# Challenger Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

# Table of Contents

# Challenger Middle School

## 624 TRAFALGAR PKWY, Cape Coral, FL 33991

## http://chm.leeschools.net/

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/17/2023.

### 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:<br><br>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;<br>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;<br>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or<br>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.**

To provide an exemplary education that develops critical thinking and problem solving skills which inspires
our students to "Challenge their Minds and Charge their Spirits".

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To develop lifelong learners with critical thinking and problem solving skills.

## 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 |
|------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Winfree, Stacia | Principal | Make decisions to govern the school<br>-Ensures a focus on learning and continuous improvement<br>-Guides the work of all Core Academic subjects<br>-Supports and monitors the work of the collaborative elective course teams<br>-Serves as a steward of the school's mission, vision, and core values<br>-Monitors achievement, climate, and satisfaction data to ensure that the learning environment is producing<br>results consistent with the school's stated goals<br>-Identifies gaps in reading performance or processes and plans for their improvement<br>-Aligns school's work with the district and classroom<br>-Provides vision for both academic and behavioral success<br>-Plans, implements and monitors the progress of the school improvement<br>-Systematically evaluates the school infrastructure,scheduling, personnel and curriculum resources, staff<br>development, and procedures<br>-Leader relating to problem-solving and making decisions regarding student achievement, including interventions, schedules, training, support, and communication<br>-Attends Team meetings to collaborate on and monitor students who are struggling<br>-Collects school-wide data for the team to use in determining at-risk students<br>-Provides or coordinates valuable and continuous professional development |
| Curls, Aaron | Assistant Principal | -Assists the principal in making decisions to govern the school<br>-AP for curriculum<br>-Ensures a focus on learning and continuous improvement<br>-Guides the work of the Science/Social Studies Departments<br>-Supports and monitors the work of the collaborative elective course teams<br>-Serves as a steward of the school's mission, vision, and core values<br>-Monitors achievement, climate, and satisfaction data in reading to ensure that the learning environment is producing results consistent with the school's stated goals<br>-Identifies gaps in reading performance or processes and plans for their improvement<br>-Aligns school's work with the district and classroom<br>-Provides a vision for both academic and behavioral success<br>-Plans, implements and monitors the progress of school improvement<br>-Systematically evaluates the school infrastructure, scheduling, personnel and curriculum resources, staff |
| Maurer, Todd | Teacher, K-12 | |
| VanCleve, Jamie | Assistant Principal | -Ensures a focus on learning and continuous improvement<br>-Guides the work of the ELA/Reading<br>-Supports and monitors the work of the collaborative elective course teams<br>-Serves as a steward of the school's mission, vision, and core values |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| | | -Monitors achievement, climate, and satisfaction data in reading to ensure that the learning environment is producing results consistent with the school's stated goals<br>-Aligns school's work with the district and classroom<br>-Provides a vision for both academic and behavioral success<br>-Monitors the progress of school improvement<br>-Systematically evaluates the school infrastructure, grounds and procedures supporting student processes<br>-Charged with problem-solving and making decisions regarding student achievement, including interventions, schedules, training, support, and communication<br>-Attends Team meetings to collaborate on and monitor students who are struggling<br>-Collects school-wide data for the team to use in determining at-risk students<br>-Implementation of the MTSS problem-solving 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.

School leadership reviewed achievement and survey results to determine the areas that should serve as a focus for the coming year. Team leaders were asked for feedback regarding academic gains and recommended next steps. The school SAC will be presented with the plan of record during the September 2023 meeting.

**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))

A SIP committee will be monitoring the schools' progress against the plan of record at regular intervals throughout the year. Upon review of the available data such FAST testing along with observation / anecdotal evidence, the committee will make adjustments to the plan as necessary.

| Demographic Data | |
|---|---|
| Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024 | |
| **2023-24 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Middle School<br>6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 54% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 100% |
| **Charter School** | No |
| **RAISE School** | No |
| **ESSA Identification** <br> *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| **Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)** | No |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented** <br> (subgroups with 10 or more students) <br> (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* <br> English Language Learners (ELL) <br> Asian Students (ASN) <br> Black/African American Students (BLK) <br> Hispanic Students (HSP) <br> Multiracial Students (MUL) <br> White Students (WHT) <br> Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| **School Grades History** <br> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: B <br><br> 2019-20: A <br><br> 2018-19: A <br><br> 2017-18: A |
| **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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 126 | 104 | 332 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 17 | 36 | 72 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 74 | 81 | 221 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 77 | 63 | 213 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 74 | 81 | 221 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 59 | 54 | 161 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 126 | 104 | 332 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 17 | 36 | 72 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 74 | 81 | 221 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 77 | 63 | 213 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 74 | 81 | 221 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 59 | 54 | 161 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

## 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 126 | 104 | 332 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 17 | 36 | 72 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 74 | 81 | 221 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 77 | 63 | 213 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 74 | 81 | 221 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 59 | 54 | 161 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

## 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* | 54 | 48 | 49 | 56 | 48 | 50 | 56 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 50 | | | 56 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 35 | | | 42 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 63 | 56 | 56 | 61 | 32 | 36 | 59 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 61 | | | 54 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 60 | | | 52 | | |

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | 53 | 45 | 49 | 51 | 51 | 53 | 54 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 80 | 64 | 68 | 82 | 53 | 58 | 68 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 80 | 80 | 73 | 83 | 45 | 49 | 77 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 44 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 66 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 56 | 29 | 40 | 54 | 78 | 76 | 47 | | |

*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 | 64 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 386 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 593 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| 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 | 40 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 45 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 78 | | | |
| BLK | 53 | | | |
| HSP | 64 | | | |
| MUL | 72 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | | | |
| FRL | 61 | | | |

| 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 | 34 | Yes | 2 | |
| ELL | 52 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 66 | | | |
| BLK | 52 | | | |
| HSP | 58 | | | |
| MUL | 63 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | | | |
| FRL | 56 | | | |

**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 | 54 | | | 63 | | | 53 | 80 | 80 | | | 56 |
| SWD | 22 | | | 38 | | | 17 | 54 | 69 | | 6 | 40 |
| ELL | 30 | | | 51 | | | 26 | 62 | 46 | | 6 | 56 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 73 | | | 82 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 50 | | | 43 | | | 45 | 73 | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 53 | | | 62 | | | 51 | 80 | 77 | | 6 | 59 |
| MUL | 57 | | | 61 | | | 64 | 80 | 100 | | 5 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | | | 66 | | | 55 | 81 | 81 | | 5 | |
| FRL | 51 | | | 59 | | | 46 | 79 | 78 | | 6 | 54 |

### 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 | 56 | 50 | 35 | 61 | 61 | 60 | 51 | 82 | 83 | | | 54 |
| SWD | 21 | 35 | 35 | 29 | 43 | 39 | 17 | 49 | | | | |
| ELL | 43 | 40 | 23 | 45 | 63 | 61 | 29 | 72 | 88 | | | 54 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 64 | 27 | | 91 | 82 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 48 | 41 | 43 | 58 | 73 | 30 | 62 | 70 | | | |
| HSP | 56 | 48 | 30 | 56 | 62 | 60 | 50 | 81 | 85 | | | 54 |
| MUL | 61 | 50 | | 57 | 63 | | 57 | 91 | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 52 | 41 | 66 | 61 | 60 | 56 | 84 | 82 | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 48 | 34 | 53 | 60 | 61 | 43 | 76 | 82 | | | 47 |

### 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 | 56 | 56 | 42 | 59 | 54 | 52 | 54 | 68 | 77 | | | 47 |
| SWD | 12 | 26 | 24 | 22 | 41 | 37 | 3 | 26 | | | | 29 |
| ELL | 38 | 54 | 51 | 38 | 54 | 53 | 32 | 52 | 60 | | | 47 |

| **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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 71 | 71 | | 93 | 86 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 54 | 43 | 39 | 43 | 45 | 30 | 55 | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | 54 | 40 | 53 | 52 | 46 | 47 | 66 | 68 | | | 48 |
| MUL | 69 | 53 | | 61 | 45 | | 73 | 73 | 67 | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 57 | 45 | 65 | 57 | 60 | 59 | 73 | 85 | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 52 | 39 | 49 | 48 | 44 | 45 | 58 | 72 | | | 47 |

**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. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 54% | 44% | 10% | 47% | 7% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 44% | 6% | 47% | 3% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 43% | 44% | -1% | 47% | -4% |

| **MATH** | | | | | | |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 63% | 52% | 11% | 54% | 9% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 42% | 37% | 5% | 48% | -6% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 65% | 60% | 5% | 55% | 10% |

| **SCIENCE** | | | | | | |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 43% | 8% | 44% | 7% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 82% | 39% | 43% | 50% | 32% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 43% | 57% | 48% | 52% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 75% | 59% | 16% | 66% | 9% |

## 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 data for '22-'23 reflects that the ELA group scored lowest in achievement and had the largest decrease. The team achieved a 52% proficiency rate which places Challenger #5 out of 20 middle schools in the district. 7th and 8th grade scored 54 and 50 percent proficient respectively and the 6th grade subgroup were 43 percent proficient vs a District score of 44 and State score of 47.

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

ELA showed a change of -4 percentage points, driven mainly by the 6th-grade results. This was the first year utilizing the new BEST standards. There is a need for deeper professional development around the depth of the standards. The team has worked this summer with the Marzano proficiency scales and have received support on the relearn / retest cycle which will improve the results moving forward. The 7th grade ELA team is instrumental in coaching the team during PLC meetings during the summer and will continue during the 23-24 school 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.**

As a subgroup, 7th-grade math had the largest gap to the State Average. Challenger 7th grade proficiency was 43% compared to the state average of 48% proficient. This year the 7th grade math grouping was comprised of level 1 and 2 students as opposed to past years where the mix included level 3 students. Additionally, the 7th grade accelerated students were assessed using the 8th grade pre-algebra test.

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

Overall math scores increased by 10 percentage points moving from 60% to 68% proficiency. The 68% proficiency places Challenger 5th out of 20 middle schools in the district. Part of what contributed to the gains was having a full compliment of math teachers on board for the entire year. Additionally the team focused on PLC's that were data focused and took actions based on the trends that were appearing. 6th grade proficiency the year before was 35% and this year increased to 66%. Overall Algebra proficiency decreased by 7 percentage points from the year prior likely due to an increase in level 3 students being scheduled for Algebra.

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

Based on EWS data, there were 332 students that were absent 10% or more of the total school days this past year. It is imperative that students attend classes to be successful. An additional area of focus is the number of students with two or more indicators which will be evaluated and reviewed.

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

1. Decreasing the number of students missing 10% or more of instructional time
2. +3 Gains in all tested areas
3. Strong retention of current staff
4. Broader engagement of our diverse community population
5. Improvement of SWD academic category results

**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.

Challenger's SWD subgroup is at 34 on the Federal Percent of Points Index. This needs to increase to at least 41. This ESSA subgroup has been below 41 for two consecutive years. The intent is have this group move above 41% proficient which will remove the school for ATSI status.

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

The goal to exceed 41% proficient within 2 years. This year's goal is to move from 34% to 37% and in '24-'25 37% to 41% percent proficient based on the '23 - '24 Standardized Assessment

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

Master schedule now has subject area PLC meetings weekly to determine student proficiency via consistent data analysis of each standard and plan for remediation. Student schedules will be analyzed to understand
where the greatest need for paraprofessional support is and the paraprofessional support will be provided accordingly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Stacia Winfree (staciaaw@leeschools.net)

**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.)

DuFour PLC Model Implemented
Streamlined data monitoring
Implementation of Close Read strategies school wide
Common vocabulary instruction - school wide
Professional Development on SIOP strategies to support ELL
Learning Walks

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

Data driven decisions improve student achievement. Implementation of Close Read and Vocabulary Instruction strategies are scientifically proven educational strategies for highly effective instruction. SIOP strategies provide
educators with necessary tools to support non-native English speaking students. These are state and nationally supported strategies proven to support students acquiring a new language

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

### #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

**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.

Challenger achieved Level 1 of Marzano's High-Reliability levels which is
intended to produce a system that has high reliability and becomes transformational in its approach to educating its students. When a school has met the criterion indicators for a specific level in the model, it consistently monitors those indicators. It makes immediate corrections when school performance falls below acceptable levels. The first level of school effectiveness is a Safe and Orderly Environment that Supports Cooperation and Collaboration. Our school is currently working through PLCs in leadership to bring forward the knowledge at the school level to begin our study of the leading indicators: (1) The faculty and staff perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (2) Students, parents, and the community perceive the school environment as safe and orderly (3) Teachers have formal roles in the decision-making
the process regarding school initiatives. (4) Teacher teams and collaborative groups regularly interact to address common issues regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students
(5) Teachers and staff have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school (6)
Students, parents, and the community have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of
the school (7) The success of the whole school, as well as individuals within the school, is appropriately acknowledged (8) The fiscal, operational, and technological resources of the school are managed in a way that directly supports teachers. As this knowledge is implemented, our school will work with teachers, students, parents, and community members to engage in and study the
indicators to ensure that the school culture is inclusive and positive. With an eye towards retention and inspiration, the leadership team has implemented a feedback loop for the teachers to engage with.

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

The goal is to begin the '24 - '25 school year with a full complement of teachers and minimize voluntary teacher turnover as a whole.

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

The school climate will be measured via surveys administered three times during the year in September, January, and April. The results will be analyzed and appropriate changes will be made to address common issues. Additionally, Challenger will continue the practice of utilizing the elevation board process for internal suggestions made by staff.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Stacia Winfree (staciaaw@leeschools.net)

**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.)

Interventions relating to teacher turnover is executing a robust continuous feedback loop where teachers provide feedback with is addressed by administration in a timely manner. Additionally regular formal and curbside coaching's will take place between administration and staff.

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

The landscape in education today is difficult as it relates to teacher retention and attraction. There are multiple factors at play they contribute to the high turnover rates the industry is experiencing. It is of the utmost importance to provide an environment where the staff feels recognized and appreciated for their efforts and execution. By doing so we will help stem the tide of attrition that takes place and retain highly qualified and effective teachers.

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA |
|---|

**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.

Grades 6-8 proficiency in ELA will be at or greater than 53%. This specific goal was determined by looking at the students in grades 6-8 from the 22-23 school year and calculating what percentage was proficient and adding the students who were one level below proficiency. Through intensive instruction, interventions, and progress monitoring, the goal is to keep every student who was proficient at/above the proficiency level while also moving all students who were one level below up to the level of proficiency.

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

CHMS students will achieve 53% proficiency or higher based on the ELA FAST PM3 assessment.

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

This will be monitored for growth from PY scores as well as how close students are to proficiency using PM 1 and PM 2 FAST assessments and correlations from District Exemplars. Additionally, exit tickets and formatives will be monitored for standards mastery.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Stacia Winfree (staciaaw@leeschools.net)

**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.)

L25 students will be given an additional period of intervention. Instructional materials have been vetted and are provided by our Curriculum Department. Tight curriculum alignment will be collaborated on during PLC's weekly. ELA numbers have been reduced for Level 1 & students. Reading will be supported through a double block of History for grade 6 (new this year) and through all Science content. Reading teachers will push in during our longest block to provide support to our lowest 25% during ELA or other subject areas. We will promote reading as a school wide goal this year.

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

Our master schedule and intervention schedule provides students with opportunities, time, and supports they need to become proficient or make significant progress towards proficiency. Students will be closely monitored by a specific staff member and students will meet with the staff member to monitor progress, build rapport, and discuss ways to be successful.

**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 2 - Moderate 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.

All 6-8 grader students who were "On Watch" (or Level 2) at the end of last year will be listed for monitoring. Class placement as well as PY scores and attendance records will be recorded for baseline purposes.Students will be placed into cohorts and each cohort will be assigned a mentor for specific progress (admin or team lead). Students will be the focus on PLC meetings. Teachers will review data and trade students by reteach groups to repeat instruction using new methods and students will reassess.

**Person Responsible:** Stacia Winfree (staciaaw@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

| #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math |
| --- |

**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.

Challenger's Math proficiency scores had an overall increase of 8 percentage points from the year prior. Challenger's proficiency increased from 60% to 68% with the highest area being 6th grade that moved from 33% to 66%. This is likely due to the change in assessment given to students statewide. The 7th grade proficiency decreased from 55% to 47% based on this year's assessment data; however, Challenger outperformed the state and district. Pre-Algebra increased from 62% to 69% but Algebra decreased from 89% to 82%. Challenger's Pre-Algebra outperformed the district; however, the Algebra proficiency was 2% lower than the district average.

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

CHMS Math proficiency will increase to 73% based on the FAST PM3 Math assessments.

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

Challenger will review progress monitoring data as well as district exemplars to measure growth during the school year. The department chairperson will be monitoring relearn and reassess cycle where teachers share students based on unit test data to provide instruction to remediate or enrich students as needed.

**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.)

Scheduling - The master schedule ensured that the students who earned a 3 on the 7th grade FAST (Pre-Alg), will be placed in one classroom for targeting remedial skills. These students differ from the students that scored 3-5 but took Accelerated 7th grade math which is similar to the Pre-Algebra course they will take this year.

PLC - The department chairperson will be monitoring relearn and reassess cycle where teachers share students based on unit test data to provide instruction to remediate or enrich students as needed. Collaborative teams will track data on a bi-weekly basis.

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

DuFour's PLC cycle of reteaching and reassessing students increases overall proficiency. Additionally, taking students that had a different math course previously and providing them with additional scaffolding and remediation will give them support needed to perform better academically.

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**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.

Science proficiency increased from 50% to 51% this year based on the Science assessment. Challenger outperformed the district by 8 points. Challenger wants to see our proficiency increase to pre-Covid numbers of +60% and is taking steps to achieve this over the course of the next few years.

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

54% of Challenger 8th grade students will demonstrate proficiency on the end of year exam.

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

Unit tests will be reviewed at department PLC meetings. Admin and the department chairperson will review reteach and reassess materials and process.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Stacia Winfree (staciaaw@leeschools.net)

**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.)

PLC Meetings
Reteach/Reassess model
Double blocking Science in 6th and 7th grade to build skills for 8th grade

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

Data will determine if enrichment or intervention to reteach standards is needed
Cooperative learning supports acquisition of skills

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

## 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).

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating funding to schools. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student needs. Initially the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, % of ESE students for academic support and for funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, SAI, and UniSIG plans as appropriate there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Ongoing monitoring of student data and underperforming subgroups is provided through monthly visits and data chats by principal supervisors.

## 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: Teacher Retention and Recruitment | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | $0.00 |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | $0.00 |
| 5 | III.B. | Area of Focus: -- Select below --: | $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.**

Yes