
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Educational Horizons Charter

1281 S WICKHAM RD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

<http://www.educationalhorizons.net>

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Turner

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2014

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 9/29/2020.

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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Educational Horizons Charter

1281 S WICKHAM RD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

<http://www.educationalhorizons.net>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School KG-6</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>32%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>39%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 9/29/2020.

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Turner, Cheryl	Principal	Administrator for school and manager of faculty and staff. Contribute and oversee creation of SIP. Collect ideas from stakeholders, staff, SAC, PTO, parents, community, and school governing board for SIP. Share final SIP with all involved.
Needle, Eileen	Administrative Support	To serve as Administrative Assistant in ways including attendance, scheduling, student services and family support. Contribute to creation of SIP with editing and student data.
Murphy, Heidi	Teacher, K-12	To serve in the classroom representing grades K-6 and serve as the Education Leadership person for the district. Carry the message of curriculum back to teachers. Also to serve on Threat Assessment Team. Contribute to creating SIP and help with editing.
Stevens, Lonna	Teacher, K-12	To serve in the classroom representing grades K-6 and serve as the Title IX person for the school. Also, serve as teacher representative for the SAC committee and carry message to meeting and back to school teachers. Contribute to creating SIP and help with editing.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 6/1/2014, Cheryl Turner

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.*

1

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

10

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (83%) 2015-16: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

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

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	26	25	23	21	8	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	6	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/19/2020

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

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

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

Students with two or more indicators 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 2

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Retained Students: Current Year 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

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

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 26 25 23 21 8 13 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 129

Attendance below 90 percent 2 1 6 2 0 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 14

One or more suspensions 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Course failure in ELA or Math 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Level 1 on statewide assessment 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 2

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

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

Students with two or more indicators 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 2

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Retained Students: Current Year 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 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

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	85%	62%	57%	85%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	60%	58%	70%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	57%	53%	0%	52%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	89%	63%	63%	95%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	83%	65%	62%	82%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	53%	51%	0%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	57%	53%	0%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(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
03	2019	82%	64%	18%	58%	24%
	2018	100%	63%	37%	57%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	100%	61%	39%	58%	42%
	2018	67%	57%	10%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		33%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	56%	17%
	2018	82%	54%	28%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2019	0%	60%	-60%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	100%	61%	39%	62%	38%
	2018	100%	62%	38%	62%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	100%	64%	36%	64%	36%
	2018	93%	59%	34%	62%	31%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	60%	13%
	2018	82%	58%	24%	61%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
06	2019	0%	67%	-67%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	68%	-68%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

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

Subgroup Data

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
WHT	82	64		91	88		75				
FRL	79	45		79	82						
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
WHT	84	78		94	74						
FRL	81	82		94	82						
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
WHT	81	71		96	85						
FRL	73			91							

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	

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	80
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	71
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.

Using the data we currently have, it shows a growth of 2% from 2018 at 83% to 85% in 2019. Concurrently the data shows that the ELA learning gain went down from 70% in 2018 to 66% in 2019. Our math achievement goal went down from 93% in 2018 to 89% in 2019. Our grade 6 students (in 2019) with a number under 10 did not contribute to the scores.

In addition to the aggregated data from the year before, we would like to look at our student performance as they return to the 2020-21 school year. To keep the integrity of the tests, all learners came to the school campus in small groups with CDC guidance to be assessed. All 109 students were assessed in the first two weeks of school with 100% attendance. Teachers used diagnostic assessments from our McGraw Hill series of Math and Reading. These benchmarks will be used for ongoing progress monitoring. We will also include FAIR (state) and QLA (district) for Reading.

Grade Level Equivalent as of 9/10/2020 from initial diagnostic (100% of students assessed n=109)
 GRADE K 1 2 3 4 5 6
 READING PreK.4 1.0 1.4 2.8 3.7 5.3 5.8
 MATH PreK.5 K.4 1.4 2.4 3.5 4.5 5.2
 #students 23 25 16 17 11 7 10

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

In 2018 our grade 3 students showed an achievement of 100% at level 3 and above. The next year, the new group of grade 3 students show only 82% scoring at level 3 and above. This is a different group of students and also a different teacher. The grade 5 students, when compared year to year, also showed a decline. In 2018, 82% of the students scored a level 3 and above. For the 2019 school year 73% of the students scored a level 3 or above. In math there was a decline when we look at the same grade comparison for grade 5. The 2018 group scored 82% at level 3 and above. The 2019 group scored 73% at level 3 and above. The composite for this group of grade 5 students included 20% ESE.

Using the initial diagnostic assessment August/September 2020, it is evident that all of our students are not at the same level as the incoming students for the 2018-2019 school year. We need to keep in mind the lack of state data for last year when we are comparing grades. With a threshold value of 70% and 80% for mastery, it shows that the class averages are below this level.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

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

NO new data to use from 2019-20

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

We saw an increase in the Science achievement with our grade 5 students. In 2018, they scored a 64% proficient. In 2019, they scored a 73% which is an increase of 9%. The larger sample and population may have contributed in a positive way. With this increase in population, we were able to hire a second teacher for the combined grade 5 and 6 class giving more differentiation and specialization to the room.

For the initial data, we do not see an improvement.

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

Looking at the data from 2019, we saw that 15% of the population (2 students) scored a Level 1 in ELA or Math. Of that, one of the students had attendance lower than 95% for the year.

Looking at the EWS data for the 2019-20 school year located in Performance Matters, we see that we had 6 students with attendance lower than 90% for the first half of the year and 3 students with attendance lower than 90% for the second half of the year.

Looking at the first part of the school year for 2020-21 (to supplement the data collected in August and September, we see that we have 20 of the 109 students showing EWS indicators in Performance Matters.

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

1. Closing the achievement gap due to school closure (pandemic) and remote and distant learning.
2. Meet the Social and Emotional needs of our students.
3. Increasing technology to meet needs of remote and distant learning.
4. Meet needs of students entering Kindergarten after closure of VPK units
5. Supporting teachers with digital learning and technology.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Support teachers to meet needs of our students who were affected negatively due to the school closure, remote learning, and pandemic of COVID-19. Fifty percent of our school population have returned to brick and mortar classrooms (campus). The other fifty percent have chosen to learn from home (eLearners). This unique situation bears the responsibility of teaching and assessing with equity. Increased technology and resources will be crucial for success and support of teachers and students. All students will be given initial diagnostic assessments on campus to see the learning gaps and recession due to missed instruction beginning mid March 2020. Looking at these scores will help guide instruction, intervention, and recovery.

Measurable Outcome: Looking at the diagnostic data and length of time outside of the school classrooms, we will strive to maintain the level of achievements we have seen in the past. Without a state assessment (FSA and FCAT) we are left to rely on the 2019 data for comparison. Our measurable goal will be to not see a decrease in our school score and grade. Our last score and grade (Spring 2019) was 79% and an A.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cheryl Turner (turner.cheryl@educationalhorizons.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: All teachers will have a stake in the state testing in the Spring of 2021. They will all contribute to rti and using the MTSS process to identify Tier 2 and 3 students and give additional support in the school day. This will include both brick and mortar and eLearners.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: With a high regard to the decline for the rigor of instruction at the end of the school year (beginning mid March) and the impact of the pandemic, we are concerned about the scores from our diagnostic assessments given in the initial weeks of school. We will use ongoing progress monitoring to track our learners and see how they are performing.

Action Steps to Implement

All students will be assessed at the beginning of this school year for a baseline and to see if there is a gap in their learning. Ongoing progress monitoring will occur evenly throughout the year to track progress. Teachers will give addition research based instruction to support those who are identified as having learning drops.

Person Responsible Cheryl Turner (turner.cheryl@educationalhorizons.net)

School and teachers will increase use of digital resources for learning and sharing information with campus and eLearning students. Building will be reinforced to meet needs of technology and internet capacities. Teachers will be equipped with laptops with cameras and sound to teach those remote families. Online components of text and paper tools will be incorporated for all students. Addition training in the preplanning will be used to understand delivery methods of a blended classroom. A Google classroom will be used for all students this year.

Person Responsible Cheryl Turner (turner.cheryl@educationalhorizons.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In addition to focusing on our student academic achievements, our staff will focus on the Social Emotional Needs of all of our students (campus and eLearners). This year we will continue our study of Conscious Discipline and join BPS with a three year commitment to using skills and strategies shared by Becky Bailey. Collaboration and exploration will be used as we continue to participate in professional development opportunities for this shift in understanding and meeting needs of all of our students.

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.

This year with the new constraints on social distancing, we will strive to remain a community and a school family. Social events, school meetings, school board meetings, parent conferences, and ESE and service meetings will be virtual. This will require increased technology and increased preparedness ahead of time. We will continue to maintain contact with our families and include them in as many ways as possible. Using Conscious Discipline, we will share our celebrations, keep families informed, include them in school decision. Our team will strive to be a positive role model for both set of learners. Surveys and input will be obtained from our stakeholders regularly and used to guide decisions.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$14,300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7900	379-Telephone and Other Data Communication Services	6511 - Educational Horizons Charter	General Fund		\$2,000.00
<i>Notes: Set up routers and internet connection to handle technology</i>						

	1340	648-Technology-Related Capitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	6511 - Educational Horizons Charter	General Fund		\$4,800.00
			<i>Notes: laptops for teachers with cameras and microphones</i>			
	1382	399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	6511 - Educational Horizons Charter	General Fund		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Online components of resources and text</i>			
	8200	310-Professional and Technical Services	6511 - Educational Horizons Charter	General Fund		\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: Set up Google classrooms</i>			
					Total:	\$14,300.00