

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

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">70%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">92%</p>

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	<p>School Counselor</p> <p>School Testing Coordinator</p> <p>School ESOL contact</p> <p>School Multi-tiered system of support Coordinator</p> <p>School Child Abuse and Neglect contact</p> <p>School Suicide Prevention</p> <p>Fostercare Contact</p> <p>H.E.A.R.T. contact</p> <p>Safe Team member</p> <p>Behavior Threat Assessment Team</p>
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	<p>Supporting teachers and students with curricular, behavioral approaches, Furthermore, with the individualization of their instructional/learning practices.</p> <p>Active participant in the IEP process.</p> <p>Cafeteria duty.</p> <p>Bus duty.</p>

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	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

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	0	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	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 ELA assessment	0	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	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				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
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
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%
			Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter

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