

Brevard Public Schools

Educational Horizons Charter



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Educational Horizons Charter

1281 S WICKHAM RD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

<http://www.educationalhorizons.net>

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Turner

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2014

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-6 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 35% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: A (75%) 2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (77%) |
| 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 | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 7/26/2022.

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 | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Educational Horizons Charter

1281 S WICKHAM RD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

<http://www.educationalhorizons.net>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School KG-6</p> | <p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>35%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>48%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
| Grade | A | A | A | A |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 7/26/2022.

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.

Educational Horizons Charter School will provide students with educational opportunities using Montessori methods and philosophy of learning skills for college and career readiness and lifelong learning. We emphasize the small learning community school in which students are personally responsible for their actions and exhibit courtesy and respect for all people and property.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Educational Horizons Charter School we expect to meet the high standards of student achievement in a diverse learning environment that focuses on the individual student. Incorporating Montessori education with state standards and district requirement, we promote independent and academic success with the rigor of critical thinking skills needed for 21st Century success. In conjunction with families and home, we share the responsibility of teaching and monitoring students progress in a nurturing and safe environment.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------|---------------------------|---|
| Needle, Eileen | Administrative Support | Eileen is the front of the house who takes care of all student services, registrations, records, attendance, lunches, and communication with families. She will contribute data and information about student populations, SWD, FRL, attendance, truancy, family demographics to help create SIP. |
| Murphy, Heidi | Teacher, K-12 | Heidi serves as our lower elementary teacher and serves as our Educational Leadership representative. Heidi is the Montessori leader of the school with knowledge of the method. She will work closely with teachers to collect information for the creation of the SIP. |
| Stevens, Lonna | Teacher, K-12 | Lonna represents the lower elementary classrooms as well as serving as our Title IX rep. Her data and knowledge of civil rights and equity will contribute to the creation of the SIP to help meet needs of all students |
| Thorson, Erik | Parent Engagement Liaison | Erik is our school manager. He will represent the families and their needs as Parent Liaison as he contributes to creating the SIP for our school. |
| Turner, Cheryl | Principal | Cheryl serves as principal and administrator who will help coordinate creation of SIP combining talents and contributions from the team. She will help meet deadlines. She also serves as GSP, ELL, and ESE support for the school and institutes the MTSS process. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 6/1/2014, Cheryl Turner

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

12

Total number of students enrolled at the school

131

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

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 23 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/28/2022

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 | 23 | 22 | 24 | 13 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| | 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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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 |

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 | 23 | 22 | 24 | 13 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| | 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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 77% | 61% | 56% | | | | 85% | 62% | 57% |

| School Grade Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Learning Gains | 50% | | | | | | 66% | 60% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | 57% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 88% | 49% | 50% | | | | 89% | 63% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 85% | | | | | | 83% | 65% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | 53% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | 60% | 59% | | | | 73% | 57% | 53% |

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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 82% | 64% | 18% | 58% | 24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 100% | 61% | 39% | 58% | 42% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -82% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 60% | 13% | 56% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -100% | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 60% | -60% | 54% | -54% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 100% | 61% | 39% | 62% | 38% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 100% | 64% | 36% | 64% | 36% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -100% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 60% | 13% | 60% | 13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -100% | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 67% | -67% | 55% | -55% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 56% | 17% | 53% | 20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| WHT | 67 | 31 | | 83 | 77 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 64 | | | 86 | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| WHT | 85 | | | 81 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 100 | | | 91 | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| WHT | 82 | 64 | | 91 | 88 | | 75 | | | | |
| FRL | 79 | 45 | | 79 | 82 | | | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 75 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 300 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 65 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 75 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Using the current Spring 2022 data, we look for growth as our students returned to face to face learning this year. We can see learning gains in the composite ELA and Math scores. Our ELA achievement for grades 3-6 was 77% with a learning gain of 50%. Our Math achievement for grades 3-6 was 88% with a learning gain of 85%. Our goal this year was to have all grades with a population of ten so that every student score would count. One student withdrew for Home Education the week of standardized testing. This caused our grade 5 population to decrease to 9 students. We did not have a component score for the lowest 25% due to the low number of students scoring a 1 or 2. For this reason we only had 4 of the 7 components of the data included in our school grade. Our economically disadvantages student population is showing a growing trend over the past four years as follows: 29% -2019, 30% - 2020; 32.4% - 2021, and 36.2% - 2022.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data shows our students in ELA had learning gains, but the overall number of students proficient were lower than last year. Scores show 77% proficient in 2022 compared to 90% proficient in 2021. Although not published, our Science composite score was down from last year from 33% proficient in 2022 compared to 100% proficient in 2021. In reflection, our greatest need is in understanding content of information text and non-fiction passages.

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

One factor is that students are transitioning from home based or online learning back into the classroom. They bring with them a loss of instruction. Reviewing the data from the school year, we see that the decrease in ELA and Science scores can be attributed to a lack of strong reading comprehension skills. A focus on text-based evidence in reading will contribute to greater comprehension in all subjects. By using researched based strategies our students will gain confidence and skills in reading comprehension. With the implementation of BEST standards for Math and ELA, we will spend time on training, practice, collaboration, and understanding of the depth of standards and the scaffolding between grades.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

We were pleased with the Math score increase. Our students showed an increase in scores with 88% proficient in 2022 compared to 79% proficient in 2021. This was a focus of our School Improvement Plan for last year. Our goal was to focus on re-teaching basics and reduce the gaps in learning while strengthening foundations of math.

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

With Math basic concepts as a focus on last year's SIP, we saw a rise in scores overall. A concentration on principle skills for helped our Tier 1 students show an increase in accuracy in foundational skills that led to better problem solving. In school interventions were put in place for off track students in Tiers 2 and 3. Additional tutoring opportunities for grades K-6 afterschool for this population was used for the entire school year. These supports worked well in small group setting for our students in need. We used both paper and digital reinforcements to help students make learning gains. Increased attention to using Montessori methods in math along with traditional methods gave practice for all learning modalities.

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

With a full immersion with new BEST Math standards and new textbook adoptions, our teachers will need support to deliver high quality lessons to increase "Mathematic Thinking and Reasoning" (MTR standards). With the new text book adoption, we are committing to using the new way of approaching math in all grades K-6 with paper based and digital 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.

Teachers and administrator will be encouraged to attend summer opportunities for unpacking the new standards in Math. Pre-planning professional development day will be devoted to reviewing, understanding, and implementing the new BEST standards in ELA and Math. Review of lesson plans

and classroom walk throughs and observations will be used to measure accurate implementation of BEST standards in the classroom. Collaboration among teachers between grades will be encouraged and early releases days will lend opportunities to share ideas and review student data. Ongoing progress monitoring three times a year will help to guide instruction and chart progress. All teachers will be encouraged to earn Reading endorsement to add to the state certification.

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

We will add support in the area of technology and digital resources to continue growth and forward momentum as our students move to computer based state assessments. Purchase of devices for each student to use in the classroom and for assessments will be added to 2022-23 budget. Increased internet and router speeds from our provider will aid in handling the new devices.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

By the 2022-23 school year, Florida is expected to fully implement the new Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (BEST) standards. In ELA there are 6 expectations with 4 strands. The Math standards, Mathematical Thinking and Reading Standards (MTR), contain 7 overarching expectations for students to promote deeper learning an understanding. With this shift, we will need to learn, understand, and fully implement the standards in our daily lessons.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

As a result of daily implementation of BEST standards, we expect our students to show growth with ongoing progress monitoring in grades K-6. Our expectations will be that 90% of our students in grades K-6 will be proficient in both Math and ELA.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly faculty meetings to review use of standards in plans and classroom walkthroughs will be one way to monitor the implementation of the BEST standards. Checking student work and assessment to see if they are using standards will help gauge our effectiveness of instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheryl Turner (turner.cheryl@educationalhorizons.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Standard based instruction is a process for planning, delivering, monitoring and improving academic programs in which clearly defined academic content standards provide the basis for content in instruction and assessment. The focus is to help ensure students learn what is important.

Rationale for**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

With adoption of standards, informing students of their goals, and using them in the classroom with fidelity, everyone is held to the same accountability for classroom progress. It will guide planning, instruction, focus, and measurement of leaning goals.

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.

Beginning in pre-planning, BEST standards will be shared for Math and ELA to all teachers. We will devote the Professional Development Day on August 4th to unpacking the standards and understanding the connections. Time will be spent on looking at connections to Montessori and how to use our materials to support learning.

Person Responsible Cheryl Turner (turner.cheryl@educationalhorizons.net)

#2. 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.

In looking at our 2021-22 data, we see that comprehension in reading impacts success in all subjects. With a decrease in our proficiency rates of our grades 3-6 students in ELA (from 90% in 2021 to 77% in 2022) we see a need to focus on the area of reading.

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

With direct instruction in reading comprehension, we can expect our scores for student proficiency to rise to 90% for all grades K-6.

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

We will use ongoing progress monitoring three times a year with researched based assessments to collect data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheryl Turner (turner.cheryl@educationalhorizons.net)

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

We will teach students how to find text-based evidence to support their answers in all subjects. With a focus on non-fiction and information text, students will have increased opportunities to use their skills and find support in the passages and text. We will use reteach, tutoring, rti, small group, and Montessori methods to help increase comprehension and mastery of concepts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Research shows that citing textual evidence is important because it requires the reader to support their ideas, questions, and claims with factual evidence from their source verse opinions or irrational notions.

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.

Encourage teachers to earn Reading endorsement by allowing and offering professional courses through our Professional Development Community.

Person Responsible Cheryl Turner (turner.cheryl@educationalhorizons.net)

Share knowledge of Montessori method for reading and comprehension.

Person Responsible Heidi Murphy (murphy.heidi@educationalhorizons.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Following the new assessment for all Florida students in grades K-6, we learn that they will be assessed on computers instead of paper based. In review of our digital and technological devices, we will have to update and increase our technology.

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

We will have a working device for each student in the school to be able to practice, work, learn, and test on.

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

We will order, collect, and inventory devices. A contract will be created with manufacturer to keep devices up to date and current.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erik Thorson (erik@thorsonmanagementgroup.com)

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

Technology in the classroom and digital tools, expands resources, learning material, and builds 21st century skills. It can link teachers and students to data and information. Assessing through technology can help differentiate and scaffold questions to better measure student learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

To meet the needs of standard based assessments, we need to equip our students and teachers with the necessary technology for learning, practicing, and assessing knowledge.

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.

Research, order, inventory and maintain devices for standard based instruction and assessment.

Person Responsible

Erik Thorson (erik@thorsonmanagementgroup.com)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Our Montessori philosophy is a practice that fosters rigorous, self-motivated growth for children and adolescents in all areas of their development, with a goal of nurturing each child's natural desire for knowledge, understanding, and respect. It helps guide us in every decision we make. Our motto of "Grace and Courtesy" is woven into every interaction and decision. We build a positive school culture with Conscious Discipline and how we treat each other. Our encouragement of using skills and powers of this program helps move students and adults to self regulate and problem solve. We keep an open communication between home, school and community with emails, phone, newsletters, monthly calendars, social media, websites, and meetings. We encourage families to be active in the school by volunteering of their time.

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

Our school teachers and staff are at the core of our stakeholders. They contribute to decisions with daily operations including scheduling, academic events, curriculum, materials, classroom, and analyze student data. In addition, our school administration, management and leadership is here to support the staff and guide decisions. We have an active Parent Teacher Organization which meets monthly to help support our school and students and connect us to the community. They provide enrichment, social enhancements, and financial support of projects. Our school governing board is the steering component of the school managements, financial strength, and academic success. These directors are made up of talents people who are vested in the success of the school. The help guide and serve the school by making policy and procedures as well as be good stewards of our finances. Our Brevard Country School district serves as our sponsor helps facilitate all facets of operations including professional development, certification, exceptional student support, and systems data bases.