

Manatee County Public Schools

Horizons Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Horizons Academy

1910 27TH ST E, Bradenton, FL 34208

<https://www.manateeschools.net/horizons>

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.

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, 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
Hird, James	Principal	Responsible for Instructional leadership and all aspects of school management.

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.

Administration, including Dean and Student Support Specialists, worked with Department Chairs, School Advisory Council Chairperson and Title I Resource Teacher to review school wide data and trends.

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))

Instructional Leadership Team will meet monthly to discuss school wide data and to monitor each aspect of our School Improvement Plan. Attendance, passing rates and benchmark data will be reviewed and analyzed to determine whether action steps/strategies are proving fruitful. Adjustments will be made to the plan (specifically to the action steps or strategies employed, as necessary).

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)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	77%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: MAINTAINING
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	63	238
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	19	42	144
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	12	23	175
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	11	17	140
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	0	0	1	2	3	3	21	59	267

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	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	19	65	279

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	63	81
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	19	42	68
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	12	23	40
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	11	17	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	0	0	1	2	3	3	21	59	89

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	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	19	65	95

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	2	48	53	7	50	55	7		
ELA Learning Gains				17			29		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	0	57	55	0	40	42	0		
Math Learning Gains				11					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	5	53	52	0	56	54	0		
Social Studies Achievement*	0	72	68	11	57	59			
Middle School Acceleration		70	70		53	51			
Graduation Rate	23	63	74	51	52	50	43		
College and Career Acceleration	13	53	53	14	76	70	16		
ELP Progress		46	55		66	70			

* 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](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	7
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	43
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	59
Graduation Rate	23

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	14
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	111
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	73
Graduation Rate	51

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	20	Yes	4	4
ELL	15	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	7	Yes	4	4
HSP	12	Yes	4	4
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	18	Yes	2	1
FRL	7	Yes	4	4

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	21	Yes	3	3
ELL	21	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	13	Yes	3	3
HSP	20	Yes	3	3
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	33	Yes	1	
FRL	16	Yes	3	3

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	2			0			5	0		23	13	
SWD	0									16	3	
ELL											1	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	0			0			0			6	5	
HSP	9									8	3	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	0									25	3	
FRL	5			0			5	0		7	6	

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	7	17		0	11		0	11		51	14	
SWD										33	8	
ELL										41	0	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	5	19		0	8		0			54	8	
HSP	5	7								53	16	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										49	16	
FRL	13	16		0	13		0	20		51	11	

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	7	29		0			0			43	16	
SWD										35	6	
ELL										48	0	

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										37	17	
HSP	17	40								51	8	
MUL										40		
PAC												
WHT										41	31	
FRL	4	30					0			42	13	

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
10	2023 - Spring	7%	44%	-37%	50%	-43%
05	2023 - Spring	*	53%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	12%	43%	-31%	47%	-35%
08	2023 - Spring	17%	45%	-28%	47%	-30%
09	2023 - Spring	9%	46%	-37%	48%	-39%
04	2023 - Spring	*	54%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	11%	45%	-34%	47%	-36%
03	2023 - Spring	*	47%	*	50%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	23%	59%	-36%	54%	-31%
07	2023 - Spring	21%	58%	-37%	48%	-27%
03	2023 - Spring	*	62%	*	59%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	64%	*	61%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	14%	41%	-27%	55%	-41%
05	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	55%	*

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	7%	45%	-38%	44%	-37%
05	2023 - Spring	*	49%	*	51%	*

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	13%	58%	-45%	50%	-37%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	5%	56%	-51%	48%	-43%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	21%	64%	-43%	63%	-42%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	69%	-47%	66%	-44%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	18%	58%	-40%	63%	-45%

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.

Most areas did not have the minimum of 10 students within each cell to register a percentage. The lowest performance shown was the graduation rate for Students with Disabilities (SWD). SWD percentage was 33. This was well below the school wide graduation rate of 51%. This may be explained by the increase in the number of SWD students that required a self contained setting. Students in these settings have struggled with managing their behavioral challenges. Multiple students that presented with very challenging behaviors, struggled with their interactions with other students that exhibited similar challenges and behaviors.

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

Most areas did not have the minimum of 10 students within each cell to register a percentage. The lowest performance shown was the graduation rate for Students with Disabilities (SWD). SWD percentage was 33. This was well below the school wide graduation rate of 51%. This may be explained by the increase in the number of SWD students that required a self contained setting. Students in these settings have struggled with managing their behavioral challenges. Multiple students that presented with very challenging behaviors, struggled with their interactions with other students that exhibited similar challenges and behaviors. Challenges with recruitment and retention of staff to work in this intense setting resulted in vacancies throughout the school year. This limited our ability to provide smaller groupings for students that would benefit from it.

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.

While we lagged well behind state averages for all areas, we were farthest behind in Mathematics and Science. Students may have struggled with the digital platform that we rely on to provide the variety of courses with a single subject area teacher for each core subject. This limits the amount of individual teacher or peer support in courses.

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

The area that showed the greatest improvement is graduation rate for black students. The percentage increase from 37% in 2021 to 54 % in 2022.

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

One area of concern is the low percentage of students scoring proficiently on state assessments and End of Course Exams. An additional area of concern is our chronically low attendance rate. Along with these concerns is the need for students to engage more with their coursework.

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

- Priority 1: Attendance
- Priority 2: Engagement/Course Completion
- Priority 3: Assessment Performance

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

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:

[no one identified]

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.)

Graduation Enhancement Technician will implement strategies 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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our school district has invested in the research that supports the use of Graduation Enhancement Technicians to improve attendance and graduation rates. Our Title I funds support a Graduation Enhancement Technician for our campus and a Title I Resource teacher. Additionally, UNISIG grant funds support a paraprofessional and Non Contracted Hourly funds extended instructional hours to provide academic and behavioral interventions for students.

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.

Provide extended instructional hours for students to receive academic and behavioral support from teachers and qualified staff

Person Responsible: Ryan Clarke (clarker@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 5, 2023, identified students will participate in extended instructional hours (2 hours/day, 3 days/week) supported by teacher, ESE teachers and paraprofessional, for a total of 108 days of academic and behavioral support.

#2. 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 student typically struggle on assessments. We will focus on instructional support for teachers and students that will lead to improved performance on district benchmark assessments as well as state assessments. Our school improvement rating should be positively impacted by our focus on instructional support.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June of 2024, we will increase our percentage of students showing growth in ELA state assessments by 10% and we will increase our percentage of students showing growth in Math state assessments by 10%, as evidenced by our School Improvement Rating.

Monitoring:

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

Our team will monitor student course completion in Edgenuity. Our Department Chairs, testing administrator and School Counselor will monitor students participation in district Benchmark assessments, EOC's and state assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Hird (hirdj@manateeschools.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.)

Students will receive small group support in ELA and Math courses. Students will be given opportunities to participate in intervention groups during extended hours, by ESE and CORE academic teachers. Where possible, students will participate in test preps strategies throughout the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The research shows that students need extended time on task is the best way to ensure student success. Our students have struggled with school attendance and engagement. Providing specific support and extending time for students to engage in guided practice should prove fruitful.

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.

Identify students participating in state assessments.
Identify current levels of performance on prior year state assessments.

Develop schedule of intervention and extended instructional time.
 Monitor student attendance and participation.

Person Responsible: James Hird (hirdj@manateeschools.net)

By When: Intervention and extended instructional time begins by September 5, 2023.

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).

CSI

In collaboration with the school administrative team, the Department of Federal Programs and Grants, along with the Executive Directors and curriculum team provide CSI schools support with aligning resources based on the school's areas of Focus. The team met in July of 2023 to review the UNISG grant application, SIP template, and additional funding sources to brainstorm with CSI's school to allocate funds based on the school's Areas of Focus. Feedback regarding plans were provided by the Federal Program and Grants team to ensure all UNSIG budgets were aligned to the assurances as identified in the grant application.

ATSI

State funds are not provided to assist ATSI schools. However, local funds are provided to schools based on PPA in the School District of Manatee County (Mission Critical). These funds can be used and will be used to address areas of focus to support Federal Index Groups that are performing below 41% proficiency. Once schools are given an allocation school leadership team in collaboration with the Executive Directors of Elementary and Secondary review plans and ensure resources are used appropriately.

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

NA

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.

NA

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?

NA

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?

NA

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

NA

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.

SIP and UNISIG budget will be reviewed at our Family Engagement events that are held quarterly along with SAC meetings. Families are provided updated information regarding student needs: academic and behavioral.

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))

Parents participate in development of our Title I Compact. Parent, stakeholder, and staff feedback is used to develop a working plan to the success of our students. Horizons has partnered with Community Based Organizations to connect with families to provide support in areas of need i.e. Counseling, Community Resource data-base, and parent information classes.

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)

Providing differentiated support to students through multiple platforms will assist with meeting the needs of the diverse population at Horizons.

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))

Project LFT grant through DOJ that focuses on Violence Prevention and connecting families to community resources. Coordination with LEA departments: ESOL, Title I, and Project Heart continues to support the students and families at Horizons.

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))

NA

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))

NA

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).

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$87,849.10
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
5100	150	0731 - Horizons Academy	UniSIG	1.0	\$21,218.00	
<i>Notes: Hire paraprofessional to support a positive culture and environment for all students as well as for classroom-tiered instruction based on the needs of students to increase student growth and proficiency.</i>						
5100	210	0731 - Horizons Academy	UniSIG		\$2,879.28	
<i>Notes: Retirement for paraprofessional</i>						
5100	220	0731 - Horizons Academy	UniSIG		\$1,623.18	
<i>Notes: FICA for paraprofessional</i>						
5100	231	0731 - Horizons Academy	UniSIG		\$3,322.74	
<i>Notes: Health Insurance for paraprofessional</i>						
5100	240	0731 - Horizons Academy	UniSIG		\$265.23	
<i>Notes: Workman's Compensation for paraprofessional</i>						
5100	232	0731 - Horizons Academy	UniSIG		\$48.80	
<i>Notes: Life Insurance for paraprofessional</i>						
5100	120	0731 - Horizons Academy	UniSIG	0.83	\$47,760.17	
<i>Notes: 6 Teachers for After School Tutoring (NCH) 2 hours per day, 3 days per week throughout the length of the school year to increase student growth and a positive environment on campus.</i>						
5100	210	0731 - Horizons Academy	UniSIG		\$6,481.05	
<i>Notes: Retirement for NCH (After School Tutoring)</i>						
5100	220	0731 - Horizons Academy	UniSIG		\$3,653.65	
<i>Notes: FICA for NCH (After School Tutoring)</i>						
5100	240	0731 - Horizons Academy	UniSIG		\$597.00	
<i>Notes: Workers Comp NCH (After School Tutoring)</i>						
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$3,743.65
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	

	5100	510	0731 - Horizons Academy	UniSIG		\$3,743.65
			<i>Notes: Student supplies as needed for increased growth (notebooks for journal entries and writing samples aligned to content area vocabulary, pens, markers, highlighters, and pencils)</i>			
Total:						\$91,592.75

Budget Approval

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

No