

Broward County Public Schools

Challenger Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Challenger Elementary School

5703 NW 94TH AVE, Tamarac, FL 33321

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tara Zdanowicz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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 Broward 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Challenger Elementary School

5703 NW 94TH AVE, Tamarac, FL 33321

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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.

Challenger Elementary will provide a positive learning environment, which recognizes the importance of individual needs, and encourages community involvement. Challenger is committed to educating all students/staff to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Challenger Elementary is aligned with the District's vision. We are dedicated to educate today's students and staff to succeed in tomorrow's world.

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
Zdanowicz, Tara	Principal	<p>The Principal will provide leadership and administration which will motivate instructional and support personnel to strive for superior performance so as to provide the best possible opportunities for student growth and development, both educationally and personally.</p> <p>In addition to the primary function, the elementary principal shall be responsible for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developing and administering the general school routine, and coordinate all activities within the school building. 2. Participating in the selection of new teaching and classified personnel. 3. Observing, counseling, and motivating professional staff toward performances to attain the educational goals of the District. 4. Utilizing to the fullest extent possible, all available school facilities, materials, and staff service personnel. 5. Continually evaluating existing programs and practices, curriculum content, and pilot or experimental programs. 6. Maintaining an educational philosophy and school climate which encourages a cooperative and participating attitude on the part of all teachers and students.
Philip, Chelsea	Teacher, K-12	<p>Supervise classes to ensure all students are learning in a safe and productive environment.</p> <p>Organize supplies and resources for lectures and presentations.</p> <p>Deliver personalized instruction to each student by encouraging interactive learning.</p> <p>Plan and implement educational activities and events.</p> <p>Ensure your classroom is clean and orderly.</p> <p>Prepare and distribute periodic progress reports and semester report cards.</p> <p>Attend parent-teacher meetings.</p> <p>Evaluate and document students' progress.</p> <p>Allocate and grade homework, assignments, and tests.</p> <p>SAC Co-Chair</p> <p>The Chair must ensure that the Committee functions properly, that there is encouraged full participation during meetings and open forums. Ensures that all relevant matters are discussed, communicated to constituency and that effective decisions are made and carried out.</p> <p>Records the minutes of the meetings.</p>
Brightman, Christopher	Assistant Principal	

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sujballie-Holness, Tia	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Tara Zdanowicz

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.*

10

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%)

	2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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 .	

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	139	113	158	142	193	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	910
Attendance below 90 percent	25	15	17	17	25	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	2	4	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	5	1	2	1	0	0	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

Wednesday 9/23/2020

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	110	169	130	192	160	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	909
Attendance below 90 percent	10	0	5	4	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	5	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	12	11	0	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	0	0	0	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	3	13	10	13	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	110	169	130	192	160	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	909
Attendance below 90 percent	10	0	5	4	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	5	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	12	11	0	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	0	0	0	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	3	13	10	13	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	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%	59%	57%	65%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	60%	58%	67%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	54%	53%	60%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	65%	63%	67%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	76%	66%	62%	71%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	53%	51%	59%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	46%	53%	46%	45%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	60%	60%	0%	58%	2%
	2018	66%	59%	7%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	62%	6%	58%	10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	63%	58%	5%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	56%	59%	-3%	56%	0%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	65%	1%	62%	4%
	2018	61%	63%	-2%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	67%	7%	64%	10%
	2018	66%	63%	3%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	64%	64%	0%	60%	4%
	2018	65%	62%	3%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	49%	-4%	53%	-8%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33	45	50	35	50	41	21				
ELL	58	64	59	72	74	64	45				
ASN	73			91							
BLK	60	67	59	67	73	50	44				
HSP	67	64	57	75	78	59	42				
MUL	75	64		75	71		55				

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
WHT	67	68		74	80		58				
FRL	60	63	57	69	75	52	43				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	43	54	48	41	46	35	31				
ELL	57	68	67	61	61	58	31				
BLK	61	61	50	64	56	40	43				
HSP	70	68	65	67	63	41	61				
MUL	81	79		67	79		70				
WHT	75	68		80	74		70				
FRL	63	63	55	66	63	45	50				
2017 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	28	55	64	38	57	38	21				
ELL	41	67	79	58	62	60	25				
BLK	61	64	54	61	70	60	38				
HSP	59	60	64	66	61	48	50				
MUL	70	79		73	71						
WHT	81	81		83	88		74				
FRL	59	64	60	61	67	57	39				

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	62
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	494
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39

Students With Disabilities	
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	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
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	63
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	68
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	69
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	59
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the Students With Disability (SWD) achievement level in ELA with a percentage of 33%. The contributing factors include a need for increased differentiated instruction, more rigorous IEP goals, and teacher professional development. The trends include a performance gap between SWDs and general student population.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was the ELA proficiency level which dropped from 43% to 33%. The factors that contributed to the decline were areas of need in the scheduling for SWD support, lack of rigor in a portion of grade level IEP goals, and a need for additional teacher professional development specific to strategies relating to SWDs.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is the Science proficiency level. A factor that contributed to this was a need for more professional development with the curriculum and resources. There is also a need for teachers to receive more professional developments in regards to unwrapping the standards to drive instruction.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the SWD lowest quartile learning gains in Math. The actions taken by the school was the implementation of effective mathematic strategies and best practices as well as the utilization of the Math Acaletics program.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, two potential areas of concern include:

1. The number of students with attendance below 90%.
2. The amount of students who received a level 1 in Math and Reading on the 2019 FSA.

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

1. Promoting a Balanced Literacy school wide initiative for all students that incorporates science through differentiated instruction.
2. Increase learning gains for students with disabilities.
3. Provide adequate and efficient professional development for all teachers in the areas of differentiated instruction, high yield strategies to be utilized with SWDs, and accessing and adequately using content related resources.
4. Fostering a school wide science forward initiative.
5. Monthly data chats to effectively monitor student achievement and progress throughout the school year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disability proficiency performance in Mathematics declined. Students with Disability proficiency declined from 41% (2017-18) to 35% (2018-19).
Measurable Outcome:	By 2020-2021, SWDs will increase their Math proficiency level from 35% to 45% by increased usage of I-Ready and high yield strategies implemented by interventionist as evidenced by 2020-2021 FSA scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Brightman (christopher.d.brightman@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitating meetings that support data analysis of formative assessments given throughout the school year. In addition, sharing instructional strategies and interventions to support students in need of Tier II and Tier III support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers utilize formative data to create effective differentiated instructional practices, then student achievement results will increase in Math as well as other areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monthly progress monitoring of SWDs involving the SWDs facilitator and classroom teacher.
2. Monthly data driven PLCs focused on highly effective differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Tara Zdanowicz (tara.zdanowicz@browardschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Area of focus surrounds SWDs Lowest Quartile in ELA. This group has been chosen for the Area of Focus due to a decline in meeting proficiency on the FSA. In 2018 this group made 43% proficiency, however in 2019 there was a 10% decrease. If teachers utilize more effective interventions and strategies to remediate, then student achievement will improve.

Measurable Outcome: By 2020-2021, SWDs will increase their ELA proficiency level from 33% to 45% by increased usage of I-Ready and high yield strategies implemented by interventionist as evidenced by 2020-2021 FSA scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tara Zdanowicz (tara.zdanowicz@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Develop a master schedule allowing for collaborative planning time and sharing of best practices, including instructional strategies and interventions to support students in need of Tier II and Tier III support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If teachers are given collaborative planning and professional development time this will allow for effective use of time, and sharing of responsibilities. Teachers will also be given time to analyze grade level data to acknowledge trends. Teachers will share best practices in the areas of scaffolding, remediation, and enrichment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monthly progress monitoring of SWDs involving the SWDs facilitator and classroom teacher.
2. Monthly data driven PLCs focused on highly effective differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Tara Zdanowicz (tara.zdanowicz@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Promoting a Balanced Literacy school wide initiative for all students that incorporates science through differentiated instruction.
2. Increase learning gains for students with disabilities.
3. Provide adequate and efficient professional development for all teachers in the areas of differentiated instruction, high yield strategies to be utilized with SWDs, and accessing and adequately using content related resources.
4. Fostering a school wide science forward initiative.
5. Monthly data chats to effectively monitor student achievement and progress throughout the school year.

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 Elementary builds a positive school culture and environment by ensuring that there is:

- Social justice and equity by ensuring that all students regardless of race or disability receive differentiated instruction and access to resources needed for learning.
- Allocation of funds are used to provide adequate resources for all students.
- Celebrating Diversity by including Social Emotional components such as Morning Mindfulness and utilizing Cloud 9 character traits.
- Incorporating the four state mandates into core curriculum to promote diversity and acknowledge cultural contributions.
- Providing high communication where parents are involved in the decision making process through SAC and family nights including Title 1 family events.
- Professional development is provided to staff to share best practices and desegregate data.
- Celebration of all stakeholder achievements such as acknowledging volunteers, Honor Roll, Reading Across Broward, Staff Appreciation week, and spotlighting Star staff of the week.
- Established a positive behavior discipline plan where all stakeholders are involved to ensure safety in our school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$44,940.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	3771 - Challenger Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$8,500.00
			Notes: Instructional Materials for ELO			
	5100	100-Salaries	3771 - Challenger Elementary School	IDEA		\$36,440.00
			Notes: Salary for 2 teacher assistants to assist Students with Disabilities.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$26,720.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	3771 - Challenger Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$8,500.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional Materials for ELO</i>			
	5100	100-Salaries	3771 - Challenger Elementary School	IDEA		\$18,220.00
			<i>Notes: Salary for one teacher assistant to assist Students with Disabilities.</i>			
Total:						\$71,660.00