

Hernando County School District

Challenger K 8 School Of Science And Math School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Challenger K 8 School Of Science And Math

13400 ELGIN BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/ck8>

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.

Our mission is to instill high standards of learning in our students by aligning all elements of school life to achieve educational excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ad astra per Aspera

"To the stars through hard work."

School Leadership Team, 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
Maiorini, Rosemarie	Principal	

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.

Administration meets monthly with our School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) and our School Advisory Council (SAC) to discuss and problem solve around the students' data. The input Administration receives from those meetings are noted, put into action, and addressed throughout our SIP Plan.

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))

Administration and our MTSS coordinator meets with grade level and department teams monthly to review data and discuss SWDs, Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. As students progress, our goal will be changed to increase proficiency in certain subgroups. We will also decrease and make the goal more attainable if we feel that our students aren't progressing at each progress monitoring.

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)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	4	3	4	3	5	10	15	29	18	91	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	9	10	11	12	1	46	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	19	7	11	0	58	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	1	2	2	1	0	1	2	4	15	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	0	0	1	1

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	0	0	1

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	6	
One or more suspensions	4	22	9	3	13	15	44	32	17	159	
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	5	9	6	10	8	14	52	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	8	15	7	3	4	46	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	

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	0	1	0	1

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	6	
One or more suspensions	4	22	9	3	13	15	44	32	17	159	
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	5	9	6	10	8	14	52	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	8	15	7	3	4	46	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	

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	0	1	0	1

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	77	53	53	80	57	55	80		
ELA Learning Gains				64			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			45		
Math Achievement*	82	56	55	87	48	42	83		
Math Learning Gains				71			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			65		
Science Achievement*	82	57	52	81	60	54	78		
Social Studies Achievement*	92	72	68	93	59	59	93		
Middle School Acceleration	89	75	70	86	52	51	89		
Graduation Rate		65	74		56	50			
College and Career Acceleration		30	53		77	70			
ELP Progress	27	51	55	80	74	70			

** 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	532
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	767
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	54			
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	78			
HSP	83			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	79			

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	46			
ELL	73			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	69			
HSP	76			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	75			

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	77			82			82	92	89			27
SWD	47			52			44				4	
ELL	70			79							3	27
AMI												
ASN	87			97				100			3	
BLK	76			79			80				3	
HSP	75			80			78	94	89		6	
MUL	82			79			69	92	92		5	
PAC												
WHT	77			82			84	91	89		6	
FRL	72			75			75	86	86		6	

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	80	64	56	87	71	69	81	93	86			80
SWD	39	35	31	54	56	45	33	71				
ELL	88	74		87	58		50					80
AMI												
ASN	94	72		97	86		82					
BLK	76	65	64	73	62	46	83		80			
HSP	77	66	56	85	71	71	82	88	89			
MUL	85	68	62	91	75	84	81	92	100			
PAC												
WHT	80	63	55	88	71	68	80	95	84			
FRL	76	61	56	84	74	74	83	86	80			

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	80	62	45	83	66	65	78	93	89			
SWD	46	37	28	50	44	44	19	40				
ELL	86			87								
AMI												
ASN	94	65		94	87		90		100			
BLK	86	67		72	73	70	94					
HSP	78	61	41	79	63	57	74	95	88			
MUL	77	57	40	84	63		80	100	92			
PAC												
WHT	80	62	45	85	66	66	77	91	87			
FRL	74	61	42	77	59	60	73	91	84			

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
05	2023 - Spring	83%	56%	27%	54%	29%
07	2023 - Spring	74%	40%	34%	47%	27%
08	2023 - Spring	67%	35%	32%	47%	20%
09	2023 - Spring	98%	48%	50%	48%	50%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	52%	28%	58%	22%
06	2023 - Spring	71%	42%	29%	47%	24%
03	2023 - Spring	81%	50%	31%	50%	31%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	71%	44%	27%	54%	17%
07	2023 - Spring	88%	52%	36%	48%	40%
03	2023 - Spring	92%	61%	31%	59%	33%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	55%	25%	61%	19%
08	2023 - Spring	72%	40%	32%	55%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	77%	50%	27%	55%	22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	80%	43%	37%	44%	36%
05	2023 - Spring	84%	55%	29%	51%	33%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	46%	52%	50%	48%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	42%	58%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	61%	31%	66%	26%

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.

Our overall proficiency in Math went from 87% in 21-22 to 80% in 22-23. Some contributing factors may be the acceleration of Math at the middle school level. We moved several 6th grade and 7th grade students in 7 Advanced. They took the 7th Math FAST even though majority of their instruction focused on the 8th grade Math standards. 7th grade overall proficiency was 88%. This year the students in 7 Advanced will be taking the 8th Math FAST which will be more aligned with the standards they learned throughout the year and hopefully increase our 8th grade Math proficiency. Our 8th grade Math proficiency was 72%%. Most 8th grade students are in Algebra or Geometry leaving just a handful of students in 8th grade Math. Giving our 7 Advanced students the 8th grade FAST will increase proficiency for 8th grade.

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

Our ELA proficiency for 22-23 was 79% which was a decline by 1% point. However, Our Math proficiency was 80% which was a decline of 6% points from the 22-23 school year. Unsure of the contributing factors of the decline in Math. We will be focusing on increasing the rigor and engagement of our Tier 1 instruction this year using ALDs, B1G M, and Building a Thinking Classroom.

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.

NA

All areas are above the state average.

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

Third grade Math showed great gains with 92% proficiency. The third grade team plans together rigorous and engaging lessons. They embraced the 5 practices of Math and continue to grow and learn as educators. This year they have worked over the summer to implement strategies from Building a Thinking Classroom.

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

Our area of concern would be the number of level ones on the FAST. We are hoping that our plan this year to increase rigor and engagement will decrease the number of level ones for the 23-24 school year.

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

- Increase proficiency with SWD
- Increase rigor and student engagement in the classrooms for Tier 1 instruction in Math using ALDs, B1G M, and Building a Thinking Classroom strategies
- Better alignment with Tier 2 and Tier 1 instruction
- Improve processes for MTSS, using the decision tree

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.

Looking at Challenger K8 ESSA subgroups, there is a disparity between all other subgroup areas and our Students with Disabilities. Last year, our SWD fell in the mid C range with 46% proficient. Our goal was to increase that proficiency to 54% proficient to at least the B range. However, our SWD only increased 1%. They are 47% proficient in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At least 54% of SWD at Challenger K8 will achieve proficiency on their FAST ELA Progress Monitoring 3 Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Challenger grade level and content teams will use iReady data focusing on stretch growth and Standards Mastery, FAST progress monitoring, and teacher created checklists/assessments to monitor student growth on BEST benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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.)

Strategy 1: Challenger K8 will be focusing on aligning Tier 2 academics supports to our Tier 1 instruction.

Strategy 2: Challenger K8 ESE staff will design IEP goals that align with student need and BEST grade level benchmarks.

Strategy 3: Challenger K8 Administration will mentor students in the lowest quartile that also fall into the SWD category. The mentorship will consist of data chats and goal setting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategy 1: Students have the opportunity to preview texts, review prerequisite skills, frontload vocabulary, and build confidence in knowledge prior to being taught in the tier 1 setting.

Strategy 2: Staff and students will utilize the IEP goal to drive instruction and show students their individual progress at the growth monitoring and progress monitoring times.

Strategy 3: Building positive relationships and fostering confidence within students are powerful indicators of academic and life-long success.

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.

Strategy 1:

1. PL content will support aligning Tier 2 support to Tier 1 instruction. The acceleration model will continue to be implemented to support learning gaps that our SWDs might have.
2. Paraprofessional support will be structured to best implement Tier 2 supports.

Person Responsible: Lauren Schumacher (schumacher_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will be in place after PM1 results and tweaked after PM2 results if necessary.

Strategy 2:

1. ESE Department will meet as a team to review BEST benchmarks and discuss how to use them to write individualized student goals.
2. ESE case managers will use progress monitoring data to have data chats with students about their academic progress.
3. Progress monitoring data for students that fall in dual categories of SWD and lowest quartile will be closely monitored by the MTSS coordinator and administration in an effort to intervene with additional support in a timely manner.

Person Responsible: Lauren Schumacher (schumacher_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

By When: PM2 window

Strategy 3:

1. Students that fall in dual categories of SWD and lowest quartile will be matched up with one of the administrators.
2. Administrators will hold data chats to review the students data and set goals.
3. Administrators will monitor their instructional path, growth monitoring, and Standards Mastery from iReady with the students.
4. Administrators will discuss the students with each other at their weekly administration meeting.

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

By When: This will be on-going throughout the year. It will begin after PM1 data.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**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 K8 would like to continue to grow in our learning gains to be at or above the state data from 2018-2019 school year. Our ELA learning gains in 2018-2019 were 68% and in 2021-2022 it was 64%. Our Math learning gains in 2018-2019 were 76% and in 2021-2022 it was 71% and in 2022-2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Using FAST PM3 data, at least 68% of our students will make learning gains in ELA and at least 76% of our students will make learning gains in Math.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring tools will include FAST and iReady progress monitoring and iReady Growth Monitoring. Administration will also use classroom walkthroughs and teachers will collaborate and discuss during team/department meetings, data chats, School Based Leadership Teams, and during vertical planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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.)

Planned and intentional School Based Leadership meetings where grade levels will share the engagement activities and instruction that took place and the results of those activities and instruction using iReady Standards Mastery. Administration will provide feedback on the level of engagement and depth of the benchmark during classroom walkthroughs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To increase learning gains throughout our classrooms, the level of Tier 1 instruction needs to be at a higher level making sure the depth of the standard is being addressed. By focusing on rigorous activities and engagement, students will develop confidence with more difficult tasks.

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.

1. Administration will discuss the expectations for the 23-24 school year to include the new SBLT format. Each team leader/dept. chair will add to a Power Point slide the activities and instruction with high level of engagement and rigor monthly.
2. Administration will discuss how teachers need to use ALDs, B1G M, Building Thinking Classroom, and

Rigorous Learning Toolkit to plan instruction and activities.

3. Administration will have data chats with teams, individual teachers, and students to discuss the data and how to improve that data with tier 1 instruction.

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

By When: Before PM2 and again before PM3

1. Administration will discuss the expectations for the 23-24 school year to include the new SBLT format. Each team leader/dept. chair will add to a Power Point slide the activities and instruction with high level of engagement and rigor monthly.

2. Administration will discuss how teachers need to use ALDs, B1G M, Building Thinking Classroom, and Rigorous Learning Toolkit to plan instruction and activities.

3. Administration will have data chats with teams, individual teachers, and students to discuss the data and how to improve that data with tier 1 instruction.

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

By When: Before PM2 and again before PM3