Challenger 7 Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Challenger 7 Elementary School

6135 RENA AVE, Cocoa, FL 32927

http://www.challenger.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Courtney Maynor L

Start Date for this Principal: 9/3/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

> * 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 Brevard 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

Challenger 7 Elementary School

6135 RENA AVE, Cocoa, FL 32927

http://www.challenger.brevard.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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.

We will create a supportive environment in which children and adults feel welcomed, respected, safe and valued. Diversity is honored in our community where we collaborate to benefit the whole child.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Challenger 7 is a school in partnership with families and the community, where all students excel and grow to become life-long learners.

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
Rassel, Magali	Principal	Serves as instructional leader, engages community and stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision making process. Ensures standards based instruction is implemented. Engages the community through social media posting and monthly newsletters.
King, MaryHelen	Assistant Principal	Serves as instructional leader, engages community and stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision making process. Engages with business partners to support our school community. Tracks attendance data, communicates with parents, works with staff to design and implement a program to increase attendance rates. Collaborates with staff to design inclusion schedule.
Barrons, Angela	Instructional Coach	Serves as instructional leader, engages community and stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision making process. Coordinates family engagement nights. Works with teachers and staff members to improve their instructional practices through the coaching cycle.

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	75	71	80	81	81	84	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	565
Attendance below 90 percent	33	29	32	21	21	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
One or more suspensions	5	0	1	5	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	8	7	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	11	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	49	37	39	41	33	29	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	261

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	5	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

40

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/10/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	28	33	32	22	24	27	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	188
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	14	20	23	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	30	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	1	0	3	30	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	64%	62%	57%	71%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	60%	58%	64%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	57%	53%	49%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	63%	63%	73%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	65%	62%	77%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	53%	51%	63%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	57%	53%	60%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	75 (0)	71 (0)	80 (0)	81 (0)	81 (0)	84 (0)	93 (0)	565 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	33 ()	29 ()	32 ()	21 ()	21 ()	23 ()	21 ()	180 (0)
One or more suspensions	5 ()	0 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	14 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)	7 (0)	18 (0)	18 (0)	51 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (0)	18 (0)	14 (0)	43 (0)

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	59%	64%	-5%	58%	1%
	2018	65%	63%	2%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	61%	-3%	58%	0%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	56%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	57%	60%	-3%	56%	1%
	2018	61%	54%	7%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019	75%	60%	15%	54%	21%
	2018	71%	63%	8%	52%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	61%	-8%	62%	-9%
	2018	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	64%	-2%	64%	-2%
	2018	67%	59%	8%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	66%	60%	6%	60%	6%
	2018	72%	58%	14%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	81%	67%	14%	55%	26%
	2018	72%	68%	4%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	56%	-13%	53%	-10%
	2018	58%	57%	1%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	32	50	43	45	49	43	15				
BLK	61	53		57	53						
HSP	56	55		56	70						
MUL	63	62		66	69	70					
WHT	65	60	53	71	64	58	51				
FRL	64	60	51	64	63	38	36				
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	33	46	52	35	46	48	15				
BLK	54	50		69	50						
HSP	61	68		69	79		45				
MUL	61	68		64	55		75				
WHT	67	53	35	73	60	43	63				
FRL	61	54	45	68	61	46	56				
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	35	42	38	40	50	39					
BLK	40	27		60	64						
HSP	68	77		58	67						
MUL	73	53		77	47						
WHT	72	64	51	74	82	71	68				
FRL	64	63	46	67	76	58	50				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	402
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - 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%	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
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	59
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	60
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	54
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.

Science Achievement showed the lowest performance with 45% proficient in 2019 compared to all other areas in the School Grade Component. Contributing factors include science instruction that isn't meeting the depth of the standard, and lack of hands on science inquiry. The data trend over the last 3 years shows a downward trend with a decrease of 13% in proficiency.
2016-17 58%
2017-18 58%
2018-19 45%

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

Science Achievement went from 58% in 2018 to 45% in 2019. Students are not being exposed to depth of the standards and labs necessary for deep understanding. Our students need to be exposed to the 5 E Model and inquiry methods of instruction.

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.

Science Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state with an 8% gap. Students are not being exposed to depth of the standards and labs necessary for deep understanding. Our students need to be exposed to the 5 E Model and inquiry methods of instruction.

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

ELA Learning Gains had the most improvement with 60% learning gains compared to last years 55%. We focused on strengthening our interventions in reading across all grade levels. Grade level teams worked with ESE teachers, Title 1 Staff, and the leadership team to target student needs based on data from multiple assessment sources.

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

Students need to be at school in order to learn. During the 2018-19 school year we noticed that 25% of testing grades 3-6th had below 90% attendance rate. We will target our attendance rate of students at 90% or above. A committee comprised of a representative from each grade level, ESE, Activity, and Leadership will meet monthly to discuss individual cases and interventions to be put in place to increase attendance.

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

1. ESE Subgroup
2. Science Instruction
3. Writing
4. Strengthen Standards Based Instruction through Collaboration
5. SEL

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ESE Teachers will begin to plan collaboratively starting with reviewing data to change their practices by focusing on exposing their students to grade level text.
Rationale	Our FSA and iReady scores indicate that our students are not meeting the complexity of the standards. Also, in 2018-19 our ESE subgroup did not meet ESSA requirements. Research tells us that if teachers plan collaboratively for instruction that is based on rich content knowledge that is accurate, current and consistent that reflects the full intent of the grade level standards.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% of ESE students will make learning gains. These students will be tracked several times a year using the iReady Growth Monitoring tool.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Magali Rassel (rassel.magali@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teams will work in weekly professional learning communities to design lessons and plan for instruction based on what the data is telling us our students need in all areas and levels. The leadership team will schedule collaborative planning and data analysis time with leadership team member will be established.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According the Hattie and Fisher, providing formative evaluation has an effect size of .90. When teachers are planning for standards-based instruction they are checking for understanding thought their teaching, and adjusts instruction, and identifies learning gaps throughout their lessons.
Action Step	
Description	1. Collaboratively plan key questions and formative assessments in reading and writing instruction. 2. Implement Write Score, administer writing assessment 3 times during the year. Analyze data and adjust writing instruction accordingly. 3. Develop Look Fors instruments with teachers for meeting the standards for writing instruction. 4. Display Focus Walls 5. Meet with vertical team members to plan 6. Designated time for collaborative planning with ESE and General Education Teachers to implement standards based instruction to increase the complexity level of the text and planned teacher questions.
Person Responsible	Magali Rassel (rassel.magali@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Science Instruction
Rationale	According to the Needs Assessment Data from the FL Standards Science Assessment, there was a 13% decrease in Science Achievement from 58% in 2017-2018 to 45% in 2018-2019.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Grade 5 Review Summative Assessment had a 48% passing rate. Our goal would be to see an increased passing rate on the Grade 5 Review with 70% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Magali Rassel (rassel.magali@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Look at the standards as a collaborative team to better understand the cognitive complexity of the standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. Analyzing the 5th Grade Review Summative 2. Discuss the results with the 5th grade team of teachers. Develop lessons to reteach concepts missed. Teachers in 3rd and 4th Grade were given these results and an action plan was made to close these gap. 3. Provide formative assessments to track progress in grade K-3. 4. Michelle Ferro is scheduled to come to our school to model hands on learning to the depth of the standards. She will also demonstrate the 5 E model for teachers to better understand how to integrate science instruction into our other subject areas. 5. Teachers in 3rd and 4th will also use these results to improve instruction on their grade level standards that are only taught in their specific grade.
Person Responsible	Magali Rassel (rassel.magali@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Teachers will plan collaboratively focusing on the cognitive complexity level of the standards to increase student achievement.
Rationale	Our FSA and iReady scores indicate that our students are not meeting the complexity of the standards. Research tell us that if teachers plan collaboratively for instruction that is based on rich content knowledge that is accurate, current and consistent that reflects the full intent of the grade level standards.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	70% (or higher) of students will be on grade level according to iReady diagnostic at the end of the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Magali Rassel (rassel.magali@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teams will work in weekly professional learning communities to design lessons and plan for instruction based on what the data is telling us our students need in all areas and levels. The leadership team will schedule collaborative planning and data analysis time.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According the Hattie and Fisher, providing formative evaluation has an effect size of .90. When teachers are planning for standards-based instruction they are checking for understanding thought their teaching, and adjusts instruction, and identifies learning gaps throughout their lessons.
Action Step	
Description	1. Collaboratively plan key questions and formative assessments in reading and writing instruction. 2. Implement Write Score, administer writing assessment 3 times during the year. Analyze data and adjust writing instruction accordingly. 3. Develop Look Fors instruments with teachers for meeting the standards for writing instruction. 4. Display Focus Walls 5. Meet with vertical team members to plan 6. Designated time for collaborative planning with ESE and General Education Teachers to implement standards based instruction to increase the complexity level of the text and planned teacher questions.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).