

Escambia County School District

Hope Horizon At Judy Andrews Center



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide
Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	0

Hope Horizon At Judy Andrews Center

129 N MERRITT ST, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Leeanne Guy

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	ESE
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special 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*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: Maintaining 2018-19: Unsatisfactory 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to develop and implement individual and therapeutic educational programs for all of our students. We offer strategic interventions to help each student achieve their own “personal best” academically, socially, and behaviorally. We offer Hope to students and families when they are encountering emotional and mental health challenges that interfere with their school progress. We work collaboratively in a holistic approach to help students see that brighter days are on the Horizon.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Hope Horizon, we believe that all children have the capacity to achieve success and make progress toward their individual goals. Hope Horizon will strive to provide the structure and positive supports needed to enable students to realize their potential, maximize their success and reach their goals.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

The student population at Hope Horizon is unique in that all students are invited to attend based on the level of services outlined in their Individual Education Plan which outlines the need for a more restrictive environment. In order to attend, students must either have an educational label of an Emotional/Behavioral Disability or have a major mental health diagnosis. Hope Horizon programming embeds mental health services, as well as social-emotional and behavioral supports and interventions.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Perry, Donna	Principal	Mrs. Perry serves as the school division's program specialist for students with emotional and behavioral disabilities (EBD) as well as Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). As part of her role, she is the acting principal of Hope Horizon and is on campus 2-3 per week.
Stanley, Jared	Other	Mr. Stanley is the Administrator on Special Assignment. His duties encompass those of an Assistant Principal, in addition to some Principal duties. He is the full-time administrator on campus.
Storniolo, Marcia	Behavior Specialist	Ms. Storniolo is a Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA) for the district, whose primary caseload is at Hope Horizon. Ms. Storniolo conducts functional behavior assessments (FBAs), writes behavior intervention plans (BIPs), provides professional development (instruction, modeling, observations, and feedback), and assists with implementing the school-wide positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS).
Hagan, Tara	Other	Ms. Hagan provides Tier II and Tier III reading interventions to students that scored below a level II or lower on the FSA the previous year. In addition, she provides modeling and coaching for teachers that are new to Hope Horizon (or to the profession in general) in regards to reading.
Gillard, Vivian	Other	Beyond her classroom duties (secondary mathematics teacher) Ms. Gillard is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the PBIS program in conjunction with Ms. Storniolo.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Sarah Leeanne Guy

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

7

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

9

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

31

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

2

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

2

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	2	0	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	4	31
Attendance below 90 percent	2	0	3	3	1	3	3	1	3	0	0	0	2	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	2	3	2	1	3	1	0	0	1	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	12
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	10
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	11
	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	1	3	1	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	16

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	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/3/2021

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement					64%	61%		72%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					51%	59%		49%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					41%	54%		50%	52%
Math Achievement					65%	62%		55%	61%
Math Learning Gains					47%	59%		50%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile						52%		55%	52%
Science Achievement					71%	56%		56%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					69%	78%		83%	77%

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	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	0%	42%	-42%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	0%	43%	-43%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2021					
	2019	0%	48%	-48%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2021					
	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	0%	58%	-58%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	0%	36%	-36%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	0%	50%	-50%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	21%	-21%	46%	-46%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	0%	42%	-42%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	58%	-58%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	54%	-54%	71%	-71%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	62%	-62%	70%	-70%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	52%	-52%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	47%	-47%	57%	-57%

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	14	54		24	54						
WHT	15			23	60						
FRL	7			17							
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	23		6	15						
FRL	21			9							
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	146
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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	33
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	12
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.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

READING: Students were continuously monitored using quarterly STAR data. The previous goal was to increase scores from 38% scoring a level one to 41%. Unfortunately, only 34% of our students scored above Level I.

ATTENDANCE: Student attendance was measured using FOCUS reports. The previous goal was to reach 60% of the students to have a 90% attendance rate or better, and 37% met the criteria.

RESTRAINT & SECLUSION: Data were pulled from the FLDOE reporting website. Restraints were decreased by 9%, and seclusions by 23% compared to the year prior.

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

RESTRAINT AND SECLUSION: The goal was to decrease the number of restraints and seclusions from the year prior. REstraints decreased by 9%, and seclusions decreased by 23%. This is largely in part due to the ongoing professional development and use of restorative practices.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

READING: Seeing that we did not meet our goal in the 2020-2021 school year, ongoing emphasis and support will be placed on curriculum and instruction.

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

Consistently, reading instruction scores across all grade levels and subgroups requires continued support.

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

For the 2021-2022 school year, we have added an Administrator on Special Assignment (AOSA) who will oversee the implementation of professional learning communities (PLCs) and serve as an instructional leader. In addition, we have added the position of a reading interventionist to provide small group instruction and teacher support.

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.

Beyond district-level reading professional development, teachers will partake in weekly PLCs to disaggregate data, partake in reading professional development, unpack the reading standards, discuss teaching strategies, and strategically plan. In addition, both the reading interventionist and AOSA will provide differentiated support which includes lesson plan review, modeling, co-teaching, observation, and feedback. In conjunction, in response to deficits in the data, Title I funds will be utilized to provide supplemental instructional materials beyond that which is typically available.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Improving the students' proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) will both enhance students' ability to successfully transition to less restrictive educational settings but also allow students to pursue standard high school diplomas and post-secondary careers. 39% (12/31) of students enrolled at Hope Horizon have been identified as reading below grade level. Additionally, the state of Florida has designated new reading standards, thus, a new reading curriculum is being implemented within the district.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Given specially designed and differentiated instruction, students enrolled at Hope Horizon will increase their reading proficiency by 3% on the STAR reading test by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Routine progress monitoring will take place on a quarterly basis. Data will be analyzed and used to drive instructional outcomes and professional development in weekly professional learning communities (PLCs).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers at Hope Horizon will partake in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) in order to unpack the new reading standards, explore the curriculum, and share materials/resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

PLCs are an evidence-based practice in which teachers partake in collaborative learning-centered around student data, planning, implementation, and reflection (DuFour et al., 2016). Historically, teachers at Hope Horizon (previously Lakeview School Day Support) have not had dedicated time to collaboratively focus on curriculum and instruction.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Introduce Professional Learning Communities to the entire staff.

Person Responsible

Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfi.us)

2. Establish common planning times for specified groups (e.g., teachers, instructional behavior assistants, and behavior technicians).

Person Responsible

Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfi.us)

3. Create accountability measures and resources to ensure PLC cycles are carried out with fidelity (e.g., Guidance documents, meeting minutes templates, assigned facilitators)

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

4. Implement weekly PLCs with consistency beginning by October 1, 2021.

Person Responsible

Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfi.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for

progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

In an examination of data from the first three weeks of the 2021-2022 school year (data were not examined from last year due to high levels of transiency in our student population as a center school), student attendance averaged at 79%. Research indicates that students with disabilities require intensive and consistent instruction and supports. Continuuity of instruction and fidelity of implementation of programming are both indicators for academic and behavioral success (Schwartz et al., 2020; Stahmer et al., 2014).

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Provided Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and the implementation of Restorative Practices, average student attendance per month will increase by 5% by June of 2022.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Attendance will be monitored on a daily basis and attendance data will be shared with the community via the website and graphed in the Welcome Center. Families of students who miss more than three consecutive days (other than for COVID-related quarantines) will be invited to an MTSS meeting with a cross-disciplinary team to determine if further interventions and supports are required.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Restorative Practices "are an effective way of implementing restorative justice, through starting a conversation wider than just the victim and the offender. [They are] proven to be an effective way of healing and building relationships, tackling bullying within schools and providing a sense of community" (Follestad & Wroldsten, 2018).

MTSS is a routine and structured system which systematically examines data to identify struggling students and intervene quickly. This approach requires a cross-disciplinary team to examine the whole child rather than specific silos.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Restorative Practices are an evidence-based strategy in which students learn to take responsibility for their actions (including attendance; Follestad & Wroldsten, 2018). Additionally, MTSS is an evidence-based and systematic approach in which educators utilize data to pre-emptively identify and mitigate issues that may inhibit academic progress (Eagle et al., 2013).

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Identify MTSS team

Person Responsible Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdf1.us)

2. Build MTSS structures and routines and train staff on these processes.

Person Responsible Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdf1.us)

3. Identify specific metrics in which MTSS team will review and monitor.

Person Responsible Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdf1.us)

4. Begin to identify students and establish preliminary meetings.

Person Responsible

Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfi.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

During the first three weeks of the 2021-2022 school year, Hope Horizon has reported 8 minor referrals, 12 major referrals, and 5 restraints.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Provided ongoing staff debriefs, differentiated professional development, and modeling, staff will implement student positive behavior intervention plans (PBIPs) with an overall average of 80% fidelity or higher by June of 2022.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Routine, monthly progress monitoring will occur on one student's PBIP in each classroom at random. These percentages will be posted for all staff, and incentives will be offered for those meeting specified criteria (e.g., those getting 90% or higher get an extra planning period).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

In order to decrease student discipline referrals and restraints, staff will utilize PBIPs written by the school's Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA). These documents are based on principles of applied behavior analysis (ABA).

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

In addition, staff will be trained and monitored using Behavior Skills Training (BST), which is a systematic approach to training and monitoring the fidelity of implementation of behavior analytic programming.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

ABA is a scientific approach to decreasing problematic behaviors and increasing skill acquisition (Cooper, Heron, & Heward, 2019). BST is an evidence-based approach in which practitioners use with supervises to teach a new skill or program to a specified criterion (Parsons & Rollyson, 2012).

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

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.

Hope Horizon attempts to build a positive school culture and environment for both students, families, and staff using a variety of strategies.

First, staff are encouraged to participate in routine team building activities during the workday and are provided organized extra-curricular events outside of work hours to bond with their colleagues. In conjunction, the staff are given the opportunity to engage in differentiated professional development, professional learning communities, and access to necessary instructional resources. Administration provides multiple avenues to ask questions and reflects with staff on processes and procedures (e.g., open-door policy, faculty advisory form, meeting requests) and facilitates routine staff debriefs to process difficult circumstances.

Next, students are provided with a structured positive behavior intervention system (PBIS) to foster expected school behaviors as well as individualized behavior intervention plans which explicitly teach replacement behaviors. Reinforcers are selected based on student choice and preference assessments. Students are provided the ability to request breaks throughout the instructional day and are provided additional resources beyond a typical school to meet their basic needs (e.g., additional food, water bottles, extra clothing, medication, community room). Lastly, therapeutic interventions and supports are embedded throughout the day which includes one-on-one counseling, group therapy, and restorative circles.

Finally, families are supported in a variety of ways which include ongoing daily communication, routine conferences (e.g., parent-teacher conferences, Individualized Education Plan meetings),

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

Donna Perry- EBD & ASD Program Specialist
 Jared Stanley- Administrator on Special Assignment
 Marcia Storniolo- Board Certified Behavior Analyst
 Vivian Gillard- PBIS lead teacher
 Sherry King- Teacher, School Testing Coordinator, & Technology
 Tara Hagan- Reading Interventionist
 Rachel Haynes- Clinical Manager