

Broward County Public Schools

Challenger Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 0 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 18 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 22 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Challenger Elementary School

5703 NW 94TH AVE, Tamarac, FL 33321

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mission: 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.

Vision: 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 world.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Zdanowicz, Tara | Principal | <p>Assume administrative responsibility and instructional leadership, under the supervision of the superintendent in accordance with rules and regulations of the School Board, for the planning, management, operation, and evaluation of the educational program of the school. Submit recommendations to the Superintendent regarding the appointment, assignment, promotion, transfer, and dismissal of all personnel assigned to the school.</p> <p>Assume administrative responsibility for all records and reports required regarding pupils, for the transfer of pupils within the school, and for the promotion of pupils. Has the authority to discipline students up to and including the suspension of students from school or from a school bus. Enforce the Broward County Schools Code of Student Conduct.</p> |
| Brightman, Christopher | Assistant Principal | <p>The Assistant School Principal will effectively perform the responsibilities using the following knowledge, skills and responsibilities: Ability to: demonstrate the knowledge and practice of current educational trends, research and technology; understand the unique needs, growth problems and characteristics of school students; read, interpret and implement the State Board Rules, Code of Ethics, School Board Policies and appropriate state and federal statutes; and coach, supervise and evaluate personnel in accordance with collective bargaining agreements. The Assistant School Principal will need to demonstrate effective communication and interaction skills with all stakeholders, have the ability to use group dynamics within the context of cultural diversity and be knowledgeable of Florida educational reform, accountability and effective school concepts. Computer skills as required for the position.</p> |
| Sujballie-Holness, Tia | Other | <p>Testing Coordinator, Bullying Designee, CPST Member, Teacher/student support</p> |
| Barbera, Kelly | Reading Coach | <p>Mentor and support teachers by providing ongoing literacy-related professional development in the major areas of reading and instructional assessments; modeling effective evidence-based instructional practices; assisting in analyzing student performance data for differentiated instruction and interventions; and supporting the implementation of school-wide reading initiatives.</p> |
| Hollis, Charena | School Counselor | <p>To implement a process to help students discover and develop their best talents for personal happiness and social usefulness.</p> |
| Daly, Julie | Other | <p>Facilitate IEP Meetings and oversee ESE services provided to PreK-5th grade students.</p> |
| Briggs, Steven | Other | <p>Supporting teachers and students with math, overseeing math curriculum.</p> |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We collaborate with our School Advisory Council (SAC) in order to involve our stakeholders in the SIP process. We meet with this committee every month throughout the school year. This allows us to share our data, goals, action plan, and monitoring process with all stakeholders.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Our Leadership Team meets monthly and will review achievement data from the following sources: FAST PM, i-ready Diagnostics, i-ready Growth Monitoring, Benchmark Unit Assessments, and Mastery Connect. We are also facilitating quarterly data chats with each grade level in order to monitor our data and action plan. Depending on what the data shows we are able to make any necessary revisions.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 88% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 86% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: B 2019-20: A |

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| | 2018-19: A 2017-18: B |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 40 | 45 | 38 | 41 | 37 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 253 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 14 | 33 | 22 | 36 | 21 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 19 | 33 | 33 | 40 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 167 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 11 | 51 | 45 | 61 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 8 | 41 | 40 | 47 | 39 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Students retained two or more times | 2 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Absent 10% or more school days | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | | |
| Course failure in Math | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year | | |
| Students retained two or more times | | |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more school days | 21 | 23 | 14 | 11 | 16 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 8 | 25 | 36 | 21 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 6 | 18 | 32 | 41 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 58 | 56 | 53 | 57 | 58 | 56 | 55 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 67 | | | 52 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 59 | | | 41 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 55 | 62 | 59 | 55 | 54 | 50 | 38 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 75 | | | 29 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 63 | | | 29 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 44 | 48 | 54 | 49 | 59 | 59 | 39 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 71 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 60 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 45 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 53 | 59 | 59 | 66 | | | 54 | | |

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 53 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 265 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 61 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 491 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 50 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 55 | | | |
| BLK | 48 | | | |
| HSP | 55 | | | |
| MUL | 69 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | | | |

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| FRL | 47 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 47 | | | |
| ELL | 56 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 57 | | | |
| HSP | 61 | | | |
| MUL | 73 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | | | |
| FRL | 59 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 58 | | | 55 | | | 44 | | | | | 53 |
| SWD | 52 | | | 52 | | | 24 | | | | 5 | 10 |
| ELL | 50 | | | 60 | | | 43 | | | | 5 | 53 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 40 | | | 70 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 55 | | | 49 | | | 35 | | | | 5 | 50 |
| HSP | 56 | | | 59 | | | 49 | | | | 5 | 57 |
| MUL | 75 | | | 63 | | | | | | | 2 | |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | | | 69 | | | 65 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 54 | | | 48 | | | 40 | | | | 5 | 46 |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 57 | 67 | 59 | 55 | 75 | 63 | 49 | | | | | 66 |
| SWD | 33 | 59 | 54 | 39 | 68 | 55 | 23 | | | | | |
| ELL | 46 | 66 | 60 | 47 | 67 | 67 | 26 | | | | | 66 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | 63 | 58 | 50 | 73 | 60 | 40 | | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 63 | 50 | 57 | 73 | 64 | 50 | | | | | 74 |
| MUL | 56 | 100 | | 47 | 90 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 84 | | 68 | 90 | | 69 | | | | | |
| FRL | 55 | 69 | 56 | 49 | 71 | 63 | 44 | | | | | 65 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 55 | 52 | 41 | 38 | 29 | 29 | 39 | | | | | 54 |
| SWD | 26 | 21 | 30 | 18 | 40 | 45 | 20 | | | | | |
| ELL | 44 | 45 | | 29 | 24 | | 39 | | | | | 54 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 51 | 53 | 50 | 28 | 24 | 25 | 29 | | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 50 | | 43 | 32 | | 53 | | | | | 55 |
| MUL | 61 | | | 56 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | | | 58 | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 47 | 36 | 34 | 21 | 26 | 35 | | | | | 52 |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 54% | 56% | -2% | 54% | 0% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 65% | 61% | 4% | 58% | 7% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 48% | 53% | -5% | 50% | -2% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 62% | -2% | 59% | 1% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 61% | 65% | -4% | 61% | 0% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 58% | -9% | 55% | -6% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 46% | -5% | 51% | -10% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Our data reflects that our 3rd Grade students demonstrated the lowest performance in ELA proficiency as evidenced by the ELA FAST PM3 of the 2022-2023 school year. According to the Early Warning indicators as well as Schoolwide collected data such as Benchmark Unit Tests and i-ready there was a decline in the subtest areas of phonics and vocabulary. In addition to the EWI data indicated third grade had the highest increase in chronic absences.

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

The area of greatest decline from the 2022-2023 was the amount of students K-5 who scored on level (proficient) in the area of ELA evidenced by the increase in students identified with a substantial reading deficiency from 120 students to 157 students. According to the Early warning indicators as well as the schoolwide MTSS Data a huge contributing factor is the increase in chronic absences across all grade levels. This was also the first year of a new testing format for all students as well as teachers learning a new process.

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 greatest gap when comparing challenger to the state average was our students scoring at/above grade level on the ELA FAST PM 3 in grades 3-5. Challenger scored 47% At/Above grade level which is 3% below the state average of 50% on the FAST ELA PM3 for grades 3-5. According to the Early warning indicators as well as the schoolwide MTSS Data a huge contributing factor is the increase in chronic absences across all grade levels. This was also the first year of a new testing format for all students as well as teachers learning a new process.

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

The data component with the most improvement was our 4th grade Students with Disabilities. This then contributed to an overall growth in 4th grade with students scoring at/above grade level on the ELA FAST on PM3. Over the past 2 years we have been working diligently on changing over to a push-in model for our students needing support through their IEP. We have paras trained to work with specific classrooms as well as our ESE support facilitators creating a push in model schedule. When creating our classes we started with grouping the ESE students based upon need and then worked the master schedule around those classes.

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

The Early Warning System reflects a substantial increase in the Area of Attendance Concerns from the prior year to the 2022-23 school year that are considered chronic.. There is also an overall increase in students identified with a substantial reading deficiency in grades K-5 from the prior year to the 2022-23 school year.

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

Challenger's highest priority will be to increase overall student reading proficiency as evidenced by the FAST ELA Assessment in grades K-5. In doing this we must next focus on student engagement to create an increase in student Attendance throughout the school year. Third we will specifically target our students demonstrating a substantial reading deficiency by following the K-12 CERP Elementary Decision Tree for the 2023-24 school year. Fourth we will be targeting 3 of the six components of reading showing the greatest deficit, which are Phonics, Fluency, and Vocabulary in Grades K-5 by following the k-12 CERP Elementary Decision Tree to target our students demonstrating a skill gap in these areas through a push-in/pull-out support model.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The CPS/RTI Team, Literacy Leadership Team and Administration reviewed all prior year assessment data from 2022-2023 school year, including (FAST Reading, FAST Math, Successmaker, STAR Reading/Math and I-READY Reading), along with student early warning indicators to identify struggling and fragile students. Through this process overall student reading proficiency was identified as our area with the least amount of growth. When review the data further it was determined that students attending the full school year in grade 3 demonstrated the least amount of students reading At/Above grade level. In order to demonstrate growth and increase proficiency in the 2023-2024 school year it was determined that our specific focus needs to be on student reading proficiency with our current grade 3 and grade 4 students.

In order to make sure all new and current students are receiving support, the 2022-2023 data was compared to our current 2023-2024 data from I-Ready Diagnostic¹ and FAST ELA PM1. The students identified were then assessed within the first 30 days of school to see if they qualified for 2 or more tier 2/ tier 3 indicators as listed in the BCPS: Part 2 K-12 CERP Elementary Decision Tree 2023-2024. The tier 1 support strategies were chosen based upon the weakest areas per grade level demonstrated by the data specified above.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, Students attending the full school year in grades 3 and 4 will demonstrate an overall increase in ELA proficiency from 57% to 60% or higher, as evidenced by the FAST ELA progress monitoring 3 results.

Monitoring:

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

Both Data and formative/summative assessments will be utilized
The Benchmark Unit Assessments will be used to monitor student growth on specific BEST Standards as well as I-READY Growth Monitoring, and FAST PM 2 to track progress towards Summative goal. We will use FAST ELA PM 3 as our summative data to compare learning gains from the beginning of the school year to the end. We will also review individual students progress in the tier 2/tier 3 RTI Interventions for reading at the monthly CPS/RTI Grade level meetings and PLC's. In addition to I-READY Reading Diagnostics 1,2, 3, we will use I-ready growth monitoring to progress monitor on non-testing months.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Brightman (christopher.d.brightman@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Challenger Elementary will be implementing a new Intervention called SIPPS. This intervention is school wide for students in K-5 showing a skill gap in the areas of Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Fluency. If no skill gap is indicated in those 3 areas of reading then students will be assessed on their vocabulary ability. If a skill gap is indicated in vocabulary the Benchmark Advanced Interventions for vocabulary will be implemented. If there is a significant skill gap in Oral Language and/or the above interventions are not closing the skill gap, then Reading Horizons or S.P.I.R.E. will be implemented. If no

skill gap is indicated in the previous 5 areas of reading then intervention in comprehension will occur if indicated as a skill gap as explained in the BCPS: Part 2, K-12 CERP Decision Tree. Benchmark Advanced Interventions will be used to target a skill gap in Comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our Collaborative Problem Solving Team will be closely monitoring the fidelity and effectiveness of the SIPPS intervention to ensure the skill gap is closing. By starting off school-wide with 1 specific intervention to address our lowest performing areas of reading then we should see the skill gap close which in turn will increase reading fluency, comprehension, and overall Reading Proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Apply the BCPS:Part 2 K-12 CERP Elementary Decision Tree 2023-2024 to all students identified as reading below Grade Level

Person Responsible: Kelly Barbera (kelly.mcewen@browardschools.com)

By When: October 4, 2023

Improve effectiveness of tier 1 instruction by providing professional learning and support in implementing whole group and small group instruction grades K-5

Person Responsible: Kelly Barbera (kelly.mcewen@browardschools.com)

By When: All professional development will be provided to teachers prior to the end of Quarter 2 (January 2024).

Train all Reading Endorsed teachers who will be implementing the new tier 2/3 Intervention called SIPPS

Person Responsible: Kelly Barbera (kelly.mcewen@browardschools.com)

By When: October 31st,2023

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

33% of students in grades K-2 scored below grade level as evidenced by the STAR FAST PM3 during the 2022-2023 school year. Challenger's highest priority will be to increase overall student reading proficiency as evidenced by the FAST Reading assessment in grades K-2.

More specifically Kindergarten had 26% of the full year students score below the 40th percentile. 34% of the 1st grade full year students scored below the 40th percentile. 34% of the 2nd grade full year students scored below the 40th percentile.

In doing this we must next focus on student engagement to create an increase in student Attendance throughout the school year. Third we will specifically target our students demonstrating a substantial reading deficiency by following the K-12 CERP Elementary Decision Tree for the 2023-24 school year. Fourth we will be targeting 2 of the six components of reading showing the greatest deficit, which are Phonics and Fluency in Grades K-2 by following the k-12 CERP Elementary Decision Tree to target our students demonstrating a skill gap in these areas through a push-in/pull-out support model.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

43% of our full year students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 as evidenced by the ELA FAST PM3 during the 2022-2023 school year. Challenger's highest priority will be to increase overall student reading proficiency as evidenced by the FAST ELA Assessment in grades 3-5. When breaking it down by grade level, it showed that 51% of our full year 3rd grade students scored below a level 3 on the ELA FAST PM 3. In doing this we must next focus on student engagement to create an increase in student Attendance throughout the school year. Third we will specifically target our students demonstrating a substantial reading deficiency by following the K-12 CERP Elementary Decision Tree for the 2023-24 school year. Fourth we will be targeting 3 of the six components of reading showing the greatest deficit, which are Phonics, Fluency, and Vocabulary in Grades 3-5 by following the k-12 CERP Elementary Decision Tree to target our students demonstrating a skill gap in these areas through a push-in/pull-out support model.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By May 2024, Students attending the full school year in grades 3 and 4 will demonstrate an overall increase in ELA proficiency from 57% to 60% or higher, as evidenced by the FAST ELA progress monitoring 3 results.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Both Data and formative/summative assessments will be utilized for progress monitoring throughout the 2023-24 school year. Each progress monitoring assessment score will be recorded on a live schoolwide data spreadsheet to keep track of both 3rd and 4th Grades students progress towards reading proficiency in tier 1. The following assessments will be tracked on the Challenger Data Spreadsheet:

- Benchmark Unit Assessments to monitor student growth on specific BEST Standards, I-READY Growth Monitoring to track progress towards Summative goal and embedded intervention assessments to track student progress towards closing the skill gap in the six areas of reading.
- We will use FAST ELA PM 3 as our summative data to compare learning gains from the beginning of the school year to the end.
- In addition to I-READY Reading Diagnostics 1,2, 3, we will use I-ready growth monitoring to progress monitor on non-testing months.

All of the above tier 1 data will be reviewed Quarterly during specific grade level Data chats with Administration and the leadership team. Every 6 weeks The CPS/RTI Team will meet with each teacher on 3rd and 4th grade to review any student on a Progress monitoring plan. this meaning any student currently on their roster identified with a substantial reading deficiency, 504, IEP, ELL, and/or any student receiving a tier 2/tier 3 RTI Intervention for one of the six areas of reading.

Using a schoolwide data spreadsheet teachers and staff are forced to really take a look at the data and tier 1 trends within their own classroom. The teachers are then able to compare and discuss these trends with teachers and administration during their quarterly data chats. This gives both 3rd and 4th grade teachers the change to share best practices as well as ask for support with areas of need. Then a few weeks later the same data driven discussion occurs 1:1 with their tier 2/tier3 Intervention students every 6 weeks to ensure the fidelity and effectiveness of the intervention are impacting student

improvement. This practice leads to Data Driven instruction which greatly impacts student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Zdanowicz, Tara, tara.zdanowicz@browardschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Challenger Elementary will be implementing a new moderate evidence-based Intervention called SIPPS. This intervention is school wide for students in K-5 showing a skill gap in the areas of Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Fluency. If no skill gap is indicated in those 3 areas of reading then students will be assessed on their vocabulary ability. If a skill gap is indicated in vocabulary the Benchmark Advanced Interventions for vocabulary will be implemented. If there is a significant skill gap in Oral Language and/or the above interventions are not closing the skill gap, then 1 of the 2 evidence based intervention programs, Reading Horizons or S.P.I.R.E. will be implemented. If no skill gap is indicated in the previous 5 areas of reading then intervention in comprehension will occur if indicated as a skill gap as explained in the BCPS: Part 2, K-12 CERP Decision Tree. Benchmark Advanced Interventions will be used to target a skill gap in Comprehension.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The area of greatest decline from the 2022-2023 was the amount of students K-5 who scored on level (proficient) in the area of ELA evidenced by the increase in students identified with a substantial reading deficiency from 120 students to 157 students. According to the Early warning indicators as well as the schoolwide MTSS Data a huge contributing factor is the increase in chronic absences across all grade levels. Our data reflects that our 3rd Grade students demonstrated the lowest performance in ELA proficiency as evidenced by the ELA FAST PM3 of the 2022-2023 school year. According to the Early Warning indicators as well as Schoolwide collected data such as Benchmark Unit Tests and i-ready there was a decline in the subtest areas of phonics and vocabulary. The EWI data indicated third grade had the highest increase in chronic absences. According to the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan as well as the BCPS K-12 CERP All above stated intervention programs have a strong to moderate rank of

effectiveness. Between the Use of SIPPS, Benchmark Advanced Interventions, Reading Horizons, and S.P.I.R.E., All six areas of Reading Gaps will be addressed.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|
| Apply the BCPS:Part 2 K-12 CERP Elementary Decision Tree 2023-2024 to all students in grades 3 and 4 identified as reading below Grade Level on the 2022-2023 ELA FAST PM3. | Barbera, Kelly, kelly.mcewen@browardschools.com |
| Improve effectiveness of tier 1 instruction by providing professional learning and support in implementing whole group and small group instruction grades K-5 | Barbera, Kelly, kelly.mcewen@browardschools.com |
| Train all Reading Endorsed teachers who will be implementing the new tier 2/ 3 Intervention called SIPPS plus and SIPPS challenge to our 4th and 5th grade students. | Barbera, Kelly, kelly.mcewen@browardschools.com |
| CPS Team and Administration will monitor the Tier 1/Tier 2/ Tier 3 data every 6 weeks to ensure fidelity and effectiveness of the new program in grades 3 and 4. | Zdanowicz, Tara, tara.zdanowicz@browardschools.com |

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Webpage: <https://www.browardschools.com/challenger>

One of the main ways we will disseminate this SIP is through our School Advisory Committee (SAC). We collaborate with our SAC in order to involve our stakeholders in the SIP process. We meet with this

committee every month throughout the school year. This allows us to share our data, goals, action plan, and monitoring process for the SIP with all stakeholders. If revisions need made as we progress monitor our student achievement through the year, we are able to involve our stakeholders in the process. We will also utilize our Class Dojo communication system to share the plan with stakeholders.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Webpage: <https://www.browardschools.com/Page/57628>

Building positive relationships with parents, families and the community is a top priority at Challenger. Through our Parent and Family Engagement Plan we have various family nights planned to engage our stakeholders in a variety of ways. These family nights include: Open House, Trunk or Treat, Literacy, Math, Science, and Technology. These events give us the opportunity to share critical information with our stakeholders regarding their child's learning. It also allows us to strengthen relationships with the community in order to enhance the education we provide to our students.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

One way we plan to strengthen the academic program in our school is through a focus on improving our Tier 1 instruction. We have a district training scheduled focused on Tier 1 Benchmark instruction. We also have scheduled trainings to improve our small group instruction in grades K-5. By enhancing our Tier 1 instruction, small group instruction, with an increased focused on phonics and fluency in grades k-2, and vocabulary and fluency in grades 3-5, we are confident that our student achievement will increase.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Challenger Elementary School implements the use of an educational program (Rethink Ed.) that promotes life and wellness skills for students of varied grade levels. Students develop self-awareness and learn life skills to enhance overall well-roundedness. The school counseling/guidance department provides brief counseling to address student mental, behavioral, social, personal, and academic concerns as well as crisis support. Students and their families are provided the option to access outside resources to address mental/behavioral health needs or other personal issues through referrals made by the guidance department or the school social worker. The guidance department also incorporates

outside support services that assists with delivering life skills development in the classrooms as well as referrals for grief counseling services. An in-house mentoring program has been designed for the pairing of students and staff in the effort of establishing mentoring relationships. This program is for the benefit of students presenting a need for positive adult influence to help with encouraging success with general functioning in the school environment. Various extracurricular activities as well as school-wide positive behavior incentive and recognition programs are used to reward good behavior and academic achievements.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Our Schoolwide Tiered model involves implementing Tier 1 strategies for all students which include: Caught Being Good incentive system, Daily Behavior Sheets, and Game Cart incentive system. For Tier 2, we utilize individualized Behavior Contracts with point systems, self monitoring forms, mentoring, and "take a break". Our Tier 3 involves Behavior Contracts, Functional Behavior Assessments, and Positive Behavior Intervention Plans.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teachers, paraprofessionals, and all other school personnel have gained knowledge to improve their use of data, academic assessments by attending different trainings. They have been trained in several on-line programs for Math, Reading and Science. For Math, Savas Easy Bridge, Success Maker, Reflex Math and I-Ready. Students are able take assessments and other assignments that records their data for teachers and other staff members to monitor. In Science, the staff uses Stemsopes, Brainpop and Mastery Connect to record students data and monitor progress. Through these many learning opportunities on each program, along with rigorous teaching has helped Challenger retain and also recruit effective teachers and other school personal.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

The strategies employed in order to help preschool children transition to local elementary school programs is by gradual exposure to the new environment. Additionally, preschoolers are exposed gradually to new routines, expectations, and activities to help them feel more comfortable and confident in his/her new environment.