Horizons Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Horizons Elementary School

1700 FOREST LAKE DR, Davenport, FL 33837

schools.polk-fl.net/horizonshawks

Demographics

Principal: Amy Heiser Meyers

Start Date for this Principal: 11/11/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Horizons Elementary School

1700 FOREST LAKE DR, Davenport, FL 33837

schools.polk-fl.net/horizonshawks

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Heiser Meyers, Amy	Principal	All of the functions of the school related to the facility management, instructional implementation, staff and personnel management, and community involvement liason.
Nelson, Stacy	Assistant Principal	Assisting the principal in all of the functions of the school related to the facility management, instructional implementation, staff and personnel management, and community involvement liason.
Edwards, James	Assistant Principal	Assisting the principal in all of the functions of the school related to the facility management, instructional implementation, staff and personnel management, and community involvement liason.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 11/11/2013, Amy Heiser Meyers

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

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,196

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

5

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

5

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	155	186	176	205	235	199	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1156
Attendance below 90 percent	45	59	45	54	57	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	297
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	5	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	34	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	30	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	50	90	67	88	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	384

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	30	33	28	51	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	237

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/24/2021

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	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	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				46%	51%	57%	55%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	51%	58%	60%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	49%	53%	59%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	57%	63%	58%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				47%	56%	62%	61%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	47%	51%	49%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				39%	47%	53%	44%	53%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	47%	52%	-5%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	48%	-6%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	47%	-6%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	44%	56%	-12%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	56%	0%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	51%	-13%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	36%	45%	-9%	53%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

2019 FSA Scores for 4-5 grade
2021 Spring FSA for 3rd grade
STAR and Early Literacy data for grades K-2

Grade 1			
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44	60	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	60	51
	Students With Disabilities		36	24
	English Language Learners	38	39	38
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42	79	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	69	75
	Students With Disabilities	14	33	33
	English Language Learners	30	71	72
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	50	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	48	27
	Students With Disabilities	14	44	27
	English Language Learners	44	40	25

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52	51	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	52	47
	Students With Disabilities	28	24	22
	English Language Learners	35	33	34
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53	63	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	62	48
	Students With Disabilities	24	35	24
	English Language Learners	39	56	45

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	39	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	36	31
	Students With Disabilities	9	33	18
	English Language Learners	28	36	28
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43	49	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	49	40
	Students With Disabilities	22	22	29
	English Language Learners	40	49	38

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	34	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	28	31
	Students With Disabilities	4	7	3
	English Language Learners	22	20	23
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34	34	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	33
	Students With Disabilities	13	22	15
	English Language Learners	24	29	28
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	17	36	31	27	37	54	12				
ELL	28	38	50	29	28	43	14				
BLK	34	44	55	33	29	33	25				
HSP	38	39	35	35	30	35	22				
WHT	55	42		46	31		28				
FRL	38	40	43	34	32	37	18				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	25	20	26	44	55	21				
ELL	33	41	45	38	37	44	26				
ASN	50			42							
BLK	43	40	35	40	42	46	23				

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
HSP	46	46	47	47	45	44	39				
MUL	32	42		37	25						
WHT	53	53	60	62	59	40	57				
FRL	43	42	45	45	46	43	37				

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

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	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	291
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	36
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	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

In both ELA and Math our overall proficiency rate decreased. Along with the subgroups ELL, SWD, and multi-racial have been identified as below the 41% of the federal index.

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

Based on the data, the largest improvement needed is in ELA, however, in both ELA and Math our overall proficiency rate decreased. Along with the subgroups ELL, SWD, and multi-racial have been identified as below the 41% of the federal index.

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 contributing factors included our student absenteeism rate, the change of academic instruction through movement between eLearning and face to face. Many students moved back and forth throughout the school year. The new actions are strategic opportunities for reteaching, delegated monitoring of attendance, and utilizing frequent formative assessment to gauge real student engagement.

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

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

Based off the progress monitoring we saw gains in ELA and math from fall to winter, but we saw a regression from winter to spring back to the original baseline.

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

The contributing factors from fall to winter for improvement include the following: student attendance was more consistant between fall and winter testings, with multiple families chosing to switch their student's learning modes in the middle of the school year (ie. online to face-to-face and face-to-face

to elearning). We supported elearning through utilizing support staff in addition to the assigned elearning.

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

Including opportunities to connect new learning to content, formative assessments, student collaboration with the opportunity to provide productive struggle, data driven instruction for reteaching 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.

Some professional development opportunities will include PD On Demand in Schoology, tapping into our literacy cadre staff at the school level, other after school voluntary trainings including school staff and district facilitation of training needs in ELA and/or math.

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

The additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement include: strategic utilization of instructional coaches and interventionists, data driven small group instruction provided by ESOL staff and utilizing the inclusion/ESE support staff.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the ESSA data review, students with disability subgroup scored below 41% for the 2019 FSA scores. This trend appears to be continuing from the STAR data from the 2020-2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to raise the federal index of students with disabilities scoring 3+ above 41% on progress monitoring assessments and on the 2021-2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	1. Montoring of appropriate implementation of accommodations per the IEP 2. Use of instructional targets, and success criterion to drive the instruction 3. Implement the use of rubrics and explicit teacher feedback 4. Monitoring the use of STEM questions to foster the reading and writing connection spiraled through out the lesson. 5. The following assessments will be monitored by leadership team and staff: STAR, Science Quarterly Assessments, district provided writing prompts, and formative assessments. 6. The use of literacy circle novels which are aligned to the reading level of the student, using grade level questioning prompts. 7. Using the LLI interventionist to conduct small groups across grade levels, 1,2,&3. 8. The coaches and the support staff will provide strategies to assist teachers with interpreting the complexity levels of tasks in order to collect accurate student data for differentiated instructional purposes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Heiser Meyers (amy.heiser-meyers@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidenced based strategy would be classroom walkthroughs, both non-evaluative and evaluative (Journey). Evidence of the caliber of student work posted in the classroom with appropriate rubrics and explicit student feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale is to take a deliberate, laser-focused approach to meeting the educational needs of students with disabilities in order to reduce the score gap between SWD and the non-SWD, general education, population.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development on accommodation implementation, along with implementation sheet.

Person Responsible	katie banks (katie.banks@polk-fl.net)

2. Instructional targets and success critierion will be discussed in collaborative planning. Coaches and administration will ensure fidelity with classroom walkthroughs.

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

3. Rubrics and explicit feedback will be emphasized and supported during collaborative planning.

Person Responsible	Mahboobah Jadallah (mahboobah.jadallah@polk-fl.net)

4. STEM questions will be discussed during collaborative planning.

Person Responsible	Mahboobah Jadallah (mahboobah.jadallah@polk-fl.net)

5. The leadership team, along with teacher individual conferences and MTSS meetings, will review the following student progress monitoring: STAR, Science Quarterly Assessments, district provided wrting prompts, and formative assessments.

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

5. During collaborative planning, leveled groups will be discussed, and literacy novels will be used to increase student fluency, reading comprehension, and writing skills. The ESOL teacher will also support the ELL students with the implementation of literacy novels.

Person Responsible	Mahboobah Jadallah (mahboobah.jadallah@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the ESSA data review, multi-racial subgroup scored below 41% for the 2019 FSA scores. This trend appears to be continuing from the STAR data from the 2020-2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to raise the federal index of students with disabilities scoring 3+ above 41% on progress monitoring assessments and on the 2021-2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Multi-racial students that are not meeting proficiency will be placed in tutoring with the interventionists. Administration will have data chats with the teachers to ensure progress is being made towards proficiency. The coaches and the support staff will provide strategies to assist teachers with interpreting the complexity levels of tasks in order to collect accurate student data for differentiated instructional purposes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Heiser Meyers (amy.heiser-meyers@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidenced based strategy would be MTSS and data chats.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale is to take a deliberate, laser-focused approach to meeting the educational needs of students with disabilities in order to reduce the score gap between Multi-racial and their peers.

Action Steps to Implement

Interventionists will ensure students are placed in appropriate level for support in small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Shana Shea (shana.shea@polk-fl.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the ESSA data review, ELL subgroup scored below 41% for the 2019 FSA scores. This trend appears to be continuing from the STAR data from the 2020-2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to raise the federal index of ELL students scoring 3+ above 41% on progress monitoring assessments and on the 2021-2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Utilizing ELL staff (both teacher and paraprofessionals) with schedules that target student need. Use of LLI curriculum and literacy novels in small group instruction. The coaches and the support staff will provide strategies to assist teachers with interpreting the complexity levels of tasks in order to collect accurate student data for differentiated instructional purposes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Heiser Meyers (amy.heiser-meyers@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidenced based strategy would be review of formal assessments from both LLI and literacy novel small groups. Strategic grouping in bilingual teams.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale is to take a deliberate, laser-focused approach to meeting the educational needs of ELL students in order to reduce the score gap between Multi-racial and their peers.

Action Steps to Implement

The leadership team will review student data, and target students to be placed in small groups for teired instruction of LLI and literacy novels.

Person Responsible	Shana Shea (shana.shea@polk-fl.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our rationale when selecting this area of focus was in reviewing the STAR data, it is evident that many students are deficient in functional reading skills. Looking at the Performance Matter FSA prediction score, we found a pattern of students being on the cusp of achieving either a level 2, 3, or 4.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to have 50% of all students proficient in reading.
Monitoring:	Review of bi-weekly assessments data, STAR assessment data, and fluency passage data. The leadership team will also have conversations and data chats with the teachers and reading interventionists to ensure progress. After a student has been identified as being at a 3.0 level or above, we can then begin transition into higher order stem questions with informational text and literacy novels to support reading comprehension.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacy Nelson (stacy.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement small group instruction to achieve success in our Area of Focus. We will provide training in small group instruction, emphasizing the usage of differentiated instruction, using decodable and leveled readers. The leadership team is working collaboratively with the instructional staff to create these materials for high-yield instructional strategies. As a best safety practice, teachers will be instructed on how to host small group instruction while still maintaining appropriate social distancing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With the wide range of reading levels, small group instruction will provide students with their individualized needs. This will allow students to build fluency and foundational skills in order to become more proficient readers. Students will also have the benefit of previewing words and phrases from the readers to have more success during whole group instruction the next day. For grades 3 - 5, students are working on answering questions in complete sentences, finding text evidence and making elaborations.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be trained how to implement small group instruction with decodables and leveled readers. Then they will be provided a time frame to practice, and administration will observe implementation, providing any necessary feedback. Ongoing professional development will be provided throughout the year. For intermediate grades, teacher will be trained on stem questions and literacy circles using novels.

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

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.

Horizons' school discipline data was ranked number 1 out of elementary schools statewide. Our primary area of concern is addressing children that may have experienced adverse trauma-life experiences in order to develop them to be civic minded students and community members. This will be monitored and supported through restorative practices in lieu of suspensions, drum-beat, and Harmony curriculum.

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.

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

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

Staff, students, and community all play a role in promoting a positive culture and environment at our school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$149,671.27
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$149,671.27

			Notes: Salaries for educational support.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial**				**$149,671.27**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$149,671.27
			Notes: Salaries for educational support.			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners**				**$149,671.27**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	1362 - Horizons Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$149,671.27
			Notes: Salaries for educational support.			
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$449,013.81**