Educational Horizons Charter School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Educational Horizons Charter

1281 S WICKHAM RD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

http://www.educationalhorizons.net

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 10/11/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Turner, Cheryl	Principal	Cheryl serves as principal and administrator who will help coordinate the creation of SIP combining talents and contributions from team. She will organize date and interpret scores to measure student achievement and growth. She will help meet deadlines. She serves as GSP, ELL, and ESE support for the school and institutes the MTSS process.
Needle, Eileen	Administrative Support	Eileen serves as the front of the house and takes care of student services including registration, records, attendance, lunches and department of heath compliances. She will contribute data on SWD, FRL, attendance, truancy, family demographics, and ELL status to help in creation of SIP.
Murphy, Heidi	Teacher, K-12	Heidi serves as our teacher representation and is on the Educational Leadership team. She is our Montessori certified leader with knowledge of the method and philosophy. She will work closely with other teachers to collect information for the creation of the SIP.
Stevens, Lonna	Teacher, K-12	Lonna is a teacher in the classroom and also serves as our Title IX representative. Her data and knowledge of civil rights and equity will contribute to the creation of the SIP to help meet needs of all students.
Thorson, Erik	Parent Engagement Liaison	Erik is our school operator and parent liaison. He will represent the families and their needs. He will have a stake in the health and operations of the school as well as the financial stability.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our stakeholders will be involved in the creation, editing, and approval of our 2023-24 School Improvement Plan. They will include teachers, school staff, parents and families, governing school board, management, students, and our local community. The SIP team will begin with a review and reflection on last school years goals and measure success or shortcomings. Next, the school team will get together to review data, look for trends, and suggest goals for the new school year. Teachers and staff were able to meet at the end of the school year and give an exit interview with suggestions for improvement. All classroom teachers shared their students learning gains, growth, and deficits. As we meet during pre-planning, teachers and staff will see the school data and assessment scores and compare them to past years. Our governing school board met in July and went over the data and made suggestions for the SIP. Administration and staff reviewed the student and parent surveys from Spring 2023 to look for needs from our families. This information will be used in our planning of the SIP. A draft will be created and reviewed by stakeholders including parents. After edits and reviews, governing board will approve the plan. It will be a fluid plan that can be changed and amended as needed.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

After creation and approval of the plan, it will be shared with all associated with our school through our monthly PTO meeting, school website, available in the office for view, and kept in classroom binders for teachers, staff, and students to consult. Periodic review of student data and relevant information will be used to review student achievement and school health. We will use district and state progress monitoring data throughout the year which include STAR and FAST. Adjustments will be used in classrooms and school as needed to achieve the goals. If review shows a need to adjust or change goals, the SIP team of stakeholders will get together and suggest changes and edits. Then the plan will be reviewed by stakeholders and sent to a governing board meeting for final approval. This process will be ongoing for the school year.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	35%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	4	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	3	3	1	4	1	0	0	16

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

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	3	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	0	0	10
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	3	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	0	0	10
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	76	58	53	77	61	56	90		
ELA Learning Gains				50			81		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	84	58	59	88	49	50	79		
Math Learning Gains				85			88		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	62	58	54		60	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	306
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	300
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	54			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	81			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	75			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	76			84			62					
SWD	50			58							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	65			77							2	
FRL	72			89							2	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	77	50		88	85							
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67	31		83	77							
FRL	64			86								

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	90	81		79	88							
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	85			81								
FRL	100			91								

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	92%	59%	33%	54%	38%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
06	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	47%	*
03	2023 - Spring	79%	56%	23%	50%	29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	67%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	95%	60%	35%	59%	36%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	61%	25%	61%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	77%	55%	22%	55%	22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	62%	57%	5%	51%	11%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Looking at our data from this Spring 2023 and comparing it to the previous years data, we see the lowest performance was in Math with a decline from 88% to 86%. Although it is hard to compare because they were different assessments. Our grade 6 students only had a population of 9, so they are not included in the component. This assessment was also completely given on the computer which will have a factor on the scores.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Looking at the decline rates (again these are two different assessments and different platforms), Math declined by 2%. Across the last four years in Math, we see our scores were: 89 (2019), 79 (2021), 88 (2022), and 86 (2023).

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The ELA average for our school was 80% and the state was 52% (difference of 28%). For Math our average is 86% and the state average is 57% (difference of 29%). Our school scored above the state and the difference between both subjects was only 1%.

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

The most improvement was in the area of ELA with and improvement of 3%. Our goal for last year was an increase in ELA scores. We did not reach the 90% mark, but showed an increase. One action was to add the afternoon small group and intense basic reading concepts for all grades. Another action was using the PM 1 and PM 2 to guide instruction. Across the last four years in ELA, we see our scores were: 85 (2019), 90 (2021), 77 (2022), and 80 (2023).

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern is attendance for a few students and families. This is not a problem across the entire school and only affects a few families. We will address this but not include it in the SIP. Our number of students that are identified with reading deficits are higher this year and we use progress monitoring tools. We do not see a subgroup that is higher than the general population. This shows that we can work with all students who are below in reading with interventions in the after noon and in afterschool tutoring.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Using the BEST standards for Math and ELA increasing the student achievement.
2. Increase reading comprehension and fluency to increase reading success.
3. Have all teachers obtain reading endorsement to their certification
4. Increase parent involvement and participation.
5. Increase differentiation in classroom including Montessori materials and philosophy.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our school will work on year two of fully implementing Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinks (BEST) standards. In ELA there are 6 expectations and 4 strands. The Mathematical Thinking and Reading Standards (MTR) contain 7 overarching expectations for students to promote deeper leaning and understanding. Now that we are more familiar with them, we will use standards in our instruction to increase student achievement in ELA and Math.

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

Our students and teachers have experienced a year of the new STAR and FAST in ELA and Math assessments. We will expect our PM3 scores for students in grades K-6 to show 85% proficiency in ELA and 88% proficiency in Math.

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

Our teachers will meet after each of assessments PM 1 and PM 2 to chart progress in both ELA and Math. They will use the data to guide instruction, give additional support, and make adjustments to the daily routines as needed. They will report learning gains, growth, and deficits at tend of the year interviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheryl Turner (turner.cheryl@educationalhorizons.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will use additional time in the afternoon to give instruction in reading in small groups. We will allow more time for exploration in Mathematics to help build meaning in Math. We will invite students off track to afterschool tutoring once a week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To go deeper in the subject areas and make meaning of learning. Students will be able to transfer the knowledge taught into daily assignments.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 will review data from the previous year for current students.

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

By When: Within the first month of school. Review records and complete Form 1 of IPST to look at student dynamics.

Meet at data teams to review scores and report to peer teachers.

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

By When: Ongoing through out the year with the 3 Progress Monitoring tools.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We will increase our commitment to the Montessori philosophy of learning with small group instruction worked into our daily routine.

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

We will see increase independence and time management with our students.

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

By viewing lesson plans, doing walk throughs in the classroom, and monitoring student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheryl Turner (turner.cheryl@educationalhorizons.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Using small group instruction, we can see more independence and differentiation in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our school curriculum and charter focuses on Montessori instructing in the classroom.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 will demonstrate use of Montessori in the classroom.

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

By When: Ongoing through out the year. We will check on progress at weekly faculty meetings.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase parent involvement and participation in school. Have a more welcoming culture for families who have barriers for participation.

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

Each year parents are requested to give ten hours of volunteer time per our charter. We will collect data and monitor participation. We will remind parents mid year if they are not on track to compete the hours.

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

Volunteer sheets for each family are kept in the office, periodic checks will be done to see if families are on the track to complete the requested ten hours of volunteer time.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheryl Turner (turner.cheryl@educationalhorizons.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Reminders, invitations, parent surveys, PTO meetings, and classroom invitation to participate. We will also share the volunteer process from BPS with our families an encourage them to become a registered volunteer.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

National Education Association study shows a direct correlation between parent involvement and student success. Their ten year study shows that involvement can overcome socio-economic disadvantages.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Share application process for becoming a BPS district registered volunteer.

Person Responsible: Eileen Needle (needle.eileen@educationalhorizons.net)

By When: At registration and during the first few weeks of school.

Monitor volunteer family sheets. Remind families if they are not on track for ten hours for the school year.

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

By When: By February, notify parents.

Create opportunities for families to be involved and participate.

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

By When: Through out year, continually add opportunities and communicate with families via email and newsletters.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Not applicable

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

.

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

.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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?

.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

.

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

.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Not applicable

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Not applicable

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Not applicable

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Not applicable

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Not applicable

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Not applicable

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Not applicable

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Not applicable

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Not applicable

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5000	100	6511 - Educational Horizons Charter	General Fund	10.0	$1,000.00
			Notes: Give a stipend for Reading endorsement added to certification.			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24

	5000	500	6511 - Educational Horizons Charter	General Fund	10.0	$1,000.00
			Notes: Purchase Montessori materials as needed for classroom.			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				$0.00
					Total:	$2,000.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes