

Hernando County School District

Challenger K 8 School Of Science And Math



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	51%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Maiorini, Rosemarie	Principal	
Minichino, Jillian	Assistant Principal	
O'Rourke, Cari	Assistant Principal	
Finch, Ed	Assistant Principal	
Hayden, Julia	Teacher, ESE	
Liberty, Megan	Teacher, K-12	
Ellis, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Ehlenbeck, Leonette	Teacher, K-12	
Kloiber, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Carleton, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, Janice	Teacher, K-12	
Kean, Jason	Teacher, K-12	
Doulik, Colleen	Teacher, K-12	
Goodworth, Carli	Teacher, K-12	
Bristol, Ruthann	Teacher, K-12	
Lopez, Linda	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, 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.*

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

99

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,475

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

5

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

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	110	108	125	146	165	164	229	227	201	0	0	0	0	1475
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

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

2020-21 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				86%	70%	61%	86%	62%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	61%	59%	65%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	52%	54%	66%	48%	52%
Math Achievement				91%	70%	62%	92%	68%	61%
Math Learning Gains				76%	58%	59%	77%	63%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73%	58%	52%	70%	57%	52%
Science Achievement				84%	60%	56%	83%	63%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				96%	83%	78%	97%	82%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	89%	57%	32%	58%	31%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	87%	59%	28%	58%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
05	2021					
	2019	83%	52%	31%	56%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
06	2021					
	2019	82%	52%	30%	54%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
07	2021					
	2019	89%	53%	36%	52%	37%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
08	2021					
	2019	84%	53%	31%	56%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	94%	62%	32%	62%	32%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	90%	62%	28%	64%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-94%				
05	2021					
	2019	77%	54%	23%	60%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				
06	2021					
	2019	88%	53%	35%	55%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
07	2021					
	2019	96%	62%	34%	54%	42%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
08	2021					
	2019	99%	50%	49%	46%	53%
Cohort Comparison		-96%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	79%	55%	24%	53%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	89%	54%	35%	48%	41%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	96%	75%	21%	71%	25%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	59%	41%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Diagnostics 1, 2, and 3 for English Language Arts and Mathematics
 SAM Science for 5th grade and SAM Civics for 7th grade Civics

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	94/60%	98/74%	98/98%
	Economically Disadvantaged	94/60%	95/74%	95/97%
	Students With Disabilities	11/18%	11/72%	11/91%
	English Language Learners	3/67%	3/67%	3/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	94/40%	98/68%	98/94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	94/40%	95/70%	95/93%
	Students With Disabilities	11/18%	11/63%	11/100%
	English Language Learners	3/33%	3/33%	3/67%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	111/63%	112/86%	111/96%
	Economically Disadvantaged	110/63%	110/87%	110/97%
	Students With Disabilities	17/36%	17/59%	17/82%
	English Language Learners	2/50%	2/100%	2/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	111/38%	112/68%	112/95%
	Economically Disadvantaged	110/39%	110/68%	110/95%
	Students With Disabilities	17/18%	17/41%	17/88%
	English Language Learners	2/50%	2/50%	2/100%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	139/83%	141/89%	141/96%
	Economically Disadvantaged	134/84%	134/89%	134/97%
	Students With Disabilities	15/76%	16/69%	16/100%
	English Language Learners	4/100%	4/100%	4/100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	139/38%	141/60%	143/81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	134/38%	134/62%	134/82%
	Students With Disabilities	16/32%	16/57%	16/82%
	English Language Learners	4/50%	4/100%	4/100%
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	131/71%	134/79%	136/83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	129/72%	130/79%	129/82%
	Students With Disabilities	17/53%	17/70%	17/65%
	English Language Learners	4/25%	4/50%	4/50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	131/42%	134/60%	135/87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	129/41%	130/60%	130/86%
	Students With Disabilities	17/30%	17/47%	17/65%
	English Language Learners	4/50%	4/50%	4/50%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	177/71%	176/72%	179/76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	169/72%	167/72%	167/77%
	Students With Disabilities	9/33%	9/38%	9/25%
	English Language Learners	4/50%	4/75%	4/100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	177/57%	178/70%	175/80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	169/57%	169/68%	165/79%
	Students With Disabilities	9/22%	9/33%	9/44%
	English Language Learners	4/75%	4/100%	4/100%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	179/11%	48/27%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	69/12%	69/22%	
	Students With Disabilities	7/0%	7/0%	
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/0%	
Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	195/63%	196/73%	199/74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	188/64%	188/73%	190/74%
	Students With Disabilities	17/30%	17/53%	17/29%
	English Language Learners	4/25%	4/50%	4/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	196/58%	196/74%	198/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	189/59%	189/75%	189/82%
	Students With Disabilities	17/24%	17/42%	17/53%
	English Language Learners	4/25%	4/50%	4/50%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	178/74%	180/79%	187/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	172/74%	174/78%	180/82%
	Students With Disabilities	10/0%	11/18%	11/18%
	English Language Learners	5/80%	5/80%	5/80%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	143/53%	144/67%	149/76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	137/53%	138/67%	142/76%
	Students With Disabilities	10/10%	11/9%	11/27%
	English Language Learners	4/50%	4/75%	4/50%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	187/1%	187/2%	187/17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58/2%	58/1%	58/15%
	Students With Disabilities	11/0%	11/1%	11/1%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	193/70%	192/80%	195/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	186/70%	185/80%	188/74%
	Students With Disabilities	10/40%	10/40%	10/40%
	English Language Learners	4/75%	4/75%	4/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31/6%	40/8%	41/15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30/7%	39/8%	40/15%
	Students With Disabilities	7/0%	7/0%	7/0%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/0%	1/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	46	37	28	50	44	44	19	40			
ELL	86			87							
ASN	94	65		94	87		90		100		
BLK	86	67		72	73	70	94				
HSP	78	61	41	79	63	57	74	95	88		
MUL	77	57	40	84	63		80	100	92		
WHT	80	62	45	85	66	66	77	91	87		
FRL	74	61	42	77	59	60	73	91	84		
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						

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
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	661
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	87
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	88
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	77
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	71
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	74
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 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	73
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	69
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Trends across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas include:

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

According to data components, the greatest need for improvement includes

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

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

According to data components, the most improvement was with our SWD population.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement were analyzing and understanding Reflective Data Analysis (RDAs), student data chats, targeted professional development, and implementation of formative profess.

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

Strategies to be implemented to accelerate learning include:

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

Professional development opportunities include BEST overview/unpacking standards, lesson plan facilitation, data analysis, and Student Work Analysis Protocol.

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

Focused progress monitoring by goal will allow us to closely track improvement in the next year and beyond. In addition, we have added Sanford Harmony which will help support social emotional learning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data from bottom quartile revealed that students receiving intervention were not growing in their area of need, decreasing from 61% making learning gains in '18-'19 to 45% in '20-'21, and require more targeted and consistent instruction and progress monitoring.
Measurable Outcome:	Administrators will monitor and manage the MTSS process to ensure delivery of intervention aligned to student deficit partnered with fidelity of documentation to increase the learning gains of our bottom quartile to 50%.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring tools will include monthly PLCs to review rosters and interventions being used, classroom walkthroughs, attendance at SRD and Retention meetings, and review of iReady Diagnostic, Growth Monitoring, and Standards Mastery data as it becomes available.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rosemarie Maiorini (maiorini_r@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Planned and purposeful meetings with Administration are scheduled into the PD calendar to promote collaboration and targeted focus to review interventions and documentation of progress in order to increase or tweak interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Oversight is necessary to maintain the integrity and fidelity with which MTSS is delivered. The problem solving process requires timely management and the inclusion of Administration, District, and school staff as well as ongoing professional development to ensure student success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule Administration into Tuesday PLC Calendar to monitor process.
2. Recruit District Staff and Guidance team to support with MTSS rosters and documentation.
3. Complete Classroom Walkthroughs in common RtI blocks in Master Schedule to ensure fluid walls.
4. Schedule quarterly team meetings with each grade level to review data, PMPs, and intervention logs in order to adjust rosters.
5. Review lesson plans and conduct informal walkthroughs to ensure small group support during Tier 1.
6. Schedule an ESE Co-Teacher in Intensive Reading classes.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Consistent collaboration with colleagues, Administration, and Guidance to develop lesson plans and review student work and data will lead to increased proficiency for students of all levels in ELA, Math, and Science in order to make up for the 6%, 8%, and 6% decrease in proficiency from '19-'21.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will meet weekly with Administration for facilitated lesson planning, data review, or formative assessment design/sort which will result in a 5% increase in proficiency in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science.
Monitoring:	Schedules, rosters, and lesson plans will be reviewed to ensure implementation of best practice. Classroom Walkthrough tools and iReady data will reveal the impact our PLCs have on instruction and student success.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cari O'Rourke (orourke_c@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitated Professional Learning Communities for lesson planning, data review, and formative design or sort will occur weekly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities help teachers reflect upon and redesign their practice, and challenge assumptions or current practices so they can focus clearly on student learning needs. Scheduling PLCs into the master calendar allows teachers the time and support needed for successful collaboration.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create PLC calendar to ensure time is protected and Administration is present.
2. Use templates and processes from District Model Schools (Lesson Plan Continuum, Student Work Analysis Protocol, etc.).
3. Provide expectation for and model of a Common Board Configuration.
4. Breakdown student data after each diagnostic window is over looking for areas of strength and areas of weaknesses making sure we connect areas of strengths and weaknesses to standards.

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus	The impact of school shutdown during the pandemic, as well as review of discipline data and threat assessment and safety meeting notes, reveal a need to provide a consistent level of social emotional support to students.
Description and Rationale:	<p>Social emotional learning practices will be implemented to improve the mental health and social well-being of our students. On the Student Engagement Survey, 3rd - 5th grade elementary students and middle school students will increase the percentage of "Almost Always" or "Often" for questions 28, 29, 31, 32, and 33. Percentages in the table below indicate both "Almost Always" or "Often" selected by students in grades 3-5 and students in grades 6-8.</p> <p>Grades 3-5 Grades 6-8</p> <p>Question 28 79.83% 66.55%</p> <p>I feel respected at this school.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Question 29 81.46% 69.17%</p> <p>I feel like I belong in this school.</p> <p>Question 31 88.51% 88.95%</p> <p>I have at least one friend to sit with at lunch.</p> <p>Question 32 78.49% 78.49%</p> <p>I feel supported by students in this school.</p> <p>Question 33 65.08% 52.34%</p> <p>I work in class with students other than my friends.</p>
Monitoring:	Analysis of Student Engagement Survey data, review of discipline data, and informal walkthroughts and student meetings will be used to monitor implementation of social-emotional learning programs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jillian Minichino (minichino_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony Morning Meet Ups will occur daily and a calendar of Buddy Up activities will be provided for teachers to use throughout the year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Social emotional learning programs improve classroom behavior, increase ability to manage stress and depression, and promote a sense of well-being and cohesiveness among peers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide SEL overview and Teacher Toolkit during Preschool (SEL team)
2. Provide calendar of daily Buddy Up activities
3. Create non-negotiables (begin at 9:00, use of calendar, use of Gator Gauge, etc.)
4. Complete SEL lessons in PE using Pacing Guide provided by District
5. Create surveys that support focus areas from Student Engagement Survey

6. Build process for positive communication (post cards, phone calls, etc.)
7. Incorporate PBIS data review in Faculty Meetings

Person Responsible Jillian Minichino (minichino_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

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.

Survey data regarding school and work satisfaction is reviewed with students, staff, and stakeholders and used to determine need for programs and opportunities to enhance school culture. 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 commitment to consistently meet and raise expectations. 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.

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

Challenger regularly engages stakeholders in the educational process by including them 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. We work closely with our School Advisory Council and PTO to keep them abreast of school data to ensure student and staff needs are met. Our PBIS and SEL teams help provide students the support and strategies needed to build positive

relationships with peers. Our School Based Leadership Teams engage in data review and vertical articulation to promote student achievement.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00