Challenger K 8 School Of Science And Math

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Challenger K 8 School Of Science And Math

13400 ELGIN BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34609

https://www.hernandoschools.org/ck8

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	47%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	A	A*

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to instill high standards of learning in our students by aligning all elements of school life to achieve educational excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ad astra per Aspera

"To the stars through hard work."

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Cropley, Lisa	Principal
Cullum, Olivia	Teacher, K-12
Longo, Deidre	Teacher, K-12
Warrell, Debbye	Instructional Media
Liberty, Megan	Teacher, K-12
Maiorini, Rosemarie	Assistant Principal
Hayden, Julia	Teacher, ESE
Bennett, Colin	Assistant Principal
Franz, Nicole	Teacher, K-12
Doulk, Colleen	Teacher, K-12
Davis, Janice	Teacher, K-12
Goodworth, Carli	Teacher, K-12
Kean, Jason	Teacher, K-12
Carlo, Lauren	School Counselor
Ehlenbeck, Leonette	Teacher, K-12
Hoogland, Denise	Teacher, K-12
Erb, Dawn	Teacher, K-12
Ellis, Amy	Teacher, K-12
Bristol, Ruthann	Teacher, K-12
Cornillow, Caroline	Teacher, K-12
Gomez, Lisa	Teacher, K-12
Plummer, Michelle	Teacher, K-12
Kloiber, Michelle	Teacher, K-12

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Each administrator is responsible for overseeing specific departments/grade levels. This includes participating in PLC's, data chats, and department/grade level meetings. Each administrator is also responsible for evaluating the personnel that they are overseeing.

Team Leaders and Department Chairs meet monthly with administration to present and discuss data from progress monitoring assessments, benchmark assessments, formative assessments, and RtiB. Additionally, the team develops an action plan (if necessary) based on areas in need of improvement based on the data that is presented.

Team Leader and Department Chairs support their teams by holding grade level/content specific team meetings to collaborate and plan meaningful standards-based lessons.

These leadership team members also participate in the interviewing and hiring process for new employees should a vacancy occur in their grade level/content area.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	6	6	6	10	9	6	14	17	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	11	10	3	4	7	12	4	16	11	0	0	0	0	78
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	6	27	4	10	8	0	0	0	0	58

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected
Wednesday 9/5/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	8	8	8	10	7	13	20	25	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	3	1	1	3	2	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	3	12	15	3	6	0	0	0	0	41
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	8	8	8	10	7	13	20	25	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	3	1	1	3	2	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	3	12	15	3	6	0	0	0	0	41
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Overall, our 2018 5th grade students showed the lowest proficiency performance in both ELA and Math compared to the proficiency performance of other grade levels. Districtwide, 5th grade performance was slightly lower than 2017, however, the district decline was not as significant as the school. We fell 6 percentage points in ELA and 3 percentage points in Math. The cohort comparison for our 5th grade Math students showed the greatest decline of 11 percentage points. This is not typically a trend for our school. Typically, 5th grade performs very well.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

5th grade ELA and 7th grade ELA showed the greatest decline from the prior year, dropping 6 percentage points each in proficiency. These drops in proficiency directly affected our overall ELA learning gains, causing a decrease of 5 percentage points schoolwide. In addition, looking at subgroup data, our black students showed a significant decrease of 6 percentage points in ELA proficiency from the prior year. This decline was also noticed in the 19 percentage point decrease in the ELA Learning Gains for our black students. Also significant in our subgroup data was the performance of SWD in ELA & Math. Both tested areas showed decreased proficiency as well as learning gains.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Although our school performs significantly above the district and state average across all of the tested areas, it is evident that the 5th grade Math showed the lowest comparison difference between the school and state proficiency. Challenger performed 17% above the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Overall, our 2018 4th grade ELA proficiency increased to 91% from 83% the prior year. The improvement does not appear to be a trend across our district, which declined by 2 percentage points from the prior year. The state showed no improvement in this area from 2017 to 2018.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Core Connections was fully implemented in 4th grade this year. Teachers received on-going training throughout the year and also participated in a targeted lesson study with a Core Connections trainer. The 4th grade team infused the Core Connections strategies throughout their Social Studies and Science content.

School Data
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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	86%	62%	60%	85%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	52%	57%	66%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	48%	52%	61%	45%	49%
Math Achievement	92%	68%	61%	92%	67%	56%
Math Learning Gains	77%	63%	58%	80%	62%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	57%	52%	77%	58%	48%
Science Achievement	83%	63%	57%	84%	57%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	97%	82%	77%	96%	82%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	3 (5)	6 (8)	6 (8)	6 (8)	10 (10)	9 (7)	6 (13)	14 (20)	17 (25)	77 (104)
One or more suspensions	11 (3)	10 (1)	3 (1)	4 (3)	7 (2)	12 (1)	4 (0)	16 (1)	11 (3)	78 (15)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	1 (1)	0 (0)	4 (3)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (2)	6 (3)	27 (12)	4 (15)	10 (3)	8 (6)	58 (41)

Grade Level Data
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	2018	92%	62%	30%	57%	35%
	2017	89%	61%	28%	58%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	91%	53%	38%	56%	35%
	2017	83%	55%	28%	56%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2018	76%	53%	23%	55%	21%
	2017	82%	54%	28%	53%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
06	2018	87%	53%	34%	52%	35%
	2017	89%	52%	37%	52%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
07	2018	83%	51%	32%	51%	32%
	2017	89%	51%	38%	52%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2018	84%	54%	30%	58%	26%
	2017	84%	49%	35%	55%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	95%	67%	28%	62%	33%
	2017	96%	66%	30%	62%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	91%	60%	31%	62%	29%
	2017	89%	66%	23%	64%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2018	78%	56%	22%	61%	17%
	2017	81%	57%	24%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
06	2018	91%	53%	38%	52%	39%
	2017	93%	53%	40%	51%	42%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
07	2018	97%	63%	34%	54%	43%
	2017	96%	61%	35%	53%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2018	97%	53%	44%	45%	52%
	2017	98%	53%	45%	46%	52%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	77%	56%	21%	55%	22%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	89%	56%	33%	50%	39%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		89%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	58%	-58%	65%	-65%
2017					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	97%	74%	23%	71%	26%
2017	95%	76%	19%	69%	26%
Compare		2%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	62%	38%	62%	38%
2017	100%	59%	41%	60%	40%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	45%	55%	56%	44%
2017	100%	50%	50%	53%	47%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

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	44	42	40	61	52	51	46	90			
ELL	73			100							
ASN	98	80		100	80		100		86		
BLK	82	52		89	77		93				
HSP	84	70	68	88	74	65	82	89	37		
MUL	95	74	64	95	80	71	79	100	45		
WHT	85	62	64	92	78	70	82	98	50		
FRL	85	65	66	90	75	67	81	96	31		
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	52	51	47	66	63	65	35				
ELL	56	73	73	100	100						
ASN	93	75		100	90		90	100	69		
BLK	88	71		94	78	90	64				
HSP	82	72	65	88	79	75	73	98	45		
MUL	87	72	72	94	80	80	92	100			
WHT	87	70	65	93	77	78	87	94	41		
FRL	85	66	61	91	76	78	78	93	24		

Part III: Planning for Improvement
Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Bottom Quartile Students with Disabilities in Math
Rationale	Subgroup data for students with disabilities in Math showed a 14 percentage point decrease in learning gains of our bottom quartile students from the prior year.
Intended Outcome	Increase the number of students making learning gains in our bottom quartile from 51% to 56%.
Point Person	Lisa Cropley (cropleypiesik_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	1. Ensure that every teacher/administration data chat includes detailed information on the performance of our students with disabilities in the lowest quartile. 2. Place 6-8 grade students with disabilities who are in the bottom quartile in an Intensive Math class that utilizes iReady instructional resources to focus on student learning gaps. 3. Utilize iReady diagnostic data for all grades to appropriately place students into intervention groups. 4. Work with ESE case managers to ensure students IEP goals accurately reflect areas of need and that related services are meeting the needs of each student. 5. Require all teachers to conduct student/teacher data chats after every iReady Math diagnostic.
Person Responsible	Lisa Cropley (cropleypiesik_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	1. Hold monthly data chats with teachers that includes detailed reporting of the performance/progress of the students with disabilities in the bottom quartile in Math. 2. Monitor instructional progress of Intensive Math students on a weekly basis utilizing reports from iReady. 3. Administration will monitor intervention criteria versus students placed in interventions to ensure all students who demonstrate Math deficiencies are receiving appropriate interventions. This will be monitored through participation in MTSSS meetings and after each diagnostic testing window. 4. Require ESE case managers to submit IEP progress reports to administration for those students who are in the bottom quartile in Math. 5. Observe teacher/student data chats taking place in classrooms after each diagnostic.
Person Responsible	Lisa Cropley (cropleypiesik_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$7,500.00**