Volusia County Schools

Horizon Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Horizon Elementary School

4751 HIDDEN LAKE DR, Port Orange, FL 32129

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/horizon/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Kathryn Kearn

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Horizon, we strive to provide a nurturing environment, promoting Academic Development, Individual Growth, and Mutual Respect to develop productive, responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In educating our students at Horizon, we strive to empower them to communicate effectively, include everyone, show empathy, and demonstrate responsibility and perseverance.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kearn, Kathryn	Principal	
Speidel, Teresa	Assistant Principal	
Lilly, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	
Bagby, Meg	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair
Cassel, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12	
Fay, Catherine	Instructional Media	
Kinney, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Sandrowicz, Bianca	Teacher, ESE	
Stephens, Dana	Teacher, K-12	
Strickland, William	Teacher, ESE	
Wise, Kristy Jo	Teacher, K-12	
Affatato, Alice	Paraprofessional	
Lay, Vada	Teacher, K-12	
Valenti, Kelli	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/9/2021, Kathryn Kearn

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
66

Total number of students enrolled at the school
760

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	113	114	128	139	122	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	743
Attendance below 90 percent	18	23	26	21	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	23	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	16	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	0	0	8	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	3	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/23/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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	76	110	121	110	104	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	622
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	76	110	121	110	104	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	622
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%			65%	56%	57%	64%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	60%			55%	56%	58%	50%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%			47%	46%	53%	33%	39%	48%
Math Achievement	60%			69%	59%	63%	71%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	35%			59%	56%	62%	53%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	14%			53%	43%	51%	25%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	59%			65%	57%	53%	63%	58%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	73%	58%	15%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	59%	10%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	62%	56%	6%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

For the English Language Arts and Mathematics sections the number represents the total number of students tested during the i-Ready window. Percent proficiency is percentage of students scoring "Early On Grade Level" or "Mid or Above Grade Level" on the i-Ready diagnostic assessment. For the 5th Grade Science section the number represents the total number of students tested. This number consists of more than one assessment. / Percent proficiency is percentage
of students scoring 70% or above on the assessments. The progress monitoring tools utilized for 5th grade science are the district's SMT 1 and 2, and VSTs.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	115 / 32.17%	125 / 46.4%	130 / 59.23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	81 / 30.86%	88 / 39.77%	91 / 50.55%
	Students With Disabilities	19 / 15.79%	17 / 17.65%	17 / 11.76%
	English Language Learners	2 / 50%	2 / 0%	2 / 50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	113 / 24.78%	125 / 44.8%	129 / 55.04%
	Economically Disadvantaged	79 / 21.52%	87 / 37.93%	90 / 45.56%
	Students With Disabilities	18 / 16.67%	17 / 29.41%	17 / 23.53%
	English Language Learners	2 / 50%	2 / 50%	2 / 46.49%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	112 / 20.54%	126 / 42.86%	129 / 57.36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	78 / 16.67%	90 / 33.3%	90 / 50%
	Students With Disabilities	20 / 5%	24 / 12.5%	23 / 17.39%
	English Language Learners	5 / 0%	6 / 16.67%	5 / 40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	112 / 17.86%	123 / 34.15%	118 / 51.69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	78 / 11.54%	87 / 20.69%	80 / 43.75%
	Students With Disabilities	21 / 9.52%	21 / 14.29%	21 / 14.29%
	English Language Learners	5 / 40%	5 / 20%	5 / 60%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	110 / 55.45%	113 / 75.22%	121 / 76.03%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71 / 47.89%	77 / 68.83%	81 / 69.14%
	Students With Disabilities	22 / 18.18%	21 / 42.86%	22 / 45.45%
	English Language Learners	3 / 66.67%	3 / 66.67%	3 / 33.33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	104 / 30.77%	111 / 48.65%	114 / 59.65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66 / 24.24%	75 / 37.33%	75 / 49.33%
	Students With Disabilities	20 / 15%	21 / 41.29%	20 / 25%
	English Language Learners	3 / 66.67%	3 / 66.67%	3 / 33.3%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	105 / 37.14%	112 / 43.75%	110 / 57.27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66 / 24.24%	72 / 31.94%	70 / 51.43%
	Students With Disabilities	30 / 13.33%	30 / 13.33%	27 / 18.52%
	English Language Learners	4 / 25%	4 / 25%	4 / 50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	105 / 20.95%	114 / 44.74%	108 / 62.04%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66 / 13. 64%	74 / 29.73%	66 / 54.55%
	Students With Disabilities	29 / 3.45%	32 / 18.75%	27 / 29.63%
	English Language Learners	4 / 25%	4 / 50%	4 / 50%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	95 / 41.24%	103 / 41.90%	102 / 51.89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63 / 32.31%	70 / 30.99%	67 / 42.65%
	Students With Disabilities	17 / 11.11%	20 / 10%	17 / 23.53%
	English Language Learners	3 / 33.33%	4 / 75%	4 / 100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	98 / 33.67%	101 / 44.55%	104 / 58.65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66 / 24.24%	68 / 36.76%	68 / 50%
	Students With Disabilities	17 / 5.88%	19 / 0%	18 / 5.56%
	English Language Learners	3 / 33.33%	4 / 50%	4 / 75%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	449 / 64%	379 / 74%	292 / 85%
	Economically Disadvantaged	295 / 57%	257 / 67%	199 / 79%
	Students With Disabilities	63 / 29%	60 / 29%	47 / 44%
	English Language Learners	15 / 33%	14 / 75%	12 / 100%

Subgroup Data Review

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	29	38	30	28	13	18	18				
ASN	80			90							
BLK	31	40		35	20		21				
HSP	50			48							
MUL	65			56							
WHT	71	64	50	66	43	9	69				
FRL	54	56	53	51	33	11	52				

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	32	51	52	34	48	47	33				
ELL		50			70						
ASN	92			100							

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
BLK	28	32	35	40	50	52	29				
HSP	69	52	50	64	63	55	67				
MUL	74	73		87	60						
WHT	72	61	52	75	61	50	73				
FRL	58	50	45	59	51	52	56				

2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	31	34	27	42	45	21	27				
ASN	88	73		82	73						
BLK	36	43	36	39	30	19	19				
HSP	71	50		64	53	50					
MUL	67	42		67	33						
WHT	69	51	23	80	59	20	75				
FRL	57	46	30	63	48	24	52				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	340
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	

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

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

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

ELA Learning Gains and ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains are trending upward. Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains are our lowest areas. Science is trending downwards. Black/African American subgroup mirrors the trends in Math and Science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math Learning Gains, Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains, and Science Achievement are the three areas that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. More specifically, Math Learning Gains, Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains, and Science Achievement are the three areas that demonstrate the greatest need for the Black/African American subgroup.

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

Loss of learning time due to quarantines, social-emotional/ mental health needs, distance learning, changes of instructional method from face-to-face to virtual due to quarantines and fluctuating enrollment numbers, and the lowest quartile students on Volusia Live (virtual) struggled. The new actions that will be taken to address this need for improvement are to conduct PLCs focused on analyzing data (iReady, Progress Monitoring data, FSA), identifying student needs and planning appropriate interventions and enrichments. Follow-up PLCs (data chats) will be conducted to monitor progress, particularly in Math. Additionally, professional development on "Teacher Clarity" strategies / techniques will be provided throughout the year, along with targeted use of educational technology to meet students' needs.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Learning Gains
ELA Lowest Quartile
ELA Learning Gains for SWD subgroup
Math Learning Gains for SWD subgroup
Math Learning Gains for Lowest Quartile SWD subgroup

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

ELA intervention, coordination among Gen. Ed. and ESE teachers, data-driven PLCs, and early identification of SWD students' needs. The new actions taken were targeting iReady lessons and iReady scaffolding for comprehension lessons.

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

ELA: targeted enrichment with higher level text, consistent use of strategies across grade levels, tapping into the resources in Benchmark Advance
Math: student collaborative discussion, high expectations, consistent implementation of Number Talks, PLC time for math data
Science: consistent science instruction across grade levels, opportunities for students to do science and process their learning, team collaboration with planning

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

Science PD during PLC with emphasis on interactive, hands-on experiences; Ongoing PLC Math and ELA data review; Number Talks training for new teachers

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

Peer observations, demo lessons, vertical articulations, Teacher Clarity PL, intervention teachers, purposeful use of educational technology (IXL, BrainingCamp, iReady)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional Practice specifically related to MATH (Differentiation & Standards-aligned Instruction) This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 60% (Down from 71% in '17-18 & 69% in '18-19), Math Learning Gains were 35% (Down from 53% in '17-18 & '59% in '19-20), and the Math Lowest quartile performed at 14%. Our ESSA subgroups data shows a decline in SWD Math lowest quartile from 65% in '17-18 & '18-19 to only 18% in '20-21. Our ESSA subgroups data shows a decline in B/AA Math lowest quartile from 39% in '17-18, 40% in '18-19 to only 13% in '20-21.
Measureable Outcome:	Increase overall Math proficiency from 60% to 70%. Increase overall Math learning gains from 35% to 50%. Increase overall Math Lowest Quartile from 14% to 50%.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored through analyzing student data during PLCs, data-driven planning for intervention and enrichment, and on-going PD in "Teacher Clarity" and data-analysis. Math data that will be analyzed includes: district Topic Checks, district Progress Monitoring Assessments 1 & 2, and iReady diagnostic growth from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2 to Diagnostic 3. Persons responsible- Katie Kearn (Principal), Teresa Speidel (Assistant Principal), Liz Lilly (Academic Coach).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathryn Kearn (ktkearn@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategies are: Teacher Clarity (0.75), Small Group Learning (0.47), Interventions for Students with Learning Needs (0.77), and Enrichment (0.53). We will monitor this through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrators and coaches. Teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instruction for input on students' learning and determining next steps. We will also monitor progress through regular PLC meetings. PLC meetings will have an emphasis on student data-analysis, and how to strategically adjust instruction based on students' needs and plan for purposeful interventions and enrichment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: • have appropriately high expectations. • share their notions of success criteria with their students. • ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. • ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students; and • provide welcome feedback about where to move to next. Teacher Clarity was selected to help build teachers' capacity with standards- aligned instruction in math. Other evidenced-based strategies that support increased Math achievement are: Small Group Learning (0.47), Interventions for Students with Learning Needs (0.77), and Enrichment (0.53).

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct PLCs focused on analyzing data (iReady, Progress Monitoring data, FSA), identifying student needs and planning appropriate interventions and enrichments. Conduct follow-up PLCS (data-chats) to monitor progress, particularly in Math.

Person Responsible Kathryn Kearn (ktkearn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs/PLCs and integrate the following questions into their discussions: What do we want students to know? How will we know if they learned it? What will we do if they didn't learn it? What will we do if they already know it?

Person Responsible Elizabeth Lilly (ealilly@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in planning and implementing effective Math instruction (standards-based and differentiated small groups).

Person Responsible Elizabeth Lilly (ealilly@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct learning walks during the Math block & Math intervention block. Schedule Peer Observation/ Model lessons to showcase best practices in content areas, particularly Math.

Person Responsible Kathryn Kearn (ktkearn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Target use of technology to differentiate standards-aligned instruction to meet students' needs. (iReady, School City data, IXL, Braining Camp). Conduct professional Learning in the targeted areas of math standards to include technology software.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Lilly (ealilly@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Target intervention for Tier 3 students. Conduct monthly progress monitoring during Collaborative Planning with ESE, ELL, and Intervention teachers to review data and plan instruction and tasks that are aligned to the standard.

Person Responsible Kathryn Kearn (ktkearn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus #2: Culture and Climate specifically related to Social and Emotional Learning This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a safe, healthy, supportive environment. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that students earned a total of 378 discipline referrals during the '20-21 school year, resulting in 100 suspensions. The most common discipline offenses were: Disruption Intermediate (102), Hitting/Striking (67), Disruption Minor (49), Scuffing/Horseplay (30), Hitting/Striking an Employee (29), and Insubordination/Defiance (20).
Measureable Outcome:	Reduce the total number of discipline referrals and suspensions by 25% and strengthen PBIS supports.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored through analyzing student data during PLCs, implementing behavioral interventions for at-risk students, establishing a mentor program for at-risk students, and establishing a SEL Team for the purpose of regularly analyzing school-wide discipline data and developing school-wide PBIS initiatives and incentives to reward positive behavior. Persons responsible- Katie Kearn (Principal), Teresa Speidel (Assistant Principal), Liz Lilly (Academic Coach), Natalie Sheridan (Guidance Counselor), and Vada Lay (Teacher – Mentor Program Coordinator).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathryn Kearn (ktkearn@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategies are: Behavioral intervention programs (0.62), teacher student relationships (0.52), decreasing disruptive behaviors (0.34), and positive self-concept (0.41). We will monitor this through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrators and coaches. Teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instruction for students' social and emotional needs. The SEL Team will engage in regular data-analysis of discipline referral trends. The SEL Team will also monitor progress of PBIS criteria and incentives. The Guidance Counselor will provide behavioral interventions to the most at-risk students. Administration and teachers will work with the Mentor Coordinator to ensure at-risk students are matched with a mentor.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Continuing to implement behavioral intervention programs such as Sanford Harmony and PBIS, will decrease disruptive behaviors and increase positive self-concept. Behavioral intervention programs have a 0.62 effect size, teacher student relationships have a 0.52 effect size, decreasing disruptive behaviors has a 0.34 effect size, and positive self-concept has a 0.41 effect size, so they are all likely to have a positive impact on or accelerate student achievement. PBIS is an evidence-based, tiered framework for supporting staff behavior, student behavior, decision making, and social competence and academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement	
Implement mentor program for identified at-risk students (based on EWS data, Lowest Quartile data, discipline referral data, mental health data, and teacher observations).	
Person Responsible	Vada Lay (vmlay@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Identify students in need of small group behavioral interventions from the Guidance Counselor and develop intervention schedule. Monitor behavioral data and provide support to teachers with behavior charts as needed.	

Person Responsible	Teresa Speidel (tlspeide@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Eagle Pride Ceremonies & PBIS Celebrations (quarterly) to recognize student achievement and positive behaviors.

Person Responsible	Teresa Speidel (tlspeide@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Establish SEL Team with purpose of analyzing discipline and attendance data, developing criteria for positive behavior awards, and strengthening school-wide implementation of PBIS.

Person Responsible	Teresa Speidel (tlspeide@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct district ERPL on Equity and Diversity.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Kearn (ktkearn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Hire and use Title 1 Parent Liaison to support students and families.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Kearn (ktkearn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus #3: ESSA Subgroups specifically related to Black/AA subgroup and SWD subgroup. This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 60% (Down from 71% in '17-18 & 69% in '18-19), Math Learning Gains were 35% (Down from 53% in '17-18 & '59% in '19-20), and the Math Lowest quartile performed at 14%. Our ESSA subgroups data shows a decline in SWD Math lowest quartile from 65% in '17-18 & '18-19 to only 18% in '20-21. Our ESSA subgroups data shows a decline in B/AA Math lowest quartile from 39% in '17-18, 40% in '18-19 to only 13% in '20-21. More specifically, our B/AA students were only 31% proficient in ELA & 35% in Math. Both B/AA & SWD subgroups declined in ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains. The SWD subgroup declined from 59% to 36%, and B/AA subgroup went from 50% to 38%. Both subgroups also declined in Science, with SWDs going from 66% to 48%, and B/AAs declining from 29% to 21%. When looking at discipline data, a significant number of suspensions are from the B/AA and SWD subgroups. Out of 121 total suspensions, 59 were SWDs (49%), 70 were B/AA Males (58%), 41 were B/AA & SWD Males (34%), and 13 were B/AA & SWD Females (11%).
Measureable Outcome:	For SWDs, increase ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains, Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains to 50%. For B/AAs, increase ELA/Math/Science Proficiency, ELA/Math Learning Gains, and increase ELA/Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains to 50%. For suspensions, decrease the number of SWD and B/AA suspensions to 25% for each subgroup, so that overall suspension data mirrors or is more proportionately representative of the demographics of the schools' student population.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored through analyzing students' academic & behavioral data during PLCs, implementing academic/behavioral interventions/enrichment as needed, establishing a mentor program for at-risk students, and establishing a SEL Team for the purpose of regularly analyzing school-wide discipline data and developing school-wide PBIS initiatives and incentives to reward positive behavior. Persons responsible- Katie Kearn (Principal), Teresa Speidel (Assistant Principal), Liz Lilly (Academic Coach), Natalie Sheridan (Guidance Counselor), and Vada Lay (Teacher – Mentor Program Coordinator).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathryn Kearn (ktkearn@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The main evidence-based strategy we will use is Teacher-Led Interventions. Academic & behavioral data for these targeted subgroups will be at the forefront of regular PLC meetings to ensure that ALL students are achieving at high levels every day. Adjustments will be made to instruction to maximize B/AA and SWD subgroups success.
Rationale for Evidence-	Teacher-led interventions for students with learning needs, per Hattie's effect size, is 0.77. Therefore, making sure B/AA and SWD students have the right academic & behavioral intervention supports in place has the potential to considerably accelerate their potential.

based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct focused PLCs analyzing SWD and B/AA data to determine proper placement of students in classes for small group instruction, interventions, and enrichment. Follow-up with monthly data chats focused on reviewing progress and student groupings.

Person Responsible Kathryn Kearn (ktkearn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic Coach provides support for implementation through coaching cycles.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Lilly (ealilly@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implement mentor program for identified at-risk students (based on EWS data, Lowest Quartile data, discipline referral data, mental health data, and teacher observations).

Person Responsible Vada Lay (vmlay@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct ERPL on Diversity and Equity.

Person Responsible Kathryn Kearn (ktkearn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

After comparing our school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools across the state, we have identified threats as an area of concern. It is ranked as very high. Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:

School will: -Follow district established threat assessment protocols; Educate students about safe behavior using PBIS expectations; Educate students to report any potential threats to adults immediately; Establish an SEL/PBIS Team to monitor at-risk students; Utilize guidance counselor to ensure proper follow-up supports are in place for students after a threat assessment has been conducted; Admin. to participate in monthly district-led Threat Assessment meetings; Maintain close communication with parents/guardians of at-risk students and initiative additional services as needed.

Teachers will: -Teach school-wide PBIS expectations; Implement PBIS incentives; Follow school-wide discipline procedures to accurately report potential threats; Communicate regularly with admin. and home regarding at-risk students.

School culture and environment will be monitored through the number of discipline referrals and threat assessments. Admin. participates in monthly threat assessment meetings to review the nature and level of threats, and determine if additional supports need to be put in place. The PBIS team meets monthly to review discipline referral data. Admin. team communicates regularly with MTSS team (behavior specialist, guidance counselor, social worker, psychologist) about students with threat assessments and/or multiple discipline referrals to ensure appropriate supports are implemented including behavior interventions, counseling, functional behavioral assessment, behavioral intervention plan, crisis plan, and/or safety plan.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Horizon Elementary promotes a positive culture and environment by ensuring that stakeholder groups have a voice. Our School Leadership Team, comprised of grade chairs, school counselors, and administration meets regularly to review data, policy, and school improvement initiatives. Social Emotional Learning has been identified as an area of focus for

the last three years, and Horizon Elementary implemented a modified PBIS initiative as a response to this need.
We have PBIS team, representing all grade levels and ESE, that meets to plan, review, and adjust implementation. The entire faculty and staff, including clerical, cafeteria, and custodial workers, are part of the implementation and contribute to its success. Parents and community members, too, have a voice through PTA and SAC, which meet regularly. Both of these groups contribute to school improvement goals by providing input and allocating funding for tutoring and materials. We also have a volunteer and business partner coordinator who facilitates involvement and recognition of community contributions. Horizon Elementary collaborates with the district and local universities to host teacher interns and provide them with a positive and productive experience. Some of the teaching staff formerly served as interns at Horizon.
By ensuring stakeholder input and establishing clear lines of communication, Horizon Elementary has built positive and supportive school community. This year, Horizon is also implementing a mentoring program to help support a positive school culture an environment on campus by promoting positive relationships for students.

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

In addition to the stakeholders mentioned in the previous response, students, staff and families have the opportunity to complete an annual school climate survey. Input from the surveys is reviewed by the School Leadership Team. Administration also sends out a weekly School Messenger call-out to all families to promote open communication between the school and home. Student PBIS expectations are taught through beginning of the year assemblies with students, and then reinforced through the PBIS incentive program and student-led morning news announcements.

The school addresses building positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved by hosting events such as virtual Meet the Teacher, Open House, Title 1 Family Engagement nights and using the school website and social media pages for student recognition.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00