

Broward County Public Schools

Horizon Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

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

Horizon Elementary School

2101 N PINE ISLAND RD, Sunrise, FL 33322

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Thaddeus Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 10/29/2016

| | |
|--|---|
| 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

| Table of Contents | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Horizon Elementary School

2101 N PINE ISLAND RD, Sunrise, FL 33322

[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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 70% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 92% |

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 Broward 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.

Every Child, Everyday, Whatever it takes!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Encourage, Educate, Excel.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Smith, Thaddeus | Principal | Student Achievement, Curriculum Program, School Budget, Safety and Security, Property and Inventory, Teacher feedback and professional growth. Communication to all stakeholders in the educational community. |
| Rippo, Kristi | Assistant Principal | Student Achievement, Curriculum Program, School Budget, Safety and Security, Property and Inventory, Incentive Programs, Discipline, Teacher feedback and professional growth. Communication to all stakeholders in the educational community. |
| Guy, Craig | Instructional Coach | To provide support to teachers in the subject areas of Math and Science in grades K-5. Data collection for data chats with Administration and teachers. Duties also include 504 liaison, transportation, PLC Presenter, SAC Chair, Textbook Coordinator, behavior support, and safety patrol coordinator. |
| Lohsen, Kimberly | Reading Coach | Analyzing school data and providing intervention strategies/programs for teachers to use with struggling students. Coaching teachers and providing professional development when needed. Working with small groups of students. Act as the liaison between administration and teachers to support our school's mission and vision for educating our students. Additional duties also include: member of RtI team, Title I Liaison, and SAFE Team member. |
| Shine, Artrice | School Counselor | School Counselor School Testing Coordinator School ESOL contact School Multi-tiered system of support Coordinator School Child Abuse and Neglect contact School Suicide Prevention Fostercare Contact H.E.A.R.T. contact Safe Team member Behavior Threat Assessment Team |
| Hamilton, Deseray | Other | Facilitate IEP meetings, ensure all documents related to IEPs are in compliance, assist regular education teachers of students with disabilities to implement the Individual Education Plan (IEP) and monitor progress of IEP goals, assist in identifying, reporting and correcting IDEA compliance concerns identified internally, correct compliance errors identified internally (within the school) and externally, in accordance with federal, state and local laws, rules, policies and procedures. |
| Halac, Veronica | Other | Supporting teachers and students with curricular, behavioral approaches, Furthermore, with the individualization of their instructional/learning practices. Active participant in the IEP process. Cafeteria duty. Bus duty. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|---|
| | | TIER Mentor. Team leader for the ASD Team. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 10/29/2016, Thaddeus Smith

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.*

2

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Total number of students enrolled at the school

556

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

3

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

3

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 | 84 | 95 | 77 | 80 | 98 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 519 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 22 | 19 | 11 | 17 | 19 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 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 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 2 | 7 | 3 | 16 | 20 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |

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 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |

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 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 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

Thursday 9/23/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 | | | | 61% | 59% | 57% | 60% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 63% | 60% | 58% | 57% | 57% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 51% | 54% | 53% | 43% | 51% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 62% | 65% | 63% | 60% | 62% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 58% | 66% | 62% | 59% | 60% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 30% | 53% | 51% | 42% | 47% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 35% | 46% | 53% | 52% | 49% | 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 | 57% | 60% | -3% | 58% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 62% | 8% | 58% | 12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 59% | -8% | 56% | -5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -70% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 65% | -3% | 62% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 72% | 67% | 5% | 64% | 8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 48% | 64% | -16% | 60% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -72% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 49% | -16% | 53% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready AP1, AP2, AP3 grades 1-5 and Grade 5 Statewide Science Assessment

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 83/87.4% | 82/86.3% | 82/59.8% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 19/27.5% | 32/47.1% | 39/57.4% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5/22.7% | 9/42.9% | 6/27.3% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/15.4% | 6/46.2% | 5/38.5% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 83/87.4% | 81/85.3% | 76/80% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13/18.8% | 19/28.4% | 25/39.1% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/8.7% | 5/23.8% | 7/31.8% |
| | English Language Learners | 4/28.6% | 3/23.1% | 4/36.4% |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 71/92.2% | 71/92.2% | 70/90.9% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 18/32.7% | 23/41.8% | 30/55.6% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/12% | 7/28% | 8/33.3% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/20% | 2/20% | 3/30% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 71/92.2% | 70/90.9% | 69/89.6% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12/21.8% | 17/31.5% | 18/33.3% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/16% | 4/16.7% | 6/26.1% |
| | English Language Learners | 3/30% | 3/30% | 1/10% |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 77/96.3% | 70/87.5% | 74/92.5% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 27/46.6% | 30/57.7% | 34/61.8% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6/28.6% | 5/35.7% | 5/29.4% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 1/20% | 2/40% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 77/96.3% | 72/90% | 66/82.5% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 7/12.1% | 21/38.9% | 25/52.1% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/9.5% | 3/18.8% | 3/20% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 1/20% | 2/40% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 91/92.9% | 87/88.8% | 5/6.8% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23/33.8% | 31/47% | 0/0% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/7.1% | 6/24% | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 92/93.9% | 84/85.7% | 4/4.1% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12/17.4% | 22/34.4% | 1/50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/14.3% | 6/25% | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 1/12.5% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 80/94.1% | 76/89.4% | 0/0% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17/25.8% | 20/31.3% | 0/0% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/16.7% | 4/20% | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 1/20% | 0/0% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 79/92.9% | 76/89.4% | 0/0% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13/20% | 19/29.7% | 0/0% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/12.5% | 4/20% | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/40% | 1/20% | 0/0% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | n/a | n/a | 17/24% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | n/a | n/a | 17/24% |
| | Students With Disabilities | n/a | n/a | 3/15% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | 1/25% |
| | | | | |

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 | 28 | 24 | | 36 | 24 | 10 | 6 | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 43 | | 33 | 7 | | 14 | | | | |
| BLK | 45 | 46 | | 39 | 30 | | 23 | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 29 | | 32 | 12 | | 29 | | | | |
| MUL | 43 | | | 36 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | | | 65 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 37 | 47 | 35 | 20 | 13 | 21 | | | | |
| 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 | 29 | 37 | 35 | 31 | 28 | 31 | 23 | | | | |
| ELL | 58 | 60 | 53 | 60 | 51 | 20 | 40 | | | | |
| ASN | 90 | | | 90 | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| BLK | 57 | 62 | 56 | 58 | 53 | 32 | 24 | | | | |
| HSP | 60 | 52 | 43 | 66 | 58 | 23 | 50 | | | | |
| MUL | 46 | | | 46 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | 88 | | 71 | 69 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 61 | 63 | 54 | 61 | 58 | 33 | 36 | | | | |
| 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 | 31 | 36 | 32 | 27 | 43 | 46 | 26 | | | | |
| ELL | 40 | 50 | 53 | 44 | 53 | 38 | 33 | | | | |
| ASN | 82 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 60 | 55 | 43 | 54 | 54 | 48 | 53 | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | 55 | 47 | 58 | 57 | 38 | 33 | | | | |
| MUL | 69 | 70 | | 69 | 60 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 63 | 58 | | 74 | 74 | | 62 | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 56 | 42 | 59 | 56 | 41 | 52 | | | | |

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 | 35 |
| 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 | 50 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 277 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 88% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 21 |
| 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 | 32 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 31 |
| 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 | 40 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 63 |
| 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 | 32 |
| 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?

The proficiency level of Students with Disabilities is still an area of concern. There is also concern as not all students participated in the 2021 FSA due to COVID.

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

The lowest performing area was Students with Disabilities. However, there was also a major decrease in the Math and Science scores for the Spring 2021 FSA.

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 were due to COVID--many students did not attend campus and were in great need of face to face instruction. Students are back to brick and mortar instruction. Intervention of students and hiring of ESSR teachers in the areas of Reading and Math.

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

Lowest quartile in English Language Arts increased the most.

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

Contributing factors to improvement were the inclusion of Leveled Literacy Intervention pull out groups, FSA Camp, and increased usage of the iReady Software programs for Reading and Math.

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

Continued face to face instruction, small group remediation, ESSR teachers, continued progress monitoring of students, and teacher professional development including i-ready training, B.E.S.T. standards, and Benchmark Advance.

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.

Teachers will be involved in online/in person professional learning focused on increasing student performance of Students with Disabilities in the area of ELA. Curriculum Associates/iReady representative will deliver the professional learning for all grade levels, scheduled throughout the school year..

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

Teachers will continue to be engaged in professional learning based on the new Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking standards and the changes to instruction and assessment.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Horizon has been identified as a RAISE school for the 2021-2022 school year and therefore, reading has been added as an area of focus.

Measurable Outcome: By May 2022, at least 80% of ALL Horizon students will meet their typical growth as measured by the iReady AP3 Diagnostic Assessment.

Monitoring: Progress monitoring will take place throughout the school year. Student iReady Personalized Instructional Summary reports will be reviewed weekly to note the number of student participation minutes as well as the percentage of lessons passed. Changes will be made to student learning path instruction as necessary. Student progress will also be monitored throughout the year with iReady growth monitoring and diagnostic assessments. Students in grades 3-5 will also participate in iReady Standards Mastery Assessments with data analysis of individual ELA standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thaddeus Smith (thaddeus.smith@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Although Benchmark Advance is the new Reading Adoption, the following evidence-based/ research-based programs are being utilized based upon the needs of individual grade levels/student needs:

Grades 2-5: Leveled Literacy Intervention

Grades K-1: Foundations

Grades 1-2: Heggerty Phonemic Awareness Programs (as needed)

Grade 2: Reading Horizons Discovery

Grades K-3: Supplement to Tier 1-Fountas and Pinnell Phonics, Spelling and Word Study

Grades K-5: Scholastic Book Room/Short Reads

Grades K-5: iReady

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The rationale for choosing these specific intervention programs is their direct alignment to the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan, Guidance for Determining Appropriate Evidence-Based Reading Interventions, and the Decision Tree Placement documents. Student data was analyzed to determine which program would be most beneficial to each grade level/ student.

Action Steps to Implement

Ongoing progress monitoring will take place utilizing program-embedded assessments. Data chats will take place with teachers and support staff/administration throughout the year.

Person Responsible

Thaddeus Smith (thaddeus.smith@browardschools.com)

Based on RTI Data students who are Tier 3 will receive interventions using LLI and Foundations.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Lohsen (kimberly.lohsen@browardschools.com)

Based on Data students who are Tier 2 will receive small group instruction in the classroom to reteach core instruction skills.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Lohsen (kimberly.lohsen@browardschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Horizon 's ESSA subgroup continues to struggle with meeting the 41% target needed on the FSA. |
| Measurable Outcome: | By May 2022, at least 80% of the Students with Disabilities sub group will meet their typical growth in both Reading and/or Math as measured by the iReady AP3 Diagnostic Assessment. |
| Monitoring: | Progress monitoring will take place throughout the school year. Student iReady Personalized Instructional Summary reports will be reviewed weekly to note the number of student participation minutes as well as the percentage of lessons passed. Changes will be made to student learning path instruction as necessary. Student progress will also be monitored throughout the year with iReady growth monitoring and diagnostic assessments. Students in grades 3-5 will also participate in iReady Standards Mastery Assessments with data analysis of individual ELA and Math standards. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Thaddeus Smith (thaddeus.smith@browardschools.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Although Benchmark Advance is the new Reading Adoption, the following evidence-based/ research-based programs are being utilized based upon the needs of individual grade levels/student needs:</p> <p>Grades K-5: ESE Instructional Facilitator using Foundations and other research-based programs as needed.</p> <p>Grades K-1: Foundations</p> <p>Grades K-2: Heggerty Phonemic Awareness Programs (as needed)</p> <p>Grades 2-5: Leveled Literacy Intervention</p> <p>Grade 2: Reading Horizons Discovery</p> <p>Grades K-3: Supplement to Tier 1-Fountas and Pinnell Phonics, Spelling and Word Study</p> <p>Grades K-5: Scholastic Book Room/Short Reads</p> <p>Grades K-5: iReady</p> <p>Grades K-5: iReady Teacher Toolbox</p> <p>Grades K-5: Go Math! Reteach/Intervention Resources</p> <p>Grades 3-5: STAMS spiral review</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | The rationale for choosing these specific intervention programs is their direct alignment to the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan, Guidance for Determining Appropriate Evidence-Based Reading Interventions, and the Decision Tree Placement documents. Student data was analyzed to determine which program would be most beneficial to each grade level/ student. The rationale for the Math was based upon district feedback and support from the Elementary Learning Department-Math team. |

Action Steps to Implement

Ongoing progress monitoring will take place utilizing program-embedded assessments. Data chats will take place with teachers and support staff/administration throughout the year and teachers who have SWD in their classroom will follow current IEP.

Person Responsible Thaddeus Smith (thaddeus.smith@browardschools.com)

ESE Support teacher will pull students and will push into the classroom to service students based on their current IEP.

Person Responsible Deseray Hamilton (deseray.hamilton@browardschools.com)

Classroom teachers will provide small group instruction based upon the students current IEP.

Person Responsible Deseray Hamilton (deseray.hamilton@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Horizon Elementary had no reports listed to the State of Florida for the 2020-2021 school year. Horizon Elementary continues to monitor discipline on a monthly basis and continues to make changes to our school's Positive Behavior plan as needed. All stakeholders are involved in discussion of this plan as necessary.

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.

A positive school culture and environment is created at the beginning of each day when all students are greeted by administration and support staff. This continues with teacher greetings at the classroom door. Students then participate in a morning announcement, mindfulness and moment of silence each and every day.

Rules and procedures are consistently maintained in classrooms to create a safe environment where students feel good about coming to school. Positive behavior is noticed and commended with the use of positive referrals. Our School Counselor also focuses on Broward's Kids of Character Curriculum.

Horizon also makes sure to highlight important events and essential topics each month so that students that are involved in extracurricular activities that promote a positive environment and the inclusion of ALL students.

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

The entire school staff which is composed of: administration, support staff, teachers, clerical, aides, facilities, cafeteria workers, and nurses are ALL responsible in creating a positive and safe culture and environment at Horizon Elementary.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|--|---|----------------|-----|---------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$2,894.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5000 | 239-Other | 2531 - Horizon Elementary School | General Fund | | \$2,894.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Materials to improve reading and SWD scores on the 2022 FSA.</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | | | | \$117,070.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 2531 - Horizon Elementary School | Other Federal | | \$117,070.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Funding for two ESSA teachers in the areas of reading and math.</i> | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$119,964.00 |