Brevard Public Schools

Challenger 7 Elementary School

2020-21 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)	62%
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	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

We will create a supportive environment in which children and adults feel welcomed, respected, safe and valued. Diversity is honored in our community where we collaborate to benefit the whole child.

Provide the school's vision statement

Challenger 7 is a school in partnership with families and the community, where all students excel and grow to become 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 posting and monthly newsletters.
King, MaryHelen	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 data, communicates with parents, works with staff to design and implement a program to increase attendance rates. Collaborates with staff to design inclusion schedule.
Barrons, Angela	Instructional Coach	Serves as instructional leader, engages community and stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision making process. Coordinates family engagement nights. Works with teachers and staff members to improve their instructional practices through the coaching cycle.
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 and PBIS. Works with teachers and staff members to improve their instructional practices through the intervention 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.*
6

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.*
17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
35

Demographic Data

2020-21 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)	62%
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	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/17/2020

Prior Year - 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	75	71	80	81	81	84	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	565
Attendance below 90 percent	33	29	32	21	21	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
One or more suspensions	5	0	1	5	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	8	7	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	11	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	49	37	39	41	33	29	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	261

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	5	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - 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	75	71	80	81	81	84	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	565
Attendance below 90 percent	33	29	32	21	21	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
One or more suspensions	5	0	1	5	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	8	7	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	11	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	49	37	39	41	33	29	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	261

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	5	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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	2019	59%	64%	-5%	58%	1%
	2018	65%	63%	2%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	61%	-3%	58%	0%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	56%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	57%	60%	-3%	56%	1%
	2018	61%	54%	7%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	75%	60%	15%	54%	21%
	2018	71%	63%	8%	52%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	53%	61%	-8%	62%	-9%
	2018	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	64%	-2%	64%	-2%
	2018	67%	59%	8%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	66%	60%	6%	60%	6%
	2018	72%	58%	14%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	81%	67%	14%	55%	26%
	2018	72%	68%	4%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	43%	56%	-13%	53%	-10%
	2018	58%	57%	1%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
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				

2018 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 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
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

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
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	402
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	56
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	59
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	66
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 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	60
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Science achievement showed the lowest performance with 45% proficient in 2019 compared to all other areas on the School Grade Component. Prior to the 2019 school year, science instruction wasn't meeting the depth of the standards and there was a lack of hands on science inquiry. The data trend over the past 3 years showed a downward trend with a decrease of 13% in proficiency. The lowest 25% subgroup in ELA showed the second lowest performance with only 49% proficiency. While this increased from 45% in the 2018 school year, it still fell 8% below the district average and 4% below the state average.

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

Science achievement went from 58% in 2018 to 45% in 2019. Students were not exposed to the depth of the standards and labs necessary for deeper understanding. In addition, students were not being exposed to the 5 E Model and inquiry methods of instruction.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

Science achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state with an 8% gap. Students were not being exposed to the depth of the standards and labs necessary for deeper understanding. In addition, students were not being exposed to the 5 E Model and inquiry methods of instruction.

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

ELA Learning Gains had the most improvement with 60% learning gains in 2019 compared to 2018 at 55%. During the 2018 - 2019 school year, staff focused on strengthening interventions in reading across all grade levels. Grade level teams worked with ESE teachers and the leadership team to target student needs based on data from multiple assessment sources.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Student attendance is an area of concern as students need to be in school in order to learn. During the 2018 - 2019 school year 31% of students had an attendance rate below 90%. Attendance will need to be tracked and monitored regularly and a plan for intervention will need to be developed for students with frequent absences. This will be especially important for elearners this year who continually check in and check out of lessons.

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

1. ESE subgroup instruction and proficiency
2. Science Instruction
3. Standards-Based Instruction

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 34% proficiency in ELA and 47% proficiency in Math. The ESE subgroup did not meet ESSA requirements, with a 40 Federal Index School. While the overall student school grade was a B in 2018 - 2019, the SWD subgroup school grade was a D. In looking at comparison I-ready data from fall 2019 to fall 2020, 85% of SWD are scoring below grade level, with 37% of students showing a learning loss from 2019 to 2020.
Measureable Outcome:	Increase the ELA proficiency of students with disabilities by at least 5% from 34% proficiency to 39%
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 intervention needs and instructional curriculum for all students with disabilities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Hattie's Visible Learning research, comprehensive interventions for learning disabled students has an effect size of 0.77. To maximize achievement, a combination of direct instruction and strategy instruction should be followed. The strategies with the greatest impact include scaffolding, directed response, sequencing, and drill-repetition-practice-review.

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	
Person Responsible	Angela Barrons (barrons.angela@brevardschools.org)
Professional development opportunities on the differentiation and scaffolding of instruction will be offered for teachers	
Person Responsible	MaryHelen King (king.maryhelen@brevardschools.org)
PLC's will analyze instructional tasks to ensure alignment to the focus standards. For each task, classroom teachers and ESE teachers will work collaboratively to identify scaffolding, sequencing, and questioning strategies to support instruction for students with disabilities.	
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.	
Person Responsible	MaryHelen King (king.maryhelen@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science proficiency in fifth grade decreased 15% from 60% in 2017 - 2018 to 45% in 2018 - 2019
Measureable Outcome:	Increase science proficiency in fifth graders from 45% to 55%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Work collaboratively to create hands on science lessons following the 5 E Model of Inquiry and utilize ELA text and writing prompts to further support the learning
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Planning lessons using the 5 E Model of Inquiry will provide students with hands-on opportunities to inquire about science concepts. Embedding the science concept into ELA text and writing prompts will tie the concepts across content areas and provide additional learning opportunities.

Action Steps to Implement	
Plan school-wide STEM instructional days focused on planning STEM activities across all content areas focused on quarterly science priority standards	
Person Responsible	Angela Barrons (barrons.angela@brevardschools.org)
Provide extended professional development on the 5 E Model of Inquiry and STEM Scopes resources.	
Person Responsible	MaryHelen King (king.maryhelen@brevardschools.org)
Work collaboratively in PLC's to create hands on science lessons following the 5 E Model of Inquiry and utilize ELA text and writing prompts to further support the learning	
Person Responsible	Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org)
Once per semester, teachers receive feedback on their science instructional practices. Feedback will be focused on hands on engagement, utilization of science vocabulary, and written responses.	
Person Responsible	Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELA achievement gap data shows a 3 year downward trend in ELA proficiency. While the Black subgroup is increasing, the White subgroup data and overall proficiency is declining. In addition, Black and Hispanic subgroups are performing below the White subgroup. The lowest 25% subgroup in ELA showed the second lowest performance with only 49% proficiency. While this increased from 45% in the 2018 school year, it still fell 8% below the district average and 4% below the state average. I-Ready Diagnostic data shows that Vocabulary is an area of focus with on 39% of students scoring in Tier I, 44% scoring in Tier II, and 17% scoring in Tier III.
Measureable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will increase from 64% to 67%. ELA Learning gains will increase from 60% to 63% and ELA Lowest 25 percentile will increase from 49% to 53%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Courtney Maynor (maynor.courtney@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will work collaboratively in PLC's to design lessons and plan standards-based instruction. In addition, teachers will plan small group instruction to address individual student needs and gaps in skills.
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.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will work collaboratively in PLC's to design lessons and plan standards-based instruction. Teachers will engage in task analysis and lesson planning activities to ensure task-standard alignment and analyze student work to determine skill deficits.

Person Responsible Angela Barrons (barrons.angela@brevardschools.org)

Work with district resource teachers to provide professional development to teachers on vocabulary strategies and best practices for embedding vocabulary review into instruction on a daily basis.

Person Responsible MaryHelen King (king.maryhelen@brevardschools.org)

Identify focus standards for each quarter and share school-wide. During PLC's discuss instruction, assessment, remediation, and enrichment of the focus standards. Conduct walkthroughs and provide feedback on the instruction of focus standards.

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

Teachers will work with the literacy coach to participate in coaching cycles focused on Tier I ELA instruction. Once per quarter, teachers will receive feedback on their ELA instructional practices. Feedback will be focused on opportunities for students to engage with grade level text and standards-aligned tasks.

Person Responsible	Angela Barrons (barrons.angela@brevardschools.org)

Once per semester, teachers receive feedback on their ELA instructional practices. Feedback will be focused on text complexity, student engagement, and task to standards alignment.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

A team of administrators, guidance counselor, literacy coach, and teachers will review attendance monthly.
Attendance will be tracked and monitored regularly and a plan for intervention will be developed for students with frequent absences. The team will research a list of strategies to increase full day attendance among elearners and the PBIS team will work to create incentives related to attendance for all students.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Challenger 7 Elementary School is a Gold Model PBIS school. S.T.A.R.R. expectations were created 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.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.