# Challenger 7 Elementary School

## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Challenger 7 Elementary School

## 6135 RENA AVE, Cocoa, FL 32927

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

**Demographics**

## Principal: Courtney Maynor L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 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 |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | No |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | *[Data Not Available]* |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (62%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Dustin Sims |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | [not available] |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here. | |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](www.floridacims.org.)

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

# Part I: School Information

## School Mission and Vision

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

At Challenger 7, we aim for the STARS
Student Centered + Teamwork + Academics + Rigor = Success

**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.

## School Leadership Team

**Membership**
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------|-------------------------------|
| 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. |
| Snow, Christine | Instructional Coach | Serves as instructional leader, engages community and stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision making process. Works with teachers and staff members to improve their instructional practices through the coaching cycle and PLC's. Monitors intervention curriculum and progress monitoring. |
| Farner, Jessica | Other | Coordinates family engagement and Title I events, documentation, 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. |
| Brown, Laura | Guidance 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. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Wednesday 7/15/2020, Courtney Maynor L

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
5

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

38

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

508

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

5

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

7

**Demographic Data**

## Early Warning Systems

### 2021-22

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 62 | 68 | 71 | 59 | 81 | 81 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 491 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 15 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 6/15/2021

## 2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 50 | 68 | 56 | 70 | 70 | 67 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 461 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 13 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## 2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 50 | 68 | 56 | 70 | 70 | 67 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 461 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 13 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 62% | | | 64% | 62% | 57% | 65% | 60% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 62% | | | 60% | 60% | 58% | 55% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 53% | | | 49% | 57% | 53% | 45% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 62% | | | 68% | 63% | 63% | 72% | 62% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 61% | | | 65% | 65% | 62% | 61% | 59% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | | | 51% | 53% | 51% | 49% | 49% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 54% | | | 45% | 57% | 53% | 60% | 57% | 55% |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**
**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 64% | -5% | 58% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 61% | -3% | 58% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -59% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 60% | -3% | 56% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -58% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 75% | 60% | 15% | 54% | 21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison | |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 61% | -8% | 62% | -9% | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 64% | -2% | 64% | -2% | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -53% | | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 60% | 6% | 60% | 6% | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 81% | 67% | 14% | 55% | 26% | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -66% | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 56% | -13% | 53% | -10% | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

I-Ready Diagnostic

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 61 | 74 | 86 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 60 | 74 | 85 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 47 | 53 | 60 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 36 | 63 | 77 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43 | 60 | 77 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 23 | 43 | 47 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 14 | 36 | 71 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14 | 33 | 64 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13 | 0 | 25 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 8 | 34 | 52 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 7 | 27 | 49 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 31 | 54 | 66 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 30 | 53 | 59 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 10 | 30 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 16 | 31 | 48 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 15 | 25 | 38 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10 | 30 | 40 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 58 | 81 | 90 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 62 | 79 | 88 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 26 | 53 | 74 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 10 | 35 | 63 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12 | 35 | 61 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6 | 26 | 37 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 57 | 69 | 79 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 52 | 66 | 75 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 13 | 50 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 25 | 49 | 70 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 18 | 45 | 66 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 44 | 50 | 62 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 48 | 57 | 63 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 32 | 36 | 46 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 37 | 38 | 51 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 | 17 | 25 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | 34 | 48 | 41 | 39 | 55 | 38 | 19 | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | 33 | | 50 | 58 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 62 | | | 45 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 59 | 100 | | 55 | 64 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 62 | 48 | 65 | 61 | 40 | 58 | | | | |
| FRL | 62 | 63 | 67 | 60 | 57 | 35 | 61 | | | | |

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | 32 | 50 | 43 | 45 | 49 | 43 | 15 | | | | |
| BLK | 61 | 53 | | 57 | 53 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | 55 | | 56 | 70 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 63 | 62 | | 66 | 69 | 70 | | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | 60 | 53 | 71 | 64 | 58 | 51 | | | | |
| FRL | 64 | 60 | 51 | 64 | 63 | 38 | 36 | | | | |

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | 33 | 46 | 52 | 35 | 46 | 48 | 15 | | | | |
| BLK | 54 | 50 | | 69 | 50 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 61 | 68 | | 69 | 79 | | 45 | | | | |
| MUL | 61 | 68 | | 64 | 55 | | 75 | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 53 | 35 | 73 | 60 | 43 | 63 | | | | |
| FRL | 61 | 54 | 45 | 68 | 61 | 46 | 56 | | | | |

## ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | [not available] |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 57 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 396 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Asian Students** | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 46 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 54 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Multiracial Students** | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 70 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Native American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Pacific Islander Students** | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|---|---|
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **White Students** | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 57 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Economically Disadvantaged Students** | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 58 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Analysis

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

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

While the school overall proficiency levels met or exceeded the district average in all areas, Challenger 7 Elementary has shown declines in all areas compared to the 2018 - 2019 school year. Math achievement, learning gains, and lowest 25% has declined the greatest with 5th and 6th grade scores declining and 3rd and 4th grades only slightly increasing. All subgroups have shown a decline in Math and Reading with Hispanic and Multiracial students showing the biggest drops in proficiency. While school wide proficiency in ELA and Math was 64%, students with disabilities only showed 33% (ELA) and 37% (Math) proficiency.

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

Based off of progress monitoring and state assessments, math proficiency shows the greatest need for improvement. In addition, proficiency in ELA and Math for our students with disabilities subgroup needs to show great improvements.

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

Some factors contributing to this decline may include elearning and continuous absences due to COVID-19 and quarantine protocols. This year we have received Title I funding and have utilized this funding to increase support the intervention block for all grade levels K - 6 to ensure that intervention occurs regularly, especially for Tier 3 students and the lowest 25%. Math instruction needs to include the use of manipulatives, small group instruction, and fluency based interventions to close the gaps and increase math achievement for all subgroups.

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

Science achievement scores increased by 13% from 43% proficiency to 56% proficiency. This also exceeded the district average by 4%.

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

During the 2020 - 2021 school year, all teachers embedded the Stemscopes science curriculum regularly and planned hands on lab experiments and instructional activities. The fifth grade teachers departmentalized, allowing for one teacher to primarily focus on Science Instruction and ensure all standards were addressed and provide a spiral review for the previously taught standards. After school tutoring was also provided for targeted 5th grade students to close achievement gaps and increase proficiency.

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

In order to accelerate learning, all students will receive rigorous, on-grade level Tier 1 instruction. Teachers will engage in professional development on acceleration to include understanding the impact acceleration has on student achievement and strategies for implementation. Teachers will choose acceleration strategies during PLC meetings to embed into their instruction.

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

During the 2021 - 2022 school year, teachers will engage in professional development on acceleration to include understanding the impact acceleration has on student achievement and strategies for implementation. Teachers will choose acceleration strategies during PLC meetings to embed into their instruction.
Teachers will also engage in Kagan training and will use structures such as RallyRobin and Rally Coach to activate thinking and prior knowledge during instruction.

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

Utilizing Title I funds, an interventionist teacher and IA were funded in order to ensure additional Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups were pulled regularly for small group instruction. In addition, programs such as Lexia, Reflex Math, and Write Score will be purchased to provide instruction, assessment, and progress monitoring of students.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| **#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | FSA data shows that students with disabilities are performing significantly below their non-disabled peers, with only 33% proficiency in ELA and 37% proficiency in Math. In 2021 the SWD subgroup did not meet ESSA requirements, with a 39 Federal Index Score. In looking at comparison I-ready data from Spring 2020, 52% of SWD students are scoring below grade level. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | Increase the ELA proficiency of students with disabilities by at least 5% from 34% proficiency to 39%. |
| **Monitoring:** | Progress monitoring will occur regularly for our SWD by reviewing I-Ready diagnostic data, Standards Mastery data, and specifically targeted intervention assessment data. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | 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 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. |

### Action Steps to Implement

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 to ensure additional support for ESE students. Teachers will choose which scaffolds to use to support instruction. (T)

| **Person Responsible** | Christine Snow (snow.christine@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

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) |
|---|---|

Utilize software programs during intervention and small group instruction to identify student needs and close instructional gaps. (T)

| **Person Responsible** | Christine Snow (snow.christine@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

Purchase technology such as microphones, document cameras, and headphones to support student learning. (T)

| **Person Responsible** | Jessica Farner (farner.jessica@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

Provide professional development on best practices for vocabulary instruction. Teachers will choose vocabulary instructional strategies to implement and will discuss student impact during PLC's.

**Person Responsible**    Christine Snow (snow.christine@brevardschools.org)

| **#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math** |
|---|

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Math overall proficiency, learning gains, and lowest 25% all decreased during the 2020 - 2021 school year. In particular, the lowest 25% group decreased 11%, from 53% proficiency to 42% proficiency. |
|---|---|
| **Measureable Outcome:** | Increase math proficiency from 62% to 65% and the Math lowest 25% from 42% to 47%. |
| **Monitoring:** | Progress monitoring will occur regularly by reviewing I-Ready diagnostic data and other Eureka assessments. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | 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. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based 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 math 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. |

| **Action Steps to Implement** |
|---|

Utilize software programs during small group instruction to identify student needs, build fluency, and close instructional gaps. (T)

| **Person Responsible** | Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

Utilize the I-Ready math diagnostic to identify individual student gaps in math instruction. Implement I-Ready math pathway instruction and toolkit lessons to help reinforce math standards and close gaps.

| **Person Responsible** | Christine Snow (snow.christine@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

Plan math focused family engagement activities and information sessions to increase mathematics support at home. (T)

| **Person Responsible** | Jessica Farner (farner.jessica@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

Provide additional academic support opportunities either before or after school focused on targeted math instructional gaps and needs.

| **Person Responsible** | Christina Johnson (johnson.christina@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

Professional development for all staff on Kagan Structures to increase student discussion and small group work. Weekly during PLC's, the implementation of Kagan structures will be reviewed and planned to embed within the curriculum to support student learning. (T)

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

Teachers will utilize manipulatives regularly during instruction to build conceptual understanding of math concepts.

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

Teachers will be observed during math core instruction and feedback will be provided focused on student engagement and the use of manipulatives.

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

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | During the 2021 - 2022 school year, the district implemented B.E.S.T. Standards. While ELA learning gains increased 2% and ELA Lowest 25% increased 5% in the 2020 - 2021 school year, ELA overall proficiency decreased 2% from 64% to 62%. |
| Measureable Outcome: | ELA proficiency will increase from 62% proficiency to 65%. ELA learning gains will increase from 62% to 65% and the lowest 25% will increase from 53% to 56%. |
| Monitoring: | I-ready data and standards mastery assessments will be used to monitor student progress towards the desired outcome. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Implementation of high quality ELA instructional materials with fidelity will support the explicit instruction of vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency and comprehension. High-quality reading instruction requires that teachers understand more than simply what to teach. Collaborative planning for instruction and use of high quality instructional materials will support teachers to understand how to identify their students' instructional needs, select appropriate materials, organize instruction to maximize learning, and differentiate instruction to meet individual needs. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | There is a misalignment among the level of the standard and task complexity. In addition, i-Ready data shows a school-wide gap in vocabulary skills. If task alignment would occur with differentiated small group instruction, learning gains would increase. According to Hattie's research, vocabulary knowledge is a strong predictor of reading comprehension and has a 0.67 effect size |

### Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will work collaboratively in PLC's with the Literacy Coach to review the B.E.S.T. standards and implement the new ELA curriculum as planed by the district to ensure standards-aligned instruction. Teachers will analyze student work to determine skill deficits and determine a plan for remediation as needed. (T)

| Person Responsible | Christine Snow (snow.christine@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

A Title I Interventionist and Title I IA will be utilized to provide daily small group intervention to students with disabilities who are below grade level. Interventions will be specifically targeted to address skill gaps identified through assessments. (T)

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

Twice a quarter, teachers will implement a standards mastery assessment to progress monitor students. During PLC's, these results will be reviewed and intervention groups will be created based off of student need in order to close individual gaps.

| Person Responsible | Christine Snow (snow.christine@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

Plan Indian River Lagoon field trip opportunity for students to promote informational reading and writing standards. (T)

| **Person Responsible** | Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

Plan ELA focused family engagement activities and information sessions to increase ELA support at home. (T)

| **Person Responsible** | Jessica Farner (farner.jessica@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

Teachers will be observed during ELA core instruction and feedback will be provided focused on student engagement and the implementation of the new curriculum as aligned with the B.E.S.T. Standards

| **Person Responsible** | Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**During the 2020 - 2021 school year, discipline data was highest among our students with disabilities and Kindergarten students. The majority of incidents occurred in the classroom and were primarily coded as physical aggression and classroom disruption. In order to decrease discipline referrals, we revamped our PBIS team and system to include a school store in which students can earn tickets and use them to purchase items weekly and monthly. Discipline data will be collected and shared with staff quarterly. Students who receive multiple referrals are referred to the IPST team and a behavior plan is created to support the student and promote positive behavior.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Challenger 7 Elementary School is a Gold Model PBIS school. S.T.A.R. expectations were revised and shared with all staff, students, and parents. Students receive tickets for following the expectations and maintaining a positive environment. In addition, the Youth Truth survey completed by students is reviewed by the leadership team to gain input from students on the culture of the school. Parent surveys are completed yearly as well to provide feedback on the school's processes, procedures, and culture. Parents,

teachers, and community members make up our School Advisory Council to share updates about school events, data, and
instructional practices.

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

Students complete the Youth Truth survey and parents/guardians complete the Parent Survey to provide feedback on the culture of the school and areas needed for improvements. Teachers provide feedback through the InSight Survey. All stakeholders, (students, staff, and families) were surveyed to provide feedback on our School Mission, Vision, logo, and Title I budget. These were also reviewed at the SAC meeting to include community members. All stakeholders promote a positive culture by supporting our PBIS program, providing donations, and volunteering to support our school store and events.

## Part V: Budget

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | | | | $144,922.00 |
|---|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | $63,773.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Title I Interventionist to provide small group intervention to Tier 3 students.* | | | |
| | 5100 | 150-Aides | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | $28,137.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Title I Instructional Aide to provide small group intervention to Tier 2 students.* | | | |
| | 5100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 0.5 | $32,767.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Literacy Coach to lead weekly PLC's, create intervention groups, and monitor student progress.* | | | |
| | 6500 | 360-Rentals | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | $14,700.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Software subscription fee for instructional programs.* | | | |
| | 6500 | 519-Technology-Related Supplies | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | $1,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Technology supplies including microphones and headphones to support instruction* | | | |
| | 6500 | 644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | $4,545.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Technology hardware including doc cams to support instruction* | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | $24,460.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 6500 | 360-Rentals | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | $14,700.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Software subscription fee for instructional programs.* | | | |
| | 6400 | 311-Subagreements up to $25,000 | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | $8,760.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Kagan professional development for all instructional staff* | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 6150 | 510-Supplies | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | $1,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Materials for Family Engagement Math night* | | | |
| **3** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards** | | | | **$131,557.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | $63,773.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Title I interventionist to provide small group intervention to Tier 3 students* | | | |
| | 5100 | 150-Aides | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | $28,137.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Title I Instructional Aide to provide small group intervention to Tier 2 students.* | | | |
| | 5100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 0.5 | $32,767.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Literacy Coach to lead weekly PLC's, create intervention groups, and monitor student progress.* | | | |
| | 6150 | 510-Supplies | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | $6,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Materials for an ELA family engagement night and activities* | | | |
| | 5100 | 730-Dues and Fees | 0191 - Challenger 7 Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | $880.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Plan field trip opportunities for students to promote informational reading and writing standards* | | | |
| | | | | | **Total:** | **$300,939.00** |