

Polk County Public Schools

Horizons Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Horizons Elementary School

1700 FOREST LAKE DR, Davenport, FL 33837

schools.polk-fl.net/horizonshawks

Demographics

Principal: Amy Heiser Meyers

Start Date for this Principal: 6/21/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (41%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Horizons Elementary School

1700 FOREST LAKE DR, Davenport, FL 33837

schools.polk-fl.net/horizonshawks

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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
Heiser Meyers, Amy	Principal	All of the functions of the school related to the facility management, instructional implementation, staff and personnel management, and community involvement liaison.
Edwards, James	Assistant Principal	Assisting the principal in all of the functions of the school related to the facility management, instructional implementation, staff and personnel management, and community involvement liaison.
Paye, Madison	Assistant Principal	Assisting the principal in all of the functions of the school related to the facility management, instructional implementation, staff and personnel management, and community involvement liaison.
Frazier, Maude	Assistant Principal	Assisting the principal in all of the functions of the school related to facility management, instructional implementation, staff and personnel management, and community involvement liaison.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/21/2022, Amy Heiser Meyers

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.*

2

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

100

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,412

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

2

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

14

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	98	92	85	103	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	485
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	8	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in ELA	4	23	16	60	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
Course failure in Math	6	15	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	48	26	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	40	47	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	64	115	153	91	70	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	536

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	27	47	49	37	105	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	389

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	0	0	0	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
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

Saturday 8/6/2022

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	30	33	28	51	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	237

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	30	33	28	51	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	237

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	41%	47%	56%				46%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						46%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						45%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	36%	42%	50%				48%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	49%						47%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						44%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	26%	49%	59%				39%	47%	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	47%	52%	-5%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	42%	48%	-6%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	47%	-6%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

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	44%	56%	-12%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	56%	56%	0%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	51%	-13%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	36%	45%	-9%	53%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

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
SWD	15	40	37	21	38	28	21				
ELL	33	44	44	35	52	47	22				
BLK	32	41	26	24	42	50	23				
HSP	40	50	42	37	49	40	23				
WHT	56	58		46	49		32				
FRL	39	48	36	34	50	47	26				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	17	36	31	27	37	54	12				
ELL	28	38	50	29	28	43	14				
BLK	34	44	55	33	29	33	25				
HSP	38	39	35	35	30	35	22				
WHT	55	42		46	31		28				
FRL	38	40	43	34	32	37	18				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	25	20	26	44	55	21				
ELL	33	41	45	38	37	44	26				
ASN	50			42							
BLK	43	40	35	40	42	46	23				
HSP	46	46	47	47	45	44	39				
MUL	32	42		37	25						
WHT	53	53	60	62	59	40	57				
FRL	43	42	45	45	46	43	37				

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	339
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
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	48
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	42
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?

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

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

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

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

The contributing factors included our student absenteeism rate, based on our data in Inzata, in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade we had over 1/3 of our students in each grade level whose attendance did not meet the 90% or over threshold of attendance. And in looking at data, we are seeing a direct correlate of our level ones and attendance.

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

In ELA proficiency and ELA learning gains, in Math, our biggest gains was our learning gains and learning gains in bottom 25%. Our Science had a modest increase of 2 points. These increases contributed to a grade scale point increase of 33 points over the point range earned during the 21-22 school year.

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

In ELA, teachers used real-time data and ongoing assessments to determine reteaching and small group instruction. They also aligned students' tasks to standards-based curriculum. This alignment resulted in Horizons being chosen as a future Learning ARC Framework model school. In Math, teachers had the students complete formative assessments for each benchmark, and teachers and interventionists used that real-time data to pull small groups and reteach. They too aligned students' tasks to standards-based curriculum. Science was supported through using effective reading strategies in that content area, along with strong curricular support by the district science coach.

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

In addition to working with our community outreach facilitator to decrease the overall student absenteeism, we will strategically pull small groups to maintain/increase proficiency (for based line FAST 22-23) across ELA, Math, and Science. We will also be tracking our ESSA groups to ensure acceleration opportunities to bridge the gap between current achievement status and towards future grade-level proficiency.

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.

The following strategies that will assist our learning based upon our learning needs include:

- Procedures to follow with excessive absenteeism
- Learning ARC
- Literacy Circles
- BEST Benchmarks
- Incorporating 1:1 devices
- *typing instruction
- *taking assessments on the computer
- Schoology
- How to utilize data from formative assessments in the classroom
- Begin to implement Accelerated Reader (AR) rubric for implementation accountability
- Implementing vocabulary instruction within the Science block

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

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

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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

Multiple ESSA subgroups are either scoring below or just above 41% in the following ESSA subgroups: Black, ELL, Multi-racial, and SWD. Even though our 21-22 increased in multiple ESSA categories, we are still working towards exceeding 41%.

-2021 ESSA-Black 36% now 2022 ESSA Black-41%

-2021 ESSA-ELL 34% now 2022 ESSA ELL-39%

-2021 ESSA-Multi-racial-N/A now 2022 ESSA Multi-racial-34%

-2021 ESSA-SWD-30% now 2022 ESSA SWD-30%

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

The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to raise the overall proficiency to above 41%, at the following ESSA subgroups: Black, ELL, Multi-racial, and SWD.

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

Progress monitoring data offered by district level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented.

-Data will be shared with the teachers by administration

-Data will be shared with the students by teachers

-Data will be shared with the parents by the teacher, through the progress monitoring reports ie. STAR, iStation, Freckles, etc.

-Student data will be reviewed by the administration team to determine appropriate student placement for second semester.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using the SWT.

Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework

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

The rationale is to take a deliberate, laser-focused approach to meeting the educational needs of all students in order to increase student proficiency, using planning and teaching strategies.

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.

Strategy 1 - Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 1 - Create calendar for administration team calibration walks

Person Responsible

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

Strategy 1 - Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 2 - Train administration team on walkthrough tool in first two calibration walks

Person Responsible

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

Strategy 1 - Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 3 - Conduct calibration walks until team shows 90-100% calibrated consistency with rationale

Person Responsible

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

Strategy 1 - Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Actions Step 4 - Share SWT data with leadership team members

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

Strategy 1 - Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Actions Step 5 - Monitor impact between data review from SWT and planning per content/course/grade level

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

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 1 - Create master schedule that includes intentional collaborative planning

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

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 2 - Assign and train planning facilitators

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

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 3 - The Learning Arc Framework will be evidenced in teacher lesson plans and classroom environment.

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

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 4 - Apprise leadership team members of planning findings on a frequent basis

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

When reviewing data, overall proficiency levels are low across all grade levels in the area of Language Arts. Teachers need professional learning in order to understand and effectively utilize high-yield instructional strategies during whole group instruction so that all students benefit and show progress.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

When reviewing data, overall proficiency levels are low across all grade levels in the area of Language Arts. Teachers need professional learning in order to understand and effectively utilize high-yield instructional strategies during whole group instruction so that all students benefit and show progress.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

The overall Language Arts proficiency for grades K-2 combined will be 50%

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The overall Language Arts proficiency for grades K-2 combined will be 42%

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Proficiency levels will be monitored using the FAST ELA assessments for all grades following each progress monitoring assessment. In addition, weekly reading assessments in elementary grades will be monitored to ensure that students are growing academically between progress monitoring windows. Classroom observations will provide evidence of teachers' use of the high-yield strategies through Journey and/or SWT documentation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Heiser Meyers, Amy, amy.heiser-meyers@polk-fl.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

SRA Corrective Reading, Level Literacy Intervention (LLI), FCRR, cPalms, Literacy Circle Novels, and dedicated Power Hour are all evidence-based practices and programs that will support student proficiency in the B.E.S.T. ELA standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Using high-yield strategies for classroom instruction allows all students to benefit and aids increasing overall proficiency levels. Regular progress monitoring of data allows for student progress to be tracked before state/district assessments are given so that scaffolds can be put in place to aid students in becoming academically successful prior to administering state/district assessments.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Progress monitoring data offered by district level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Data will be shared with the teachers by administration -Data will be shared with the students by teachers -Data will be shared with the parents by the teacher, through the progress monitoring reports ie. STAR, iStation, Freckles, etc. -Student data will be reviewed by the administration team to determine appropriate student placement for second semester. 	<p>Heiser Meyers, Amy, amy.heiser-meyers@polk-fl.net</p>
<p>Teachers and students will be trained on how to effectively use 1:1 devices to support reading proficiency.</p>	<p>Heiser Meyers, Amy, amy.heiser-meyers@polk-fl.net</p>

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.

1. Parents and community partners will be invited to our campus to partner in the education of our students.
2. Weekly positive posts will be made to our social media sites and on our marquee.
3. Horizons will host schoolwide activities that promote positive participation from all students, parents, and community partners.
4. Horizons will have open, transparent, and timely communication with our student, parents, and community.

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

1. Staff Members- open, transparent, and timely communication
2. Students- take pride and promote positive participation in academics and school functions
3. Parents- actively engage in campus activities in a positive manner
4. Community Members- actively engage in campus activities in a positive manner
5. Volunteers - aid and assist teachers with all academic and cultural obligations in a positive manner