Challenger 7 Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Challenger 7 Elementary School

6135 RENA AVE, Cocoa, FL 32927

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Challenger 7, we aim for the STARS
Student Centered + Teamwork + Academics + Rigor = Success (Revised 2021-22)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Challenger 7 is a community partnership where the school and families work together to ensure all students excel as life-long learners. (Revised 2021-22)

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Maynor, Courtney	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, monthly newsletters, surveys, and meetings.
Johnson, Christina	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 and discipline data and works with staff and families to increase attendance rates and decrease discipline incidents.
Farner, Jessica	Reading Coach	Coordinates family engagement and events and communication. Collaborates with all stakeholders to support the school decision making process. Monitors intervention curriculum and progress monitoring and provides Tier 3 small group instruction for Grades K - 6. Support instruction through the coaching model.
Brown, Laura	School Counselor	Leads the ESE instructional team, engages community and stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision making process. Facilitates the school-wide MTSS process.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Annual data is shared with all stakeholders during pre-planning faculty meetings and School Advisory Council meetings. A Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) was also held with teachers, administrators, and families to review data and gain feedback. Data included I-Ready diagnostic, FAST, ESSA Subgroup data, discipline, and survey data. All stakeholders analyzed the data, identified areas of strengths and areas of improvement, and provided feedback and suggestions for improvement for the 2023-2024 school year.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored for effective implementation and impact using the following strategies:
- Weekly walkthroughs of classrooms with data collection to be used to guide professional development, PLC's, and individual coaching cycles
- Weekly meetings with leadership team to determine instructional coaching and student needs as well as plans to support instruction, student engagement, and student discipline.
- Regular monitoring of I-ready, FAST data, and ESSA Subgroup data

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	94%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	4	6	8	12	7	10	9	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	1	3	0	5	2	2	11	0	0	24
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	12	12	21	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	7	25	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	12	10	17	13	11	15	0	0	84

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	0	5	2	6	12	0	0	27

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	5	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	5	9	5	8	5	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	0	5	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	8	18	7	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	8	23	18	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	0	17	10	8	5	0	0	53

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	2	4	5	5	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	8	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	5	9	5	8	5	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	0	5	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	8	18	7	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	8	23	18	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	0	17	10	8	5	0	0	53

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	2	4	5	5	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	8	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Grade Level column headers span: K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	56	58	53	59	61	56	62		
ELA Learning Gains				58			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			53		
Math Achievement*	58	58	59	57	49	50	62		
Math Learning Gains				47			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30			42		
Science Achievement*	51	58	54	58	60	59	54		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	214
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	362
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	24	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	46			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	58			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	46			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	60			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	56			58			51					
SWD	20			32			29				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			42							2	
HSP	47			61		36					4	
MUL	54			46							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	59			60			60				4	
FRL	48			54			49				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	59	58	53	57	47	30	58					
SWD	23	41	50	25	33	19						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	58	53		47	59							
HSP	58	72		60	50							
MUL	63	58		53	42							
PAC												
WHT	59	56	53	57	45	25	56					
FRL	59	58	51	54	47	33	51					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	62	62	53	62	61	42	54					
SWD	34	48	41	39	55	38	19					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	33		50	58							
HSP	62			45								
MUL	59	100		55	64							
PAC												
WHT	64	62	48	65	61	40	58					
FRL	62	63	67	60	57	35	61					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
<u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide</u>
<u>assessments</u>.

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
05	2023 - Spring	49%	59%	-10%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	58%	-2%
06	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	47%	24%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	56%	-8%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	67%	67%	0%	54%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	60%	-3%	59%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	61%	-1%	61%	-1%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	55%	2%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	49%	57%	-8%	51%	-2%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The lowest data component was Science proficiency at 49% for the 22-23 school year. This was down 5% from the previous school year for Challenger 7. It was also below the district average (57%) and the state average (51%). Teacher vacancies in 5th grade science could have been a contributing factor to the low performance.

In addition, ELA proficiency dropped 2% from 58% to 56% for the 22-23 school year. Historically, ELA

proficiency has been trending downward for Challenger 7. This was below the district average (59%) and only slightly above the state average (52%). In particular, grades 3 and 5 showed decreases at only 48% and 49% proficient.

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

The data component with the greatest decline was Science proficiency at 49% for the 22-23 school year. This was down 5% from the previous school year for Challenger 7. It was also below the district average (57%) and the state average (51%). Teacher vacancies in 5th grade science could have been a contributing factor to the low performance.

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 proficiency had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. C7 proficiency was 49% while the state average was 51%. Teacher vacancies in 5th grade science along with a lack of science instruction in primary grades could have contributed to the gap.

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

Overall, Math proficiency increase from 57% to 60%. This proficiency was higher than the state average of 57% and just slightly below the district average of 61%. During the 2022 - 2023 school year, a new math curriculum was implemented across all grade levels with fidelity. A district math coach met with teachers monthly to ensure pacing, model lessons, and provide professional development on curriculum use. Students in grades 2-6 also used Reflex Math and Frax to develop math fluency and build comprehension of fractions.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The EWS data shows an increase in students absent 10% or more of days up from 39 students (SY 21-22) to 56 students (SY 22-23). In addition, there was an increase in students scoring Level 1 in ELA from 35 students (SY21-22) to 55 students (SY22-23).

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

Subgroup Proficiency for SWD - 18% for 22-23 SY in ELA
Subgroup Proficiency for SWD - 30% for 22-23 SY in Math
ELA Proficiency - 56% for 22-23 SY
Science Proficiency - 49% for 22-23 SY

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

FSA data shows that students with disabilities are performing significantly below their nondisabled peers, with only 18% proficiency in ELA and 30% proficiency in Math. In 2022 the SWD subgroup did not meet ESSA requirements, with a 32 Federal Index Score. In looking at comparison I-ready data from Spring 2022, 60% of SWD students are scoring below grade level in ELA and 73% are scoring below grade level in Math.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase the ELA proficiency of students with disabilities by at least 7% from 18% proficiency to 25% based on FAST PM data from PM1 to PM3.
Increase the Math proficiency of students with disabilities by at least 5% from 30% proficiency to 35% based on FAST PM data from PM1 to PM3.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring will occur regularly for our SWD by reviewing I-Ready diagnostic data, FAST progress monitoring data, and specifically targeted intervention assessment data. Administrators will complete walkthroughs and collect data on the implementation of co-teaching, scaffolds, and differentiation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students with disabilities will be provided with a combination of direct instruction and small group strategy instruction to maximize achievement. Classroom teachers and ESE teachers will work collaboratively during PLC's to determine specific differentiated needs and instructional curriculum for all students with disabilities. Students with disabilities that are performing below grade level will participate in consistent small group instruction and cooperative learning opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Hattie's Visible Learning research, cooperative learning has an effect size of 0.42. To maximize achievement, instructional time should be filled with student-to-student interactions and discussions. In order for students to excel, they must use academic language through speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Classroom teachers and ESE teachers will collaborate during common planning and PLC meetings to plan instruction and differentiated supports for students with disabilities. Curriculum pacing will be reviewed and scaffolds will be discussed at PLC meetings led by the literacy coach to ensure additional support for ESE students. Teachers will choose which scaffolds to use to support instruction.

Person Responsible: Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023 - May 2024

Provide professional development on the co-teaching model and high leverage practices to support students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Teachers will choose high leverage strategies to implement and will discuss student impact during PLC's. General Education teachers and resource teachers will plan co-teaching lessons using appropriate models.

Person Responsible: Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023 - May 2024

Provide additional academic support opportunities either before or after school focused on targeted instructional gaps and needs. Small group instruction will be determined based on individual student needs and progress.

Person Responsible: Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 2023 - April 2024

Professional development for all staff on Kagan Structures to increase student discussion and small group collaboration. The implementation of Kagan structures will be reviewed and planned to embed within the curriculum to support student learning during PLC's and will be monitored during weekly walkthroughs and observations.

Person Responsible: Jessica Farner (farner.jessica@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023 - May 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The EWS data shows and increase in students with one or more suspensions from 9 students (SY21-22) to 24 students (SY22-23). 37% of students with one or more suspensions are identified as SWD. Many of these students have behavior plans and struggle with academics. When they are missing instruction due to suspensions, this puts them further behind. On the Insight Survey, the Learning Environment domain had the lowest score and decreased from 5.7 to 5.0. This area showed the greatest decline in responses in regards to student behavior and support in the classroom.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The number of students with one or more suspensions will decrease from 24 students to 15 students. Of the students receiving one or more suspension, SWD students will decrease from 37% to 30%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

- Administrators will review monthly discipline data and behavior plans to support students.
- Administrators will meet with ESE teachers monthly to revisit IEP goals, student progress, and individual student needs.
- Insight Survey Data
- Youth Truth Survey Data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will plan lessons to embed strategies from High Leverage Practice #18: Student Engagement. As part of this practice, teachers will build positive relationships with students, use a variety of strategies for ensuring student engagement, and actively monitor students for engagement will providing specific feedback. During PLC's, the general education and ESE teachers will plan collaboratively and embed these practices into their daily lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that students who report higher engagement within school are less likely to get in trouble, be off task, or drop out of school. Engaged students are more successful on tasks and gain a positive outlook on learning. According to Hattie's Visible Learning research, decreasing disruptive behavior has an effect size of 0.34. To maximize achievement, teachers need skills to ensure students don't disrupt their own learning or that of others. Research shows that social or token reinforcement programs are most effective.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional development and resources provided on Skillstreaming to teach and promote PBIS STAR Student Expectations

Person Responsible: Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

PBIS Team will meet monthly to review discipline data and the implementation of PBIS. Data and revisions to our school-wide PBIS program will be shared with all staff.

Person Responsible: Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023 - May 2024

Leadership team will meet with ESE teachers to review individual student IEP goals and behavior plans to monitor student progress and revise supports as needed.

Person Responsible: Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023 - May 2024

Administrators will complete weekly walkthroughs and document the use of PBIS strategies school wide. Data will be collected, analyzed, and shared with the PBIS team and faculty to ensure successful implementation.

Person Responsible: Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023 - May 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Data trends show that over the last 3 years, Challenger 7 ELA proficiency scores have decreased. During the 23-23 school year, proficiency dropped to 56% overall. In particular, grade 3 dropped 7 points to 48% proficient and 5th grade dropped 15 points to 50% proficient.

Science scores also decreased during the 22-23 school year to 49% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

FAST ELA overall proficiency will increase from 56% to 61%. In looking at specific grades, 3rd grade ELA proficiency will increase from 48% to 53% and 5th grade ELA proficiency will increase from 50% to 55%.

Science proficiency will increase from 49% to 54%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring will occur regularly by reviewing I-Ready diagnostic data, FAST progress monitoring data, and specifically targeted intervention assessment data. Administrators will complete walkthroughs and collect data on the implementation of benchmark-aligned instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

In order to encode new knowledge, comprehend it, and transfer it to new learning, students must be provided with a combination of direct instruction and dialogic instruction. Students will be engaged in whole group and small group tasks that build on their knowledge. Students will engage in a tasks that allow for a productive struggle, but will also receive timely feedback from the teacher. Students will be engaged in explicit, systemic, and scaffolded instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Hattie's Visible Learning research, classroom discussion for during instruction has an effect size of 0.82. To maximize achievement, a combination of direct instruction and dialogic instruction should be followed. During Tier I instruction, students should receive direct instruction and be provided with opportunities to explain their thinking, questions, and arguments to ensure they are encoding new knowledge.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Administrators will complete walkthroughs and provide feedback to teachers specific on benchmark-aligned instruction. Admin and literacy coach will provide support in planning, coaching, and implementing the instruction as needed.

Person Responsible: Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023 - May 2024

Provide additional academic support opportunities either before or after school focused on targeted instructional gaps and needs. Small group instruction will be determined based on individual student needs and progress.

Person Responsible: Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 2023 - April 2024

Teachers will collaborate to determine appropriate intervention cycles for students based on current data. The Literacy Coach will support the materials and implementation of intervention cycles. Teachers will collect data to be reviewed regularly.

Person Responsible: Jessica Farner (farner.jessica@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023 - May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

In order monitor the school improvement plan and ensure resources are allocated based on need, administrators and the leadership team will pull reports to monitor academic student progress. SWD students in the Academic Support Program will be monitored throughout the course of the ASP program. Professional development will be monitored during PD days and revisited monthly through PLC's.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Percent of students scoring below 40th Percentile on the Early Literacy or STAR Reading Assessment at the end of the school year for 2022-2023.
Kindergarten - 27%
1st Grade - 29%
2nd Grade - 28%

Final iReady diagnostic, 2022-2023, percent of students working below grade level:
Kindergarten - 11%
1st Grade - 16%
2nd Grade - 26%

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Percent of students scoring below level 3 on the FAST assessment at the end of the school year for 2022-2023.
3rd Grade - 48%
4th Grade - 56%
5th Grade - 50%

Final iReady diagnostic, 2022-2023, percent of students working below grade level:
3rd Grade - 25%
4th Grade - 47%
5th Grade - 46%

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Based on the end of year data from 2022-2023 school year on the Early Literacy/STAR Reading assessment and iReady (final diagnostic) all grades K-2 had 50% or more scoring above the 40th percentile.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on the end of year data from 2022-2023 school year on the FAST assessment, grades 34and 6 did not have more students scoring below Level 3.

However, our 3rd grade had 52% scoring below a level 3 on FAST and 5th grade had 50% scoring below a level 3 on FAST. At the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 55% of our 3rd and 5th grade students will score at or above a level 3 on the FAST assessment and iReady final diagnostic 2024.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Challenger 7 will be monitoring our 3rd and 5th grade student data in the area of ELA through quarterly district assessments, unit assessments within the curriculum, i-Ready Diagnostic scores, FAST progress monitoring, and various data such as PSI, Fluency measures, vocabulary and comprehension assessments.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Maynor, Courtney, maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

In order to identify the precise area where instruction is most helpful to students and plan to scaffold, support all learners. A well-planned scope and sequence help meet all students' instructional needs, regardless of their abilities and progress. Systematic instruction will ensure that whenever students are asked to learn a new skill or concept, they already possess the appropriate prerequisite knowledge and understanding to learn it efficiently. Explicit instruction to explicitly teach skills or concepts will allow for the gradual release process to occur, where teachers will shift the responsibility of learning from teacher to student. Finally, differentiating instruction will allow teachers to be responsive to students' specific needs based on assessment and other assessment data.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

According to John Hattie's research explicit teaching strategies have an effect size of 0.57, and scaffolded instruction has an effect size of 0.82. If teachers intentionally plan reading instruction using the features of effective instruction along with high-quality, complex text and provide appropriately designed scaffolding, they will create conditions that allow for deeper exploration of text and mastery toward the full intent of their grade level standards. If teachers use formative and summative assessments to assess student understanding, they will be better equipped to inform their instruction to support students' academic needs. During our weekly data meetings, teachers will have an opportunity to analyze the data from these assessments and discuss strategies for scaffolding and supporting all students.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Collaborative planning with the literacy coach weekly to review standards, assessments, and scaffolding.	Farner, Jessica, farner.jessica@brevardschools.org
Additional personnel will push into grades 3 and 5 to provide additional intervention support.	Farner, Jessica, farner.jessica@brevardschools.org

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No