to SEL. These sub areas of the panorama surveys for students include: Self management and social awareness, for teachers: Cultural awareness awareness and school climate

Monitoring: 1. Counselors will keep an ongoing log tracking mental health and social/emotional conferences with students throughout school year.
2. SAFE coordinator will continue to track required threat assessments meeting including those triggered by threats of self harm. Students in crisis will be referred to the appropriate mental health counselor for outside intervention when necessary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kelley Bell (kelley.bell@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: School side implementation of the district will continue throughout the school year with regularly scheduled lessons to take place during the school day. The expected outcome of this strategy will be to increase student self care capacity and student recognition and acceptance of resources available to them.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Building greater student self care capacity will decrease need for staff intervention as students develop stronger coping skills and begin to recognize areas of individual concern that increase stress and anxiety.

Action Steps to Implement

Counselors will create a spreadsheet to track student visits along with the purpose and outcome of each student visit. Data will be reviewed to identify students that would benefit from further SEL instruction, mentorship, or group sessions to increase student self care capacity.

Person Responsible Chloe Farrell (chloe.farrell@ocps.net)

Threats of self harm or harm to others will be monitored by the threat assessment team throughout the school year. The threat assessment team will follow up with student incidents, recommend further action, and develop safety plans for students in crisis at their monthly meetings.

Person Responsible Kelley Bell (kelley.bell@ocps.net)

Teachers will continue with district prescribed SEL lessons as scheduled for all OCPS schools. Prior to these lesson teachers will complete SEL training to recognize students in crisis and the appropriate intervention strategies and resources available to students, families, and teachers.

Person Responsible Chloe Farrell (chloe.farrell@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Focusing on closing the achievement gap between LY and general population of students is related to school specific environmental factors. Specifically a high influx on first generation ELL students, who have limited English proficiency. This results in higher achievement gaps between LY and general population than can be found when comparing LY and LF students. Preinstructional interventions to support concept attainment, vocabulary acquisition, and foundational knowledge prior to general instruction would allow ELL student population to begin general instruction at a level commiserate with their non ELL counterparts. Prior year culturally diverse instructional strategies and ELL specific professional development would be implemented and monitored to identify teachers that might required further support when delivering effective instruction to ELL students. Preinstructional intervention strategies would address language barriers that could impede concept attainment for ELL students. Mixed use preinstructional strategies would include both digital and traditional resources to provide maximum intervention prior to general instruction thereby maximizing content specific instructional time.

Measurable Outcome:

The achievement gap between LY and non LY students scoring on grade level will lower by at least 5 percentage points in 2021-22. When examining solely LY student scores, the percentage of students on or above grade level will increase from 24% to at least 30%.

Monitoring:

ELL compliance coordinator in conjunction with the testing coordinator and administration will conduct data analysis of common assessments for core subject areas through PLC and department meeting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chad Ryan (chad.ryan@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Students gaps will be measured throughout the school year to include: iReady data, common assessments, and PMA scores. Regular meetings with ELA grade level PLC groups will include data chats specifically focused on LY student growth and monitoring gaps between LY and non LY students.
2. Data chats in grade level PLC meetings will include triage plans each nine weeks to address achievement or learning gaps as identified through common assessments and district assessments.
3. Begin teacher peer to peer observations for implementation of best practices in cross content classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Common assessment data analysis will allow for instructional review to determine most beneficial instructional strategies for ELL student growth. PLC groups will discuss intervention strategies to adjust and modify instructional methods based on student driven results. Administration and support staff will monitor student growth and achievement to provide additional support and professional development as required to individuals or PLC groups.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify students with learning gaps when compared to general population. Student ELL data will be considered to determine LY students within the subgroup. LY students in the subgroup will be targeted for specific interventions.

Person Responsible

Chad Ryan (chad.ryan@ocps.net)

Teachers of identified sub groups will be monitored for appropriate implementation of culturally responsive teaching. Additional professional development will be provided as necessary. Biweekly data chats with PLC groups will be held to discuss progress of LY students.

Person Responsible Chad Ryan (chad.ryan@ocps.net)

Pre-instructional interventions will be held during reading and DLA classes when appropriate. Pre-instructional interventions will include critical vocabulary and foundational concepts as determined by content area teachers. Interventions will provide advanced exposure to ELL students increase interactions with material on grade level instruction and content.

Person Responsible Tiffany Stanley (tiffany.stanley@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Collected data indicates a higher than normal incidents of the threats/intimidation on campus. Conversely, suspension rates among all students are lower than district and state indicators. Most incidents appear to be threats of transitory nature or unsubstantiated threats. A school focus through SEL could include developing other coping mechanisms to build student capacity in dealing with stressors or triggering incidents. Ideally, building student capacity would result in varying interventions that would not lead to incidents of threats or intimidation. Positive behavior reinforcement would divert student actions towards more positive outcomes. Restorative justice would be used to develop student interactions in a proactive, problem solving manner to limit negative interactions of all students. Introduction of these interventions would result in a drop in referral incidents relative to threats and intimidation by 15%.

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.

Horizon West Middle School has monthly PTSO meetings. Meetings include collaborative discussions on school needs, data analysis, overview of intervention strategies, and address current community concerns.

PTSO organizes community events in conjunction with student body government and various campus organization. PTSO supports teacher social emotional well being through staff recognition, campus beautification, and supplemental resources. PTSO serves as a primary source of parent involvement and allows for communication directly with school personnel. Horizon West also has monthly SAC meetings to review progression of school improvement goals, address new concerns or opportunities for growth, develop collaborative plans for instructional strategies, provide guidance on fiscal allocations to support students needs (allocation of bonus funds through A school program when appropriate), and develops communication systems between community members (to include parents, staff, students, and community business leaders).

Horizon West has a strong partners in education program which connects business leaders to community schools to provide increased resources, develop student understanding of business and career opportunities, fund specialized projects on campus, support student recognition efforts, and provide guest speakers for special events such as Teach In.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Parents--PTSO--Cultivates positive school environment through school spirit merchandise which promotes familial atmosphere. PTSO also coordinates teacher appreciation week and this year will be decorating and stocking teacher break rooms to enhance teacher morale. Regular students events such as dances, 6th grade socials, and spirit days continue to foster positive culture and an atmosphere of cooperation at Horizon West Middle School.

Faculty and Staff--Leadership team at Horizon West Middle increases parent involvement and awareness through regular updates on multiple social media sites and school website celebrating student and school success, promoting upcoming events, and providing critical information in a timely manner. Positive behavior plan rewards students for demonstrating the appropriate behavior on campus to curb referrals and discipline incidents. Regularly scheduled activities including spirit week, assemblies, and SEL courses increase student engagement and connections to the school. Vigorous extra curricular activities such as sports, Boys and Girls club, National Junior Honor Society, Beta Club, Pride Club, and Anime Club encourage student social interaction beyond the confines of the traditional student day. Counselors have multiple group sessions to assist both students in crisis and those who would need increased socialization. Students in need are assigned mentors and points of contacts throughout campus to develop social emotional skills and engage in the community building process.

Students---Students at Horizon West Middle School have an active Student Government Association that advocates and organizes student events to include spirit weeks, off campus spirit events, dances, socials, movie nights, and field trips. Students have multiple outlets for personal interest in the variety of clubs offered. These clubs allow for students to find common interests and build connections outside of the classroom. Students initiatives have included outreach programs for new students, peer to peer student ambassadors for new international students, and a cultural showcase celebrating the various groups represented on campus. Student centered events such as concerts, dance recitals, chorus performances, and art exhibits attract community and family members to the school on a regular basis.

Community Business Partners--Through our Partners in Education program, Horizon West Middle has multiple off campus events at local business developing ties between the community and the school. Other partners provide financial, physical, and manhour donations to promoting student success through reward incentives, mentoring programs, and spirit nights at local establishments.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|---|---|----------------|---------------|---------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | | | | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | | | | \$336,261.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 100-Salaries | 1022 - Horizon West Middle | General Fund | 130.0 | \$329,679.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Added math intervention teachers and increased the number of intensive reading teachers to support both level 1 and 2 students.</i> | | | |
| | 3610 | 500-Materials and Supplies | 1022 - Horizon West Middle | General Fund | | \$6,582.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Purchase of IXL for intensive math and for our science core classes</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$336,261.00 |