Manatee County Public Schools

Horizons Academy

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Horizons Academy

1910 27TH ST E, Bradenton, FL 34208

https://www.manateeschools.net/horizons

Demographics

Principal: James H IR D

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: No Grade 2020-21: No Grade 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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 Manatee 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

Horizons Academy

1910 27TH ST E, Bradenton, FL 34208

https://www.manateeschools.net/horizons

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)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	77%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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 Academy is to get students back on track and progressing towards graduation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Horizons Academy is to be a nationally recognized alternative program.

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
Hird, James	Principal	
Clarke, Ryan	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/25/2022, James H IR D

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
25

Total number of students enrolled at the school
289

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.
4

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	2	2	4	5	30	100	34	37	69	140	423
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	63	20	17	46	74	238
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	19	42	21	21	23	11	144
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	12	23	14	24	40	57	175
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	11	17	9	27	30	42	140
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	21	59	28	29	51	70	267

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	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	19	65	23	26	36	99	279

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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

Monday 10/17/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of sutdents with a substantial reading deficiency		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	4	3	2	3	21	37	12	34	35	115	266
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	12	24	9	21	23	46	142
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	14	13	7	12	14	10	78
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of sutdents with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	11	21	8	14	17	31	111

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	11	0	19	13	18	44	117

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement		50%	55%					58%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								57%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								52%	54%
Math Achievement		40%	42%					64%	62%
Math Learning Gains								63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								55%	52%
Science Achievement		56%	54%					54%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		57%	59%					83%	78%

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	0%	51%	-51%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	17%	56%	-39%	58%	-41%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
06	2022					
	2019	14%	52%	-38%	54%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
07	2022					
	2019	15%	48%	-33%	52%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
08	2022					
	2019	12%	54%	-42%	56%	-44%
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

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	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	18%	65%	-47%	64%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	60%	-60%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
06	2022					
	2019	7%	57%	-50%	55%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	12%	57%	-45%	54%	-42%
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
08	2022					
	2019	13%	41%	-28%	46%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	12%	45%	-33%	48%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	39%	69%	-30%	67%	-28%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	29%	77%	-48%	71%	-42%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	23%	71%	-48%	70%	-47%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	6%	65%	-59%	61%	-55%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	14%	61%	-47%	57%	-43%

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										33	8
ELL										41	
BLK	5	19			8					54	8

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
HSP	5	7								53	16
WHT										49	16
FRL	13	16			13			20		51	11
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										35	6
ELL										48	
BLK										37	17
HSP	17	40								51	8
MUL										40	
WHT										41	31
FRL	4	30								42	13
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										30	
ELL										50	
BLK										17	
HSP										40	15
WHT										34	47
FRL		10								34	12

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	14
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	111
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	73%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	21
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	13
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	20
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
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	33
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	16
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	3

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?

All grade levels and subgroups are performing significantly below the 41% Federal Index. The level of performance is consistent from subject to subject. As the alternative school, the majority of our students arrive with challenges and deficiencies. The fact that they were required to pursue education through a digital platform and remotely 2 years ago is still impacting their experiences and performance. This has highlighted and exacerbated the need for Lifeskills and academic interventions.

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

Our graduation rate decreased significantly from 69% to 51%, according to district graduation rate data. The ability to waive some assessment requirements should have allowed us to positively impact the graduation rate. We were able to positively impact the number of students graduating by extending the time and support provided by a number of teachers. We expanded the amount of funding for teachers to work with students. The additional time for work and support proved helpful. This did not result in the increases that we expected with course completion, passing rates and, ultimately, proficiency. Students with Disabilities struggled more than other subgroups. We found ways to deliver many of our Lifeskills, mental health and interventions, but did not have the impact that we had in previous years. The criteria for the selection of LIFE students has been adjusted to allow more students. A significant adjustment for this current year is that district high schools are working with some of their potential LIFE students with credit recovery efforts, thereby getting some of their students back on track and NOT referring them to us. We have seen, however, and influx of students whose credit profiles are much more dire. Our system is designed to provide interventions for all students but they seem to be more receptive to responsive to these interventions.

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

Digital Platform and lack of direct instruction:
1. Teachers had to learn the platform last minute.....training and guidance has been provided and is on going. Teachers have support and guidance with regard to incentives and trouble shooting. Look fors and uniform expectations are in place.

2. Weekly grade level and Tier II meetings along with data chats using Edgenuity data provide accountability and ownership for all stakeholders.
New Actions:
1. Increase direct instruction. Only select coursework will be fully digital. Teachers are still limited in the number of preps they are comfortable with but they are able provide direct instruction in specific courses.
2. Provide after school Edge labs for credit recovery for X at risk students

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

N/A
No data points showed improvement. Learning on a digital platform with little or no deliverable Lifeskills support were all detrimental to students, even a full year after we've returned to on campus instruction.

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

We were able to fund extended opportunities for students to complete coursework on a digital platform, Edgenuity, and students were able to waive assessments. This allowed us to get more students through their coursework and on to graduation.

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

We will provide after hours and Saturday morning sessions for Lifeskills and to provide academic interventions for students. Outside agencies are referred students and provide interventions weekly, Replay and TRUTH. Weekly grade level and Tier II meetings along with data chats using Edgenuity data provide accountability and ownership for stakeholders.

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.

There is a serious need for Lifeskills support and training for students. We will leverage resources to provide mentoring and Lifeskills supports that improve student resiliency.
Department Chairs and administration focus on instructional supports that improve course completion and passing rates for students in their first sitting or core coursework.

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

Outside agencies are referred for students and provide interventions weekly. (Replay, YFC and TRUTH). Weekly grade level and Tier II meetings along with data chats using Edgenuity data provide accountability and ownership for stakeholders.

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

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Safe and secure environment offering academic and Lifeskills support	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Provide a safe environment that provides Lifeskills and academic supports for students. We will also provide more direct instruction for students in core classes and limit our use of digital/self-paced instruction.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We will increase our average daily attendance by 15%, thereby increasing instructional time for students. We will provide extended day opportunities for academic, behavioral and Lifeskills interventions for students.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Average daily attendance will be monitored through FOCUS and traditional attendance tracking systems. Attendance is included as part of the Criteria for Level and Positive Behavior systems. This criteria is used in consideration for transition back to home school.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Hird (hirdj@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Multiple strategies common to district Graduation Enhancement Technicians will be implemented by select staff including: Routine monitoring of students who are at higher risk of truancy. Preventative identification of potential barriers to attendance. Incentivizing attendance milestones. (PBIS Rewards) Providing opportunities for flexible scheduling to maximize instructional time. Providing Lifeskills, academic and behavioral interventions for students to increase school success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Our school district has invested in the research that supports the use of Graduation Enhancement Technicians to improve attendance and graduation rates. While our Title I funds do not support a Graduation Enhancement Technician for our campus, our Title I Resource teacher and Title I Teacher Assistant will implement the strategies that best fit our campus and our programming.

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.

Attendance is monitored as part of Level and Positive Behavior Support plans.
Students identified to establish goals and incentivize meeting attendance goals.
Students offered extended day and after school opportunities to make up instructional time.

Person Responsible   Ryan Clarke (clarker@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Students in all subgroups performed well below the federal index for proficiency. There seems to be a correlation with the percentage of students earning passing grades in ELA and Mathematics courses and the percentage of students scoring proficient on state assessments. If we focus on instructional practices that lead increase the passing rates for these courses, we should positively impact proficiency rates. I expect to also raise the graduation rate with the increased percentage of students passing their state assessments.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By the end of the first and second semesters, respectively, 65% of 9th through 12 grade students on campus will recieve a passing grade in the first sitting of their English courses. By the end of the first and second semesters, respectively, 65% of 9th through 12 grade students on campus will recieve a passing grade in the first sitting of their Mathematics courses.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Teachers identify struggling students before progress reports and then monitor weekly. Struggling students are targeted for Edge Lab and after school intervention activities. Teacher passing rates are discussed at TCT meetings and as part of ILT. Student grades are a criteria to be reinforced through Positive Behavior Support system.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Hird (hirdj@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students are provided extra time and support from teachers after school. Increasing individual support from teachers and providing additional time will result in increased proficiency. Incentives provided for students seeking additional assistance. Community resources provide support for students and their families.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Title I funds are used to provide additional time on task and support for students. Students identified will have their attendance monitored and incentivized as well as be provided extra time and support for their coursework. Where possible, courses that are being repeated or made up will be provided on Edgenuity so that students receive direct teacher instruction in their first sitting courses. Teachers will be able to provide more support through direct instruction. Strategies and resources will be discussed and shared in TCT meeetings monthly. Specific support is provided for specific students.

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.

Teachers identify struggling students before progress reports and then monitor weekly.
Struggling students are targeted for Edge Lab and after school intervention activities.
Teacher passing rates are discussed at TCT meetings and as part of ILT.
Student grades are a criteria to be reinforced through Positive Behavior Support system.

Person Responsible   Ryan Clarke (clarker@manateeschools.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

Students receive academic intervention support during extended school time (strategic after school remediation)

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

Students receive academic intervention support during extended school time (strategic after school remediation)

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)

100% of students grade 2 will show progress/growth on district benchmarks.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

100% of students grades 3 through 5 will show progress/growth on district benchmarks.
100% of students will score proficient on state assessments for Reading and Mathematics.

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.

Teachers and SSS will monitor student performance through district diagnostics, benchmark assessments, and weekly progress monitoring. Students will be monitored to insure they receive additional intervention time with district prescribed resources.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Stowers, Julie, stowersj@manateeschools.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. §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?

BEST standards training through district teaching and learning department.
iReady Reading
Benchmark Advance

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?

BEST is state adopted, iReady, and Benchmark Advance intervention kits are both research based.

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
Students identified through district diagnostics and prior year performance.	Stowers, Julie, stowersj@manateeschools.net
ELA Teacher and SSS provide targeted remediation for students based on diagnostics data.	Shaw, Roy, shawr@manateeschools.net
Students identified for Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 reading interventions based on weekly progress monitoring.	Stowers, Julie, stowersj@manateeschools.net

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.

Horizons Academy has several opportunities to promote parent involvement. Communication between school and home is completed through the use of newsletters, school website, letters, phone calls, progress reports and connect-ed messaging. During the pandemic, we have increased our use of TEAMS for

meetings and intakes, Events such as PBS celebrations, home visitations, intake meetings, and conferences are our most common ways to communicate with parents in person.
These include:
1. Student calling tree - specific staff members assigned to students for routine phone call check ins.
2. Student Helpline - dedicated phone line and hours established for students to call for support.
3. Engagement of community resources - Home visits by PAL liaison and REPLAY staff w/parent permission.
4. Title I sponsored activity nights and parent meetings described in Parent Engagement Plan.

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

Principal and School leadership team implement instructional support for teachers. Teachers and discipline staff engage in Tag in/out process.
Bi-monthly Tier II and Safety and Discipline meetings give staff opportunities for input and feedback regarding operational issues.
The student intake process is a critical step to orienting students and parents to expectations.
Title I parent meetings and activity nights help to engage students and families.
After school Saturday School Lifeskills sessions to address student needs.
All staff participate in training working with students experiencing trauma. (Youth Mental Health First Aid)