Challenger K 8 School Of Science And Math

2020-21 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

Demographics

Principal: Rosemarie Maiorini

Start Date for this Principal: 9/11/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
2019-20 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%)
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

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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	53%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 9/11/2020, Rosemarie Maiorini

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.*

9

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.*

22

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

99

Demographic Data

2020-21 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

2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	89	94	107	131	129	171	197	185	194	0	0	0	0	1297
Attendance below 90 percent	5	6	8	11	11	13	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	5	0	7	5	8	8	8	4	6	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/11/2020

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	
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	

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**	
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	

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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%
	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%
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		

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
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
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	85
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	83
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	77
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	74
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Students with disabilities showed the lowest performance in 2018 and 2019 in ELA and math. These students also had the lowest learning gains and gains among the bottom 25%. African American students also had lower learning gains than the school average.

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

5th grade data showed the largest decline from 2018-2019. There was an 8% drop in ELA proficiency and 14% drop in math proficiency when compared to the same cohort from the prior year.

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.

All grade levels and subgroups are performing above the state average in all subject areas.

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

Although SWD have the lowest proficiency of all subgroups, they also showed the most improvement from 2018-2019 in ELA. In 2018, 44% of SWD were proficient, which improved to 58% in 2019. In 2018, 42% of SWD made learning gains, which improved to 53% in 2019. Finally, 40% of SWD in the bottom quartile made learning gains in 2018 and this increased to 50% in 2019. The school implemented common planning time for general ed teachers and ESE teachers, which could lead to improved collaboration. ESE teachers also loop up with their students which creates consistency in learning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Students who have received multiple discipline referrals that have resulted in ISS or OSS.

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

1. Providing enrichment and acceleration opportunities to students who are already proficient.
2. Increasing proficiency and learning gains in our SWD population.
3. Ensure the targeted intervention and instruction matches the need of the student.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Learning Gains

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our high percentage of proficient students coupled with our SWD population requires us all to "work together" to design instruction that matches our expectations of students to ensure continued growth and success in accelerated learning paths as well as close learning gaps with our SWD population.
Measurable Outcome:	1. To increase learning gains of the median students to 75% by focusing on rigor, relevance, and student engagement in ELA and Math instruction. 2. To utilize small group instruction to decrease gaps in learning within our SWD population.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rosemarie Maiorini (maiorini_r@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Teachers will deliver interventions in RTI blocks and during SWAMP to promote targeted accelerated growth based on area of deficit which will increase learning gains. 2. Teachers will provide multiple opportunities for our SWD population to receive small group, multi-sensory, guided instruction based on individual learning needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Additional time and instruction is crucial to students lacking prerequisite skills necessary for more rigorous coursework. 2. 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.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Fluid groups are promoted in RtI to allow for on-level and enrichment groups.
2. An additional resource teacher was scheduled into every MTSS block in grades K-5.
3. ESE teachers are encouraged to collaboratively plan weekly small group lessons with their co-teachers for students on their caseload.
4. Monthly data chats will provide opportunity for vertical planning and student work analysis to identify strengths and weaknesses in evidence and elaboration.
5. Administration will collaborate with District coaches to provide "Just In Time PD" based on student and staff needs evident in student work and assessment results.
6. Instruction focused on targeted accelerated growth will occur regularly.
7. Students will monitor and assess their work and their progress towards their goals.
8. K-8 teachers will participate in Learning Walks to enhance vertical articulation.

Person Responsible	Rosemarie Maiorini (maiorini_r@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will continue to support our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students by reviewing interventions to ensure they match student deficits. This will be accomplished in MTSS blocks, SWAMP, and through collaboration and problem solving with ESE teachers.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

All students' needs are addressed through differentiated learning groups led by qualified educators. The culture is characterized by trust amongst staff and students, respectful behavior modeled by teachers and students, and a mindset and committment to consistently meet and raise expectations. Challenger regularly engages stakeholders in the educational process by including key stakeholders in strategic planning for school improvement. This is accomplished through open communication and providing opportunities for involvement with key committees and subgroups. Our stakeholders play a vital role in helping determine the trajectory of our students on their path to success. As a Gold Level Tier 1 Model PBIS School, we believe that all stakeholders should embody the character traits of CHOMP-Courteous, Honest, On-Task, Mindful, and Positive. Behavior expectations are reviewed quarterly with every student to ensure students know how these traits will positively impact their school community and future endeavors.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.