Marion County Public Schools

Horizon Academy At Marion Oaks

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Horizon Academy At Marion Oaks

365 MARION OAKS DR, Ocala, FL 34473

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Conner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Marion 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

Horizon Academy At Marion Oaks

365 MARION OAKS DR, Ocala, FL 34473

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

Horizon Academy will provide students a high-quality education that is robust and relevant to the world in which our students must navigate. Horizon students' success will be measured by their preparation for future education or employment as they apply and expand their skills, explore careers, and successfully transition to high school as productive citizens of society who are on track for technical careers, college, and/or the workforce.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All Horizon Academy students will receive high-quality instruction so they may expand their skills, explore careers, and successfully transition to high school and beyond.

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
Maier, Donald	Principal	The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. He provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision–making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure; conducts an assessment of the skills of school staff; ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support, and documentation; provide adequate professional learning opportunities; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff; ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need; and communicates with parents as necessary.
Perry, Dustin	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of the implementation of the intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel is serving in their specified areas.
Jones, Timothy	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of the implementation of the intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel is serving in their specified areas.
Fox, Lee	Instructional Coach	Content Area Specialist (Instructional Coach) The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Language Arts and Writing and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods, and instructional modeling. He also assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Consider, Susan	Dean	The Student Services Manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. She coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage positive behavior choices by students. She also monitors and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families.
Scofield, Susan	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates the development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in the facilitation of data-based decision-making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Preece, Ashlyn	Teacher, K-12	Teach efficiently and faithfully, using curriculum maps, district-approved textbooks and materials required, following the prescribed courses of study, and employing approved methods of instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Melissa Conner

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.*

4

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

788

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

6

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

4

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	166	226	275	221	0	0	0	0	888
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	34	89	96	88	0	0	0	0	307
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	61	50	96	61	0	0	0	0	268
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	20	54	36	38	0	0	0	0	148
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	23	62	44	55	0	0	0	0	184
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	40	45	81	43	0	0	0	0	209
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	48	54	118	54	0	0	0	0	274
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	61	86	111	91	0	0	0	0	349

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	13	0	0	0	0	13
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

Wednesday 6/30/2021

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	156	273	223	240	0	0	0	0	892
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	60	40	42	57	0	0	0	0	199
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	69	91	70	75	0	0	0	0	305
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	8	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	2	13	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	38	80	40	64	0	0	0	0	222
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	47	119	55	67	0	0	0	0	288
	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	63	132	76	97	0	0	0	0	368

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	2	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	164	225	274	221	0	0	0	0	884
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	60	40	42	57	0	0	0	0	199
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	69	91	70	75	0	0	0	0	305
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	8	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	2	13	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	38	80	40	64	0	0	0	0	222
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	47	119	55	67	0	0	0	0	288
	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	63	132	76	97	0	0	0	0	368

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	7	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				43%	49%	54%	41%	47%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	54%	54%	47%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	46%	47%	39%	45%	47%
Math Achievement				44%	54%	58%	39%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains				56%	58%	57%	52%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	50%	51%	45%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				35%	46%	51%	40%	46%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				57%	70%	72%	54%	66%	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	49%	45%	4%	54%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	41%	46%	-5%	52%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
08	2021					
	2019	41%	50%	-9%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2021					
	2019	34%	46%	-12%	55%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	45%	49%	-4%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
08	2021					
	2019	32%	41%	-9%	46%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2021					
	2019	31%	44%	-13%	48%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	0%	64%	-64%	67%	-67%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	55%	65%	-10%	71%	-16%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	0%	70%	-70%	70%	-70%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	100%	54%	46%	61%	39%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	95%	51%	44%	57%	38%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Elementary
The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:
• English Language Arts, Grade 5: iReady Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
• Mathematics, Grade 5: iReady Diagnostic-Math Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
• Science, Grade 5: Grade 5 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Middle
• English Language Arts, Grades 6-8: ELA Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• Mathematics Grades 6-8: Math Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• Algebra: Algebra Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• Geometry: Geometry Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• Civics: Civics Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
• Science: Grade 8 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20 / 14%	6 / 4%	18 / 11%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13 / 11%	3 / 2%	13 / 10%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 8%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 8%	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32 / 22%	9 / 6%	29 / 18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26 / 22%	6 / 5%	25 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 8%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	3 / 25%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	51 / 30%	42 / 21%	46 / 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39 / 28%	32 / 19%	37 / 23%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 9%	1 / 3%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	2 / 13%	0 / 0%	1 / 7%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	"Math 89 / 50% "	"Math 65 / 33% "	"Math 54 / 28% "
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 74 / 50% "	"Math 53 / 32% "	"Math 43 / 27% "
	Students With Disabilities	"Math 9 / 33% "	"Math 6 / 20% "	"Math 4 / 13% "
	English Language Learners	"Math 6 / 40% "	"Math 3 / 20% "	"Math 0 / 0% "
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	102 / 50%	93 / 39%	75 / 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	75 / 46%	67 / 35%	52 / 29%
	Students With Disabilities	6 / 20%	4 / 11%	3 / 8%
	English Language Learners	3 / 23%	2 / 13%	1 / 7%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	"Math 118 / 61% Algebra 23 / 82%	"Math 106 / 50% Algebra 19 / 68% "	"Math 87 / 42% Algebra 23 / 85% "
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 97 / 60% Algebra 12 / 75% "	"Math 87 / 49% Algebra 10 / 63% "	"Math 72 / 42% Algebra 12 / 80% "
	Students With Disabilities	"Math 14 / 41% "	"Math 10 / 26% "	"Math 4 / 11% "
	English Language Learners	"Math 6 / 46% "	"Math 6 / 38% "	"Math 2 / 13% "
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49 / 26%	54 / 26%	54 / 27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35 / 24%	39 / 24%	38 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 15%	4 / 15%	4 / 15%
	English Language Learners	2 / 15%	1 / 7%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	"Math 71 / 52% Algebra 16 / 57% Geo 12 / 80%"	"Math 89 / 57% Algebra 13 / 46% Geo 14 / 82%"	"Math 75 / 47% Algebra 15 / 54% Geo 14 / 82%"
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 55 / 50% Algebra 10 / 56% Geo 8 / 80%"	"Math 72 / 56% Algebra 9 / 50% Geo 10 / 83%"	"Math 63 / 49% Algebra 9 / 50% Geo 10 / 83%"
	Students With Disabilities	"Math 12 / 52% "	"Math 10 / 37% "	"Math 9 / 33% "
	English Language Learners	"Math 7 / 54% "	"Math 8 / 57% "	"Math 7 / 50% "

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	15	37	39	15	40	50	15	19			
ELL	26	41	37	22	39	43	13	25			
BLK	31	40	39	31	42	46	16	32	58		
HSP	38	47	38	34	42	42	24	36	79		
MUL	43	48		42	48		33	36			
WHT	45	40	29	54	53	40	38	44	63		
FRL	34	42	38	37	45	44	23	35	65		

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	14	35	26	12	46	48	16	20			
ELL	28	47	41	29	57	61	22	52	45		
BLK	40	43	30	35	47	37	29	48	71		
HSP	41	50	39	42	58	55	30	68	65		
MUL	36	33	27	34	50	50	40	40			
WHT	52	57	46	56	64	50	49	50	63		
FRL	41	47	35	41	53	48	32	56	68		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	9	36	41	19	38	29	19	21			
ELL	19	39	38	27	49	50	15	50			
BLK	41	51	33	34	51	38	34	50	77		
HSP	41	46	34	38	54	49	39	54	62		
MUL	33	54	90	28	35	40	24				
WHT	42	44	43	45	55	50	49	57	67		
FRL	40	48	41	38	52	45	40	53	68		

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	451
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	42
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	45
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	44
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 trend across all grade levels, in all subjects except Algebra I and Geometry, is that students continue to score below their district peers. Additionally, the SWD subgroup consistently scores at least 10% lower in every tested area, in nearly all grade levels. Furthermore, the lower 25% of students scoring learning gains in ELA are well below 50%.

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

According to progress monitoring data, ELA students in all grade levels show the greatest need for improvement.
Although math students consistently scored well above or near the 50% proficiency mark at all grade levels, ELA students rarely scored above 30% proficiency. While these numbers do not correlate to 2018 or 2019 FSA proficiency results in all grade levels, there is concern that student learning growth was stunted or stagnated from the pandemic-induced virtual learning and multiple absences from a large number of students.

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

The pandemic-induced virtual learning appears to have more of an effect on students' ELA classes than Math for 2020-21. That being said, students' proficiency on state assessments from 2019 and earlier have consistently lagged behind district peers. A contributing factor has been the incoming 5th-grade student's proficiency levels have been consistently below 505 in all areas. A large number of 5th-grade students' i-Ready AP1 scores are two or more grade levels behind their assigned grade. This has caused a large amount of in-school and after-school remediation in 5th grade and a carry over to the 6th grade, as teaches use i-ready, Math180, and other tactics to close their achievement levels to within one year of their assigned grade.

Actions that need to be taken are 5th-grade teachers teaching only one tested subject each day. This will allow teachers to teach to their strengths and for those teachers to become subject area experts for their 5th-grade class team. In the middle school, a Math remediation teacher and Math180 will be offered to at least 280 students not performing at proficiency in 2021-2022.

Finally, after-school tutoring, if funding is provided, needs to be offered to Students with Disabilities (SWD) as a priority. SWDs have consistently performed at least 10 percentage points below their grade level peers on all assessments. Consistent, research-based tutoring and remediation, by highly qualified teachers, will go a long way in closing their achievement gap in this subgroup.

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

Mathematics in the 7th and 8th grades showed marked improvement in progress monitoring from their 2019 state scores.

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

The addition of one Math remediation unit seems to have helped increase proficiency levels in the 7th and 8th grades. The use of the mostly scripted Math180 program showed great promise at the end of

the 19-20 school year, with most students averaging more than double than expected learning gains in the grade-level Math program. While the increases were not as significant this past year, mostly due to virtual learning and health exclusions, there was still a majority of students expected to make more than one years' growth, based on their diagnostic results. 6th and 7th-grade students received the Math remediation in 2019-2020 and 2020-2021, showing the promise of the Math180 curriculum and instruction.

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

All 5th-grade teachers will develop targeted centers of instruction in ELA, Math, and Science classrooms for remediation during their assigned class period. Additionally, students' gaps in ELA and Math identified through the MTSS process, and students with similar gaps in learning will meet for remediation daily. Students will utilize i-Ready and IXL to target shortcomings in ELA and Math in previous learning or to work on current skills not yet mastered. Students' shortcomings will be identified in science through their benchmark assessments and teachers will use those results to guide their instruction and provide time for remediation and address misconceptions. Alternatively, students identified as being on or above grade level will continue to be stretched, academically, in classrooms as well as enrichment for 30 minutes daily.

In grades 6-8 classrooms, teachers will use developed monthly standard assessment checks to quickly identify student mastery gaps and provide remediation, reteaching, and retesting on a regular basis (vice quarterly with district-assigned assessments). Instructional rounds for all teachers will occur throughout the first semester so teachers may observe their peers' planning and instruction in order to further discussion within subject-area PLCs, in an effort to internalize best practices. Teacher-student data chats will be a regular occurrence in ELA and Math classrooms and teachers will have instructional and assessment artifacts peer and admin reviewed to help all teachers find agreement between what the Standard is asking students to accomplish and how the students are being assessed to show their mastery.

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.

Data Teams for Learning - focus on developing mastery assessments as well as the dissecting of data from student assessments, and other sources - will be reviewed so staff is current and keeps the focus on the analysis of student mastery of the recent Standards taught. Focused PD on best practices of lesson planning, engagement, and assignment/assessment development will be a key factor to ensure teachers understand the requirements of the Standard taught and how to best provide practice or develop assessments for students.

As a newly designated AVID school, we will learn and implement strategies school-wide that are research-based and proven to enhance student learning. Our school-wide goal from the AVID CCI (the implementation fidelity monitoring instrument from AVID) for our first year is within the Instruction Domain. Specifically, we will focus on "Critical Reading within the content area." Another concept that will guide many of our efforts is the AVID acronym WICOR. Writing to learn, inquiry for learning, Reading to learn, etc. The 12-member AVID Site Team s will be charged with the duty of maintaining the fidelity of the staff to achieve this goal. Their first responsibility will be to implement these strategies around critical reading within their own classrooms and then to promote them school-wide.

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

Continued and consistent feedback to teachers from classroom walk-throughs, along with requisite formal and informal evaluations will provide teachers to reflect and modify planning/instruction/ assessment.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By committing to instructional practices where students demonstrate their learning by completing grade-level tasks within the Standards that validate their ability to analyze, synthesize and evaluate new content which is taught, AND assessed through Standards-expected, grade level formative, and summative assessments, we will build a sense of expectation among students and teachers that will create a learning environment more conducive to the complete learning process. Classroom teacher reflections on lessons as well as student-created artifacts from core classes indicate that many lessons are not at the requisite rigor of the Standard and/or students are not being assessed in accordance with the Item Specifications manual.
Measurable Outcome:	If we focus on rigorous, thoughtful work, (daily tasks and assessments), then ELA achievement levels can be expected to grow from 43% to 45% and Math achievement levels from 44% to 47%. Learning gains in ELA can be anticipated to increase from 50% to 53% and Math Learning Gains are projected to move from 50% to 53%.
Monitoring:	Regular classroom walk-throughs with reviews of weekly lesson plans, focusing on the Standard and how student knowledge is assessed will be the primary focus for the year. Feedback to all instructional staff will occur at least monthly and will prevent additional gaps in good instructional practices. PD will be focused on activation strategies as well as unpacking Standards and usage of the Items Specifications, as well as the monthly PD we will include from AVID.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Donald Maier (donald.maier@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the research and educational evidence of outcomes provided by the school's ICLE PD in SY 20-21, it is essential to student learning that a school's focus contain elements related to relationships, rigor, and relevance during the learning process, using formative and summative assessments and their analysis to drive instruction, remediation, differentiation, and planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Focusing on a more rigorous learning environment via thoughtful work with planned, intentional questioning will help ensure lessons and learning are more closely aligned with high expectations of student learning and performance based on standards and learning outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

We will review our Data Teams for Learning PD from SY 20-21 and the progress that was made with regards to developing Standards-based assessments to aid in identifying student shortcomings or gaps in a timely manner to address reteaching or remediation, as well as identify students for enrichment.

Person Responsible Donald Maier (donald.maier@marion.k12.fl.us)

Professional development regarding best practices for lesson planning and incorporate lesson study walks between instructional staff's classrooms as well as self-reflection of instruction through the use of SWVL video technology for all teachers to allow all teachers to evaluate their own planning, instructional, and assessment skills, as well as self-reflect.

Person Responsible Lee Fox (lee.fox@marion.k12.fl.us)

Focused collaborative planning by department/grade level with admin and admin support personnel as facilitators, focusing on best practices, student and lesson-derived artifacts, peer-to-peer lesson reviews, and teacher self-critiques of their classroom instruction videos through the use of SWVL video technology to continue efforts to improve student performance as well as building teacher efficacy.

Person Responsible Timothy Jones (timothy.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)

Instructional chats with core teachers will occur at least on a monthly basis to focus on lesson plans, data from lesson artifacts review of lessons, and student work and assessments. Teachers will review with admin and coaches the Standard taught in the lesson or overarching Standard within an assessment and gauge whether the lesson plan and/or artifacts meet the rigor of the Standards and potential plans to address remediation and enrichment.

Person Responsible Dustin Perry (dustin.perry@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By committing to a focus on differentiation coupled with after-school tutoring for those that need more individualized instruction then struggling students will develop study and learning skills within the SWD subgroup. With an ESSA index of less than 32% of the SWD subgroup for two consecutive years, and 39% for the multiracial subgroup, these aids should help bring those students closer to the 41% Index threshold and provide more opportunities for those students to enjoy grade-level instruction and success.
Measurable Outcome:	If we focus on differentiation of all students, coupled with tutoring opportunities for those students that need individualized attention, we can target gains of 6% in ELA Achievement (from 14% to 20%), ELA Learning gains increase of 4% (35% to 39%), Math Achievement gains of 6% (from 12% to 18%), Math Learning Gains of 4%.
Monitoring:	Quarterly Mastery Assessments, Monthly Teacher Standard Checks as well as Math 180, Read 180, and I-Ready data, where applicable, will be utilized in an effort to garner the whole picture of each student in each ESSA subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Donald Maier (donald.maier@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that well-designed tutoring programs that use volunteers and nonprofessionals as tutors can be effective in improving children's reading skills. Students with below-average reading skills who are tutored by volunteers show significant gains in reading skills when compared with similar students who do not receive tutoring from a quality tutoring program. Well-structured tutoring sessions will have content and delivery of instruction is carefully scripted; Careful monitoring and reinforcement of progress will be kept; Frequent and regular tutoring sessions will occur, with each session between 10 and 60 minutes daily; and specially designed interventions for the 17-20% of children with severe reading difficulties will be utilized. (US DOE,2001)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tutoring gives students individualized attention that they don’t always get in a classroom. This helps students who struggle to keep up. Tutoring may also help students develop study and learning skills that will help set them up for future years.

Action Steps to Implement

Students struggling in ELA and/or Math, based from FSA scores, classroom gradebooks and technology-related instructional remediation programs (i-Ready, Math180, reading programs, etc.), will be offered and encouraged to enroll in after-school tutoring from trained school-based instructional staff. The tutoring program will be reevaluated after 12 weeks for efficacy as well as looking for improvement in student gradebooks or advancement through any assigned remediation technology.

Person Responsible	Dustin Perry (dustin.perry@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Horizon Academy had 3.2 incidents per 100 students, well below the state average. The in-school and out-of-school suspension rates have been higher than average over the past four years and considerably higher than the statewide average. The reason for the increase since 2016 is twofold: First, students only receive a referral after three interventions in their classrooms (for classroom incidents), unless the incident is a major infraction of the Student Code of Conduct. A referral will be processed once the classroom teacher completes three interventions and has made contact with families to work out possible behavioral changes with the student. At Horizon Academy, after and before school detention is not possible, due to school hours and funding for staff. Therefore, students who have received quality referrals (those with documented classroom interventions), generally receive in-school suspension or out-of-school suspensions. OSS is only given for repeat offenders or those with serious misconduct. Over the past four years, the culture and climate of the school have improved because students and staff understand that there are guidelines, rules, and expectations to adhere to, and those students who do not will be given opportunities to change their behavior, several times, before receiving an office discipline referral. This creates a culture of ownership and responsibility from all stakeholders. We will continue to monitor discipline data monthly and work with students and families to correct misbehavior as well as train staff regarding proper intervention strategies, in an effort to lower suspensions rates, but more importantly, to ensure all students are part of the Horizon family which respects each other and themselves.

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.

In an effort to provide meaningful activities that parents/family are eager to attend, we have chosen different times and days spread throughout the school year to offer planned involvement activities. Some of the activities such as Math, Science, and Literacy night are subject-related. Those meetings include strategies and materials parents may use to engage their children at home. Other activities such as Holiday Decoration Night are for fun and
sharing, while the Principal & Parent Chats and Parent-Teacher Conferences are intended for parents to learn more about their individual child.

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

There are several opportunities for our community to assist with activities that not only build relationships within the community but also are intended to improve school achievement. For example, in October the Math Night will be held with our community Winn-Dixie. The store employees work toward making our evening a pleasant, and meaningful learning experience for all who attend. Our strong Mentor Program is built upon the idea that community members feel the need to assist us with the education of our students. In March we will hold a STEAMspirations day that is dependent upon community support to fill many of the presentation time slots available. We also have full-time interpreters and other staff members who are available to translate for our non-English speaking families and students

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00