

Escambia County School District

# Hope Horizon At Judy Andrews Center



## 2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>R.A.I.S.E</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>24</b>

## Hope Horizon At Judy Andrews Center

129 N MERRITT ST, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

### Demographics

Principal: Sarah Leeanne Guy

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

<b>2021-22 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Function</b> (per accountability file)	ESE
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Special Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities*
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: Maintaining 2018-19: Unsatisfactory 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating</b>	2023-24: No Rating

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

Our mission is to develop and implement individual and therapeutic educational programs for all of our students. We offer strategic interventions to help each student achieve their own “personal best” academically, socially, and behaviorally. We offer Hope to students and families when they are encountering emotional and mental health challenges that interfere with their school progress. We work collaboratively in a holistic approach to help students see that brighter days are on the Horizon.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

At Hope Horizon, we believe that all children have the capacity to achieve success and make progress toward their individual goals. Hope Horizon will strive to provide the structure and positive supports needed to enable students to realize their potential, maximize their success and reach their goals.

#### **Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.**

The student population at Hope Horizon is unique in that all students are invited to attend based on the level of services outlined in their Individual Education Plan which outlines the need for a more restrictive environment. In order to attend, students must either have an educational label of an Emotional and Behavioral Disability or have a major mental health diagnosis. Hope Horizon programming embeds mental health services, as well as social-emotional and behavioral supports and interventions.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stanley, Jared	Administrator on Special Assignment	Dr. Stanley is the Administrator on Special Assignment. His duties encompass those of an Assistant Principal, in addition to some Principal duties. He is the full-time administrator on campus.
Perry, Donna		Mrs. Perry serves as the school division's program specialist for students with emotional and behavioral disabilities (EBD) as well as Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). As part of her role, she is the acting principal of Hope Horizon and is on campus 1-2 per week.
Hagan, Tara	Reading Interventionist	Ms. Hagan provides Tier II and Tier III reading interventions to students that scored below a level II or lower on the FSA the previous year. In addition, she provides modeling and coaching for teachers that are new to Hope Horizon (or to the profession in general) in regards to reading.
Gillard, Vivian	PBIS Lead Teacher	Beyond her classroom duties (secondary mathematics teacher) Ms. Gillard is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the PBIS program in conjunction with the assigned BCBA.

**Is education provided through contract for educational services?**

No

**If yes, name of the contracted education provider.**

N/A

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Monday 7/1/2019, Sarah Leeanne Guy

**Total number of students enrolled at the school.**

26

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.**

10

**Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?**

10

**Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?**

0

**Number of teachers with ESE certification?**

10

**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.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	1	2	3	2	2	3	2	4	1	1	0	3	24
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	3	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	2	12
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	3	1	3	2	0	1	1	0	1	15
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	5
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	2	3	2	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	1	17

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	1	1	1	3	1	2	2	2	1	1	0	2	17

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/23/2023

2021-22 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	2	0	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	4	31
Attendance below 90 percent	2	0	3	3	1	3	3	1	3	0	0	0	2	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	2	3	2	1	3	1	0	0	1	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	10
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	11
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	3	1	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	16

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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		22%	55%					64%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								51%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								41%	54%
Math Achievement		23%	42%					65%	62%
Math Learning Gains								47%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									52%
Science Achievement		18%	54%					71%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		32%	59%					69%	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%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	42%	-42%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	43%	-43%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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%	55%	-55%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	58%	-58%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	36%	-36%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	50%	-50%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	21%	-21%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2022					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	42%	-42%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2022					
2019	0%	58%	-58%	67%	-67%

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2022					
2019	0%	54%	-54%	71%	-71%

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	62%	-62%	70%	-70%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	52%	-52%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	47%	-47%	57%	-57%

**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	10			33	42						
WHT				25							
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	14	54		24	54						
WHT	15			23	60						
FRL	7			17							
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	23		6	15						
FRL	21			9							

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	27
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	80
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	84%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
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
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
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
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
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
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - 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	25
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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.

**Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?**

READING: Students were monitored using the STAR360 test which was administered 3-4 times a year depending upon their grade level (K-2 students took it 4 times).

ATTENDANCE: Student attendance was measured using FOCUS reports and logs in the front office.

SUSPENSIONS: Student suspensions were measured used FOCUS reports.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

READING: Star 360 scores. Collectively, students at Hope Horizon made an over 8% growth on their scores (7% is equivalent to one year's growth). Staff utilized professional learning communities (PLCs) for the first time in which they learned about best practices and utilized data to drive instruction. In addition, Title I funds were allocated for more tools to facilitate hands on instruction.

RESTRAINTS: Throughout the school year, staff utilized physical restraints 33 times and seclusion 0

times. Although this number was slightly higher than the previous year (reflecting 25 restraints between the months of August-March of 2020); staff also utilized seclusion to mitigate these numbers. Therefore, administration hypothesized that restraints would increase significantly considering seclusion is no longer permitted. Throughout the school year, the number of restraints per month on average decreased over the 2021-2022 school year.

With the addition of a new full-time administrator on campus, a new Clinical Manager, and a different Board Certified Behavior Analyst, there was a heavy emphasis on evidence-based practices, least restrictive prompting, and following ethical guidelines. In addition, the new facility was designed to isolate and mitigate safety risks. There was a heavy emphasis on continued training, practice, and feedback of both Safety Care procedures as well as implementing Positive Behavior Intervention Plans (PBIPs) with fidelity.

**What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?**

READING: Although we met our goal in the 2021-2022 school year to increase STAR360 scores, we did not see this growth generalized to FSA scores.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

READING: Students were continuously monitored using quarterly STAR data which was correlated with FSA scores. While we showed an overall increase of 8% growth on STAR scores as a school, we did not see this same level of improvement in Reading FSA scores (10 students scoring a 1, 6 scoring a 2, multiple students did not test).

ATTENDANCE: Student attendance was measured using FOCUS reports. Last year, our goal was to improve student attendance from 79% to 84%, which achieved 83% (4% growth).

SUSPENSIONS: In looking at the early warning data for the 25 students we are beginning the year with, 15/25 (60%) have had one or more days of out of school suspension.

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

READING: We have re-designed our master schedule to ensure a daily intervention course for students that scored below a 3 on the reading FSA. In addition, staff are working towards building independence skills and testing stamina so that students are not fatigued when taking lengthy tests. Also, staff will continued to receive professional development in multi-sensory instruction, strengthening Tier I supports (e.g., visuals), and utilizing data to make instructional decisions.

ATTENDANCE: We have re-written our policies and procedures to more accurately track student attendance and hold families and students more accountable. First, families are called every time a student is absent. Second, late and tardy data is being more closely monitored and recorded. Third, data is being publicly reported on a weekly basis in the school newsletter in order to communicate the importance of being at school to families. Fourth, staff are being held more accountable for their attendance in order to model good attendance. Lastly, staff are learning about methods to make their classrooms a more welcoming and positive learning environment to entice students to come to school consistently.

BEHAVIOR: First, the instructional leadership team is placing a heavy focus on fidelity of implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention Plans (PBIPs) as well as the fidelity of data recording and reporting. This data is being graphed daily for decision-making, planning social skills instruction, and debriefing major incidence. In addition, all staff at Hope Horizon are participating in a Book study (Dare to Lead).

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders.**

READING: Professional learning communities, formal mentoring of new teachers, teacher full day and part-day professional learning on evidence based instruction and Tier I/II supports.

ATTENDANCE: PLCs which include counselors to analyze student attendance data and research successful interventions that are tailored to each student beyond the new school systems in place.

BEHAVIOR: Ongoing Safety Care re-certifications, Behavior Skills Training on new PBIPS, and Tier II/III positive behavioral strategies. In addition, Date to Lead PD focusing on building courage in our students to face their fears in the classroom.

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. 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.

Improving the students' proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) will both enhance students' ability to successfully transition to less restrictive educational settings but also allow students to pursue standard high school diplomas and post-secondary careers. 68% (17/25) of students enrolled at Hope Horizon have been identified as reading below grade level. Additionally, this is the second year of implementing new ELA standards and we have four new staff members teaching reading.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Given a dedicated daily reading intervention class and interventionist, students at Hope Horizon will increase average words per minute from 165 to 180 by the end of the year.

**Monitoring:**

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

Routine progress monitoring will take place on a weekly basis and reported with weekly Metrics. Data will be analyzed and used to drive instructional outcomes and professional development in weekly professional learning communities (PLCs).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdf1.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Teachers at Hope Horizon will partake in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) in order to unpack the new reading standards, explore the curriculum, and share materials/resources, and engage in professional development on evidence-based practices.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

PLCs are an evidence-based practice in which teachers partake in collaborative learning-centered around student data, planning, implementation, and reflection (DuFour et al., 2016). Historically, teachers at Hope Horizon (previously Lakeview School Day Support) have not had dedicated time to collaboratively focus on curriculum and instruction. Last year (2021-2022), Hope Horizon teachers started PLCs which were lead primarily by the AOSA. This year, the goal is to gradually release the responsibility of facilitating PLCs off to the teachers (while the AOSA participates and provides feedback and guidance).

**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.

Reintroduce PLCs, particularly to new teachers and education support professionals

**Person Responsible**

Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdf1.us)

Establish common planning times for specified groups (e.g., teachers, instructional behavior assistants, and behavior technicians.

**Person Responsible**

Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdf1.us)

Update accountability measures and resources to ensure PLC cycles are carried out with fidelity (e.g., Guidance documents, meeting minutes templates, assigned facilitators).

**Person Responsible**

Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdf1.us)

Implement weekly PLCs with consistency beginning by September 15, 2022.



**Person Responsible**

Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfi.us)

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

**#2. Other specifically relating to Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** In an examination of data from the 2021-2022 school year, student attendance averaged at 83%. Research indicates that students with disabilities require intensive and consistent instruction and supports. Continuity of instruction and fidelity of implementation of programming are both indicators for academic and behavioral success (Schwartz et al., 2020; Stahmer et al., 2014).  
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

**Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.  
 Provided Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and the implementation of Restorative Practices, average student attendance per month will increase to 86% by June of 2022.

**Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.  
 Attendance will be monitored on a daily basis and attendance data will be shared with the community via the website, front office window, and weekly newsletter. Families of students who miss more than ten days collectively (other than for COVID-related quarantines) will be invited to an MTSS meeting with a cross-disciplinary team to determine if further interventions and supports are required. Next, families will be called upon every student absence. Finally, data recording of tardiness and early dismissals has been improved in order to ensure more valid data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.  
 Restorative Practices "are an effective way of implementing restorative justice, through starting a conversation wider than just the victim and the offender. [They are] proven to be an effective way of healing and building relationships, tackling bullying within schools and providing a sense of community" (Follestad & Wroldsten, 2018).

MTSS is a routine and structured system which systematically examines data to identify struggling students and intervene quickly. This approach requires a cross disciplinary team to examine the whole child rather than specific silos. Meetings will take place every 4.5 weeks of school.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Restorative Practices are an evidence-based strategy in which students learn to take responsibility for their actions (including attendance; Follestad & Wroldsten, 2018).  
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.  
 Additionally, MTSS is an evidence-based and systematic approach in which educators utilize data to pre-emptively identify and mitigate issues that may inhibit academic progress (Eagle et al., 2013).

**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.

Update MTSS documents and data sheets.

**Person Responsible** Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfl.us)

Provide training to staff responsible for recording data.

**Person Responsible** Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfl.us)

Communicate a clear timeline and deadlines for data submission and analysis.

**Person Responsible** Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfi.us)

Identify students for Tier II/III interventions and/or parent meetings.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

During the first seven days of the 2022-2023 school year, students at Hope Horizon displayed an overall average of 87% of their individual replacement behaviors outlined in their Positive Behavior Intervention Plan (PBIP).

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Given staff professional development on Daring Classrooms and use of Restorative Circles, students at Hope Horizon will increase their overall average replacement behavior from 87% to 90% by the end of the year.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Instructional Leadership Team (Program Specialist, Administrator on Special Assignment, Board Certified Behavior Analyst, and Clinical Manager) will be routinely conducting classroom walkthroughs, completing fidelity of implementation checklists for PBIPS, and conducting inter-observer agreement (IOA) data analysis on student point sheets. In addition, the BCBA will utilize Behavior Skills Training (BST) to train staff on new PBIP procedures and provide ongoing feedback and support.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

In order to decrease student target behavior and increase replacement behaviors, staff will utilize PBIPs written by the school's Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA). These documents are based on principles of applied behavior analysis (ABA). Staff will be trained and monitored using Behavior Skills Training (BST), which is a systematic approach to training and monitoring the fidelity of implementation of behavior analytic programming.

Next, staff will utilize both the Dare to Lead curriculum in conjunction with Restorative Practices in an effort to infuse social-emotional learning and therapeutic supports into daily routines.

ABA is a scientific approach to decreasing problematic behaviors and increasing skill acquisition (Cooper, Heron, & Heward, 2019). BST is an evidence-based approach in which practitioners use with supervises to teach a new skill or program to a specified criterion (Parsons & Rollyson, 2012).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

"Dare to Lead" is a curriculum designed by Dr. Brene Brown (2018) which is designed to help teachers (and other professionals) instill a sense of courage and cultivate a culture of bravery within the classroom.

Restorative Practices are an evidence-based strategy in which students learn to take responsibility for their actions (i.e., replacement and target behaviors; Follestad & Wroldsten, 2018).

**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.

Design data sheets to track longitudinal data, fidelity of implementation, and inter-observer agreement.

**Person Responsible** Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfl.us)

Train staff responsible for completing respective data sheets.

**Person Responsible** Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfl.us)

Conduct random and routine walkthroughs to collect data, analyze, provide feedback, reflect, and make changes to practice.

**Person Responsible** Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfl.us)

Create PD schedule for Dare to Lead (across first four months of school).

**Person Responsible** Jared Stanley (jstanley1@ecsdfl.us)

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

**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**

100% of students in K-2 scored below grade-level in ELA on the STAR360 and iReady assessments throughout the 2021-2022 school year.

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

100% of students in 3-5 scored a 1 on the FSA in ELA throughout the 2021-2022 school year.

#### **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)**

Given a dedicated reading intervention class and interventionist, students at Hope Horizon will increase to and average of 75 words per minute by the end of the year.

#### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Given a dedicated reading intervention class and interventionist, students at Hope Horizon will increase to an average of 100 words per minute by the end of the year.

#### **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.

Students will be given a reading passage and timed once a week during their reading intervention block. This data collection will be monitored by the reading interventionist and her instructional behavior assistant.

#### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hagan, Tara, thagan@ecsdfl.us

**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?

Students will be utilizing various hands-on and multi-sensory Tier III intervention programs. These programs (e.g., Sonday systems, Tyner) are selected based off an initial student baseline assessment and decision-making tree.

**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?

These Tier III interventions were selected by the districts ELA department for students that are reading significantly below grade level and provide explicit and specially designed instruction to students with disabilities.

**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
Collect baseline data.	Hagan, Tara, thagan@ecsdfi.us
Place students in appropriate interventions.	Hagan, Tara, thagan@ecsdfi.us
Collect ongoing data (i.e., words per minute)	Hagan, Tara, thagan@ecsdfi.us
Routinely meet to analyze data and adjust instruction based upon need.	Hagan, Tara, thagan@ecsdfi.us

### Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

#### Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

PBIS linked to classroom management strategies

#### Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

In an effort to measure various stakeholders' input and engagement, numerous data points will be collected and analyzed in an effort to progress monitor. This information includes:

PARENTS: Attendance at events (e.g., IEP meetings, Parent-Teacher Conferences, Title I/School-wide Events) and parent satisfaction surveys.

STUDENTS: Daily Point Sheet Data, PBIS Event Data, Student Referrals, Student satisfaction surveys.

STAFF: Attendance at school-sponsored teambuilding events, attendance at professional development, and staff satisfaction surveys.

#### Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

Hope Horizon attempts to build a positive school culture and environment for both students, families, and staff using a variety of strategies.

First, staff are encouraged to participate in routine team building activities during the workday and are provided organized extra-curricular events outside of work hours to bond with their colleagues. Previous events have included activities such as Friday game days, off-campus Axe throwing, bon fires, etc. In conjunction, the staff are given the opportunity to engage in differentiated professional development, professional learning communities, and access to necessary instructional resources. Administration provides multiple avenues to ask questions and reflects with staff on processes and procedures (e.g., open-door policy, meeting requests) and facilitates routine staff debriefs to process difficult circumstances. In difficult circumstances, leadership has also facilitated restorative circles to provide clarification, solve miscommunications, and rebuild relationships. Additionally, staff are provided additional incentives in an effort to recognize and reward staff for meeting or exceeding expectations.



Next, students are provided with a structured positive behavior intervention system (PBIS) to foster expected school behaviors as well as individualized behavior intervention plans which explicitly teach replacement behaviors. Reinforcers are selected based on student choice and preference assessments. Students are provided the ability to request breaks throughout the instructional day and are provided additional resources beyond a typical school to meet their basic needs (e.g., additional food, water bottles, extra clothing, medication, community room). In addition to these Tier III supports, the school's PBIS system creates opportunities for incentive-based activities (e.g., monthly events, surprise community room, activity period Fridays). Lastly, therapeutic interventions and supports are embedded throughout the day which includes one-on-one counseling, group therapy, and restorative circles. Finally, families are supported in a variety of ways which include ongoing daily communication, routine conferences (e.g., parent-teacher conferences, Individualized Education Plan meetings).

**Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.**

All stakeholders will be surveyed at the end of the first and third quarters to measure growth and satisfaction of the program.

In addition, stakeholder attendance and behavioral data will be taken throughout the year at respective events.

This information will be collected and analyzed by the following team:

- Donna Perry- EBD & ASD Program Specialist
- Jared Stanley- Administrator on Special Assignment
- TBD- Board Certified Behavior Analyst
- Vivian Gillard- PBIS lead teacher
- Sherry King- Teacher, School Testing Coordinator (Secondary), & Technology Coordinator
- Courtney Davis- Teacher, School Testing Coordinator (Elementary)
- Tara Hagan- Reading Interventionist
- Rachel Haynes- Clinical Manager

**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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Develop stakeholder surveys.	Stanley, Jared, jstanley1@ecsdfi.us
Administer Baseline Survey	Stanley, Jared, jstanley1@ecsdfi.us
Analyze data from Survey 1 and implement interventions.	Stanley, Jared, jstanley1@ecsdfi.us
Re-administer post-baseline assessment in the spring.	Stanley, Jared, jstanley1@ecsdfi.us