

Brevard Public Schools

Challenger 7 Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	12
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (52%) 2020-21: (57%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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.

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 (Revised 2021-22)

Provide the school's vision statement.:

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Maynor, Courtney	Principal	Serves as instructional leader, engages community and stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision making process. Ensures standards based instruction is implemented. Engages the community through social media, monthly newsletters, surveys, and meetings.
Johnson, Christina	Assistant Principal	Serves as instructional leader, engages community and stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision making process. Engages with business partners to support our school community. Tracks attendance and discipline data and works with staff and families to increase attendance rates and decrease discipline incidents.
Farner, Jessica	Other	Title I Interventionist/ Coordinator 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 2022 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.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

507

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

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	62	70	64	77	57	82	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	492
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	5	9	5	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	8	18	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	8	23	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	13	0	17	10	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	2	2	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/2/2022

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	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	0

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	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	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	61%	56%	62%			64%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	63%	61%	62%			60%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	54%	52%	53%			49%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	57%	60%	60%	62%			68%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	47%	64%	64%	61%			65%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	55%	55%	42%			51%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	56%	51%	54%			45%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	59%	64%	-5%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	61%	-3%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	60%	-3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
06	2022					
	2019	75%	60%	15%	54%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	53%	61%	-8%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	64%	-2%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					
	2019	66%	60%	6%	60%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
06	2022					
	2019	81%	67%	14%	55%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	56%	-13%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	23	41	50	25	33	19					
BLK	58	53		47	59						
HSP	58	72		60	50						
MUL	63	58		53	42						
WHT	59	56	53	57	45	25	56				
FRL	59	58	51	54	47	33	51				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	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				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
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	362
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	54
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	60
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	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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 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	50
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Challenger 7 Elementary has shown declines in all areas, except for ELA lowest 25% which has resulted in the school dropping from a B to C in 2021-22. Math achievement, overall learning gains, and learning gains for the lowest 25% have declined the most, with only 3rd grade showing a 5% increase in math proficiency. Overall ELA proficiency was 59% which was 3% drop from the previous year. Black, Hispanic, and Students with Disabilities subgroups showed lower proficiency than other students at Challenger 7. SWD was the lowest subgroup with only 24% proficient in ELA. Overall Math proficiency was 57%, which was a 5% drop from the previous year. Black, Hispanic, and Students with Disabilities subgroups showed lower proficiency in math. SWD was the lowest subgroup with only 17% proficient in math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based off of progress monitoring and state assessments, math proficiency, learning gains, and the lowest 25% 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 continuous absences due to COVID-19 and quarantine protocols. We also departmentalized in fourth grade, and saw the lowest proficiency and learning gain scores for this grade level. Based on this drop, this year all fourth grade teachers will be self-contained to encourage collaborative planning and data tracking. We have also re-allocated positions to ensure we have 3 ESE teachers that push in the general education classroom to service our students with disabilities, instead of 2 that we had last year. This year we will have a new Math curriculum that will reinforce 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 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science achievement scores increased by 4% from 54% proficiency to 58% proficiency. This also exceeded the district average by 3% and the state average by 10%.

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

During the 2021 - 2022 school year, all teachers embedded the Stemsscopes 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. Teachers will also receive additional professional development on strategies for teaching students with disabilities and providing scaffolds to support learning.

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 2022 - 2023 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. PD sessions will also focus on High Leverage Practices to support general education and ESE teachers in the general education classroom.

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 2 IA's 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. Title I funds will also be utilized to provide Kagan training for all teachers to help increase student engagement within Tier I instruction.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#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 nondisabled peers, with only 24% proficiency in ELA and 17% proficiency in Math. In 2022 the SWD subgroup did not meet ESSA requirements, with a 32 Federal Index Score. **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** In looking at comparison I-ready data from Spring 2020, 67% of SWD students are scoring below grade level in ELA and 62% are scoring below grade level in Math.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the ELA proficiency of students with disabilities by at least 5% from 24% proficiency to 29% based on FAST PM data from PM1 to PM3. Increase the Math proficiency of students with disabilities by at least 5% from 17% proficiency to 22% based on FAST PM data from PM1 to PM3. **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

Monitoring: Progress monitoring will occur regularly for our SWD by reviewing I-Ready diagnostic data, FAST progress monitoring, Standards Mastery data, and specifically targeted intervention assessment data. **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

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. **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** 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. **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

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

Classroom teachers and ESE teachers will collaborate during common planning and PLC meetings to plan instruction and differentiated supports for students with disabilities. Curriculum pacing will be

reviewed and scaffolds will be discussed at PLC meetings led by the literacy coach to ensure additional support for ESE students. Teachers will choose which scaffolds to use to support instruction. (T)

Person Responsible Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@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 and intervention materials during intervention and small group instruction to identify student needs and close instructional gaps. (T)

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

Purchase technology such as headphones, toner, and charging carts to support student learning. (T)

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

Provide professional development on high leverage practices to support students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Teachers will choose high leverage strategies to implement and will discuss student impact during PLC's.

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

School wide PLC schedule for teachers to ensure that ESE teachers are able to plan with the appropriate grade levels.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Math overall proficiency, learning gains, and lowest 25% all decreased during the 2021 - 2022 school year. In particular, learning gains decreased 14%, from 61% to 47%.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

Increase math proficiency from 57% to 65% and learning gains from 47% to 55% based on FAST PM data.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will occur regularly by reviewing I-Ready diagnostic data, FAST progress monitoring and other instructional assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

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.

Utilize software programs (Reflex Math Online) and intervention materials (Do the Math program) during small group instruction and intervention to identify student needs, build fluency, and close instructional gaps. (T)

Person Responsible

Jessica Farner (farner.jessica@brevardschools.org)

Plan math focused family engagement activities and information sessions to increase mathematics support at home. Provide families with math activities to work on at home and increase student understanding of math concepts. (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 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 ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ELA overall proficiency and learning gains decreased during the 2021 - 2022 school year. In particular, learning gains decreased from 62% to 58%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency will increase from 59% proficiency to 65%. ELA learning gains will increase from 58% to 65%.

Monitoring:

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

I-ready data, standards mastery assessments, and FAST progress monitoring 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: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

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.

A Title I Interventionist and two Title I IA's 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)

Plan ELA focused family engagement activities and information sessions to increase ELA support at home and provide materials for additional practice 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 curriculum as aligned with the B.E.S.T. Standards.

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

School based intervention schedule to ensure that Title I teacher and IA have dedicated and protected time for interventions. (T)

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

Utilize software programs (Lexia and Write Score) and intervention materials (Story Champs) during small group instruction and intervention to identify student needs, build fluency, and close instructional gaps. (T)

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

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 reviewed 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 school culture and environment.

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 data, engagement activities, 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.