
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Challenger K 8 School Of Science And Math

13400 ELGIN BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/ck8>

Demographics

Principal: Rosemarie Maiorini

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	52%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (76%) 2014-15: A (80%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Hernando 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Challenger K 8 School Of Science And Math

13400 ELGIN BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/ck8>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>47%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>30%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Maiorini, Rosemarie	Principal	Oversees all grade level leaders, department heads, and non-instructional staff to promote the education and welfare of students and families of Challenger K8.
Warrell, Debbye	Instructional Media	Media Specialist, oversees Reading Counts and Sunshine State Readers program
Liberty, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Second grade team leader responsible for leading collaborative planning and data review to prepare for SBLT.
Hayden, Julia	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Leader responsible for leading collaborative planning and data review to prepare for SBLT.
Doulk, Colleen	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Head responsible for leading collaborative planning and data review to prepare for SBLT.
Davis, Janice	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Head responsible for leading collaborative planning and data review to prepare for SBLT.
Goodworth, Carli	Teacher, K-12	Represents Middle School Electives in SBLT
Kean, Jason	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Head responsible for leading collaborative planning and data review to prepare for SBLT.
Carlo, Lauren	School Counselor	Middle School Guidance Counselor over 6th grade and the second half of 7th grade responsible for scheduling and social/emotional support.
Ehlenbeck, Leonette	Teacher, K-12	Elementary Specials team leader responsible for leading collaborative planning and data review to prepare for SBLT.
Erb, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	Eighth grade team leader responsible for leading collaborative planning and data review to prepare for SBLT.
Ellis, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Fifth grade team leader responsible for leading collaborative planning and data review to prepare for SBLT.
Bristol, Ruthann	Teacher, K-12	Represents MS Electives responsible in SBLT.
Cornillow, Caroline	Teacher, K-12	Fourth grade team leader responsible for leading collaborative planning and data review to prepare for SBLT.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gomez, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten team leader responsible for leading collaborative planning and data review to prepare for SBLT.
Plummer, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Seventh grade team leader responsible for leading collaborative planning and data review to prepare for SBLT.
Kloiber, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Sixth grade team leader responsible for leading collaborative planning and data review to prepare for SBLT.
Cooper, Jayna	Assistant Principal	Oversees all Middle School evaluations, disciplines, data chats, and leadership team meetings.
O'Rourke, Cari	Assistant Principal	Oversees all Elementary evaluations, disciplines, data chats, and leadership team meetings.
Minichino, Jillian	Assistant Principal	Oversees all Quest evaluations, disciplines, data chats, and leadership team meetings.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	97	100	122	152	159	174	196	218	209	0	0	0	0	1427
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	1	5	8	10	6	7	18	8	9	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	6	19	12	4	4	0	0	0	0	47

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	14	11	17	25	30	35	56	48	55	0	0	0	0	291

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

95

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

Prior Year - 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	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 with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Prior Year - 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	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 with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	86%	70%	61%	87%	64%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	61%	59%	70%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	52%	54%	65%	48%	51%
Math Achievement	91%	70%	62%	93%	70%	58%
Math Learning Gains	76%	58%	59%	78%	63%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%	58%	52%	79%	60%	50%
Science Achievement	84%	60%	56%	84%	59%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	96%	83%	78%	95%	79%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	97 (0)	100 (0)	122 (0)	152 (0)	159 (0)	174 (0)	196 (0)	218 (0)	209 (0)	1427 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (3)	0 (6)	1 (6)	2 (6)	1 (10)	1 (9)	1 (6)	0 (14)	2 (17)	8 (77)
One or more suspensions	1 (11)	5 (10)	8 (3)	10 (4)	6 (7)	7 (12)	18 (4)	8 (16)	9 (11)	72 (78)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (2)	2 (1)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	4 (4)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (3)	6 (6)	19 (27)	12 (4)	4 (10)	4 (8)	47 (58)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	89%	57%	32%	58%	31%
	2018	92%	62%	30%	57%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	87%	59%	28%	58%	29%
	2018	91%	53%	38%	56%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	83%	52%	31%	56%	27%
	2018	76%	53%	23%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
06	2019	82%	52%	30%	54%	28%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	87%	53%	34%	52%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
07	2019	89%	53%	36%	52%	37%
	2018	83%	51%	32%	51%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	84%	53%	31%	56%	28%
	2018	84%	54%	30%	58%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	94%	62%	32%	62%	32%
	2018	95%	67%	28%	62%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	62%	28%	64%	26%
	2018	91%	60%	31%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	77%	54%	23%	60%	17%
	2018	78%	56%	22%	61%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
06	2019	88%	53%	35%	55%	33%
	2018	91%	53%	38%	52%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
07	2019	96%	62%	34%	54%	42%
	2018	97%	63%	34%	54%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	99%	50%	49%	46%	53%
	2018	97%	53%	44%	45%	52%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	79%	55%	24%	53%	26%
	2018	77%	56%	21%	55%	22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	89%	54%	35%	48%	41%
	2018	89%	56%	33%	50%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	58%	-58%	65%	-65%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	75%	21%	71%	25%
2018	97%	74%	23%	71%	26%
Compare		-1%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	59%	41%	61%	39%
2018	100%	62%	38%	62%	38%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%
2018	100%	45%	55%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

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	58	53	50	64	62	58	50	75			
ELL	87	75		94	85						
ASN	97	74		100	94		90				
BLK	84	67		81	58	40	80				
HSP	85	64	63	88	74	72	77	96	48		
MUL	89	63		95	74		96	100	67		
WHT	86	69	60	92	76	76	85	96	55		
FRL	85	70	60	88	72	71	80	94	49		
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		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	691

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	59
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	85
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	91
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	68
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	83
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	77
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	74
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our bottom quartile in ELA showed the lowest performance, demonstrating only 61% proficiency. The addition of the writing component to the Fourth-Eighth Grade FSA challenges our bottom quartile, particularly the evidence and elaboration pieces. Students struggle with stamina and persistence through multiple texts. We also found in some circumstances that interventions and accommodations are not correlating directly to deficiencies.

Another group we are closely monitoring is our "cusp students", the group just below our top quartile. Thirty percent (30%) of this group did not make learning gains. Due to our students' level of proficiency, it is more difficult to demonstrate gains. Our proficient and higher students were not always challenged to increase the rigor in Tier 1 as well as in On-Level and Enrichment groups during the Rtl block.

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

Bottom quartile in ELA dropped from 66% to 61%, in spite of an increase in District and State- by 4 percentage points and 2 percentage points respectively. The addition of the writing component to the Fourth-Eighth Grade FSA challenges our bottom quartile, particularly the evidence and elaboration pieces. Students struggle with stamina and persistence through multiple texts. We also found that interventions and accommodations are not correlating directly to deficiencies.

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.

Bottom quartile in ELA is above the State average by 7 percentage points. However, our percentage decreased while the State average increased in this area from last year. In all other components, we were 9 to 29 points above the State average.

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

Our lowest quartile in Math increased 3 percentage points from 70% to 73%. This was our SIP focus last year and we feel this increase was a result of close monitoring of MTSS interventions and ESE accommodations. Data Chats with Gen Ed and ESE teachers always included frank discussion of at-risk students. Guidance and School Social Worker addressed behavior, social/emotional, and truancy concerns that led to further supports for the bottom quartile.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Our number of Level 1 scores in fifth grade remains high at 35.

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

1. Seventy-five percent (75%) of cusp students will demonstrate Learning Gains in ELA.
2. The percent of students in the bottom quartile for ELA demonstrating proficiency will increase by 3 percentage points from 61% to 64%.
3. The number of Fifth Graders scoring Level 1 on statewide assessments will decrease by 4 from 23 to 19.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Learning Gains
Rationale	Our high percentage of proficient students requires us to "Raise the Bar" in ELA instruction and our expectations of students to ensure continued growth and success in Middle School accelerated learning paths. Students in our upper third demonstrated learning gains and proficiency higher than the median group, therefore the median group was selected.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To increase learning gains of the median students to 75% by focusing on rigor, relevance, and student engagement in ELA instruction. 2. To enhance writing instruction in all content areas, leading to learning gains and increased proficiency in ELA for all students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rosemarie Maiorini (maiorini_r@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will utilize fluid walls in Rtl and the resources provided for schoolwide focuses of relevance, rigor, and student engagement when designing ELA instruction to enhance learning gains of the median (the middle) students. 2. Teachers will provide multiple opportunities for text-based writing, and then review and analyze student writing to determine needs and plan for student support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When instruction is relevant to students, and includes opportunities for meaningful work, authentic resources, and learning connections, student engagement increases and learning can be accurately assessed with formatives that include questioning and academic discussions. 2. Students need opportunities to practice the skills of citing evidence and using elaboration guided by a clear rubric. Teachers then need to analyze this student work to determine instructional implications. Students who struggle with reading stamina and comprehension require additional supports in writing in order to provide the evidence and elaboration necessary to demonstrate proficiency.
Action Step	

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fluid walls are promoted in Rtl to allow for on-level and enrichment groups. 2. An additional resource teacher was scheduled into every MTSS block in grades K-5. 3. Instructional staff were given Focus Area cards to use as a guide in planning instruction. 4. Staff received the "Rigorous Learning Toolkit" to reflect on their practice and move toward Quadrant D of rigor, with the final goal of Adaptation of content knowledge. 5. Rubrics (Relevance, Rigor, and Learner Engagement) were given to teachers to serve as a guide when lesson planning. 6. Teachers representing all grade levels and departments K-8 will participate in a book study of "Moving Beyond Quadrant A: Developing Rigor, Relevance, and Learner Engagement in Your Classroom." II. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monthly data chats will provide opportunity for vertical planning and student work analysis to identify strengths and weaknesses in evidence and elaboration.
--------------------	--

2. Administration will collaborate with District coaches to provide "Just In Time PD" based on student and staff needs evident in student work and DELAW results.
3. Writing instruction focused on evidence and elaboration will occur regularly and students will use rubrics to monitor and assess their work.
4. K-8 ELA teachers will participate in Learning Walks to enhance vertical articulation.

Person Responsible Cari O'Rourke (orourke_c@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

We will continue to support our bottom quartile students in Math by reviewing interventions and accommodations to ensure they match student deficits. This will be accomplished in fluid walls MTSS blocks and through collaboration and problem solving with ESE teachers.