Brucie Ball Educational Center

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Brucie Ball Educational Center

11001 SW 76TH ST, Miami, FL 33173

http://merrick.dadeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Amrita Prakash J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2018-19 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
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	CS&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 Dade 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

Brucie Ball Educational Center

11001 SW 76TH ST, Miami, FL 33173

http://merrick.dadeschools.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-12	No	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2011-12	2010-11	2010-11	2010-11
Grade	F			

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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.

The mission of Brucie Ball Educational Center is to provide a quality educational program that maximizes the potential of our students with special needs. Individualized instruction in the school, home and/or hospital environment is designed to target each student's unique needs. Our mission includes providing an educational experience which will enable each student to participate in the community to the fullest extent possible and to achieve their academic goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our school creates safe learning environments in multiple educational settings for students living in Miami-Dade County. The teleclass program encourages students to feel comfortable and safe verbalizing school and/or personal issues. Students/parents can ask to be placed on a separate line on the multi-telepatcher system to speak privately with the teacher. Itinerant Hospitalized/Homebound and Community Based teachers respect
the environment and culture of the home/educational setting of their students.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Prakash, Amrita	Principal	Principal, Dr. Prakash, is the school's instructional leader. She provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Dr. Prakash establishes high expectations for all students and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and the appropriate Response to Intervention (RtI).
Sardinas, Alex	Assistant Principal	Mr. Sardinas, assistant principal, works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. He ensures fidelity of the MTSS monitoring by evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs.
Martinez, Ray	Other	Mr. Martinez serves as the chairperson for Student Services . In his role as chairperson, he provides direct instructional to student to improve and support students' academic success. In addition, Mr. Martinez is an integral part of the MTSS team that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention.
Corbin, Maria	Teacher, ESE	As an ESE instructor, Ms. Corbin provides direct instructional to student to improve and support students' academic success. In addition she is an integral part of the MTSS team that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention.

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	12	18	23	23	10	14	20	19	25	30	40	31	70	335
Attendance below 90 percent	11	7	5	7	9	7	13	20	19	38	31	33	13	213
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	9	4	4	7	9	14	7	0	0	62

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
65

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 8/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0%	63%	61%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	61%	59%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	57%	54%	0%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	67%	62%	0%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	52%	0%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	56%	0%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	12 (0)	18 (0)	23 (0)	23 (0)	10 (0)	14 (0)	20 (0)	19 (0)	25 (0)	30 (0)	40 (0)	31 (0)	70 (0)	335 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 ()	7 ()	5 ()	7 ()	9 ()	7 ()	13 ()	20 ()	19 ()	38 ()	31 ()	33 ()	13 ()	213 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)	9 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)	14 (0)	7 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	62 (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.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	23%	60%	-37%	58%	-35%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	24%	64%	-40%	58%	-34%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		24%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	15%	58%	-43%	54%	-39%
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
07	2019	52%	56%	-4%	52%	0%
	2018	36%	54%	-18%	51%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	46%	60%	-14%	56%	-10%
	2018	48%	59%	-11%	58%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
09	2019	37%	55%	-18%	55%	-18%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	53%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
10	2019	55%	53%	2%	53%	2%
	2018	38%	54%	-16%	53%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

				MATH		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	15%	67%	-52%	62%	-47%
	2018	0%	67%	-67%	62%	-62%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	18%	69%	-51%	64%	-46%
	2018	0%	68%	-68%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
05	2019	0%	65%	-65%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	66%	-66%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	17%	58%	-41%	55%	-38%
	2018	14%	56%	-42%	52%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
07	2019	50%	53%	-3%	54%	-4%
	2018	26%	52%	-26%	54%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		36%				
08	2019	32%	40%	-8%	46%	-14%
	2018	24%	38%	-14%	45%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	13%	43%	-30%	48%	-35%
	2018	19%	44%	-25%	50%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	68%	-20%	67%	-19%
2018	47%	65%	-18%	65%	-18%
Compare	1%				

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	73%	-25%	71%	-23%
2018	44%	72%	-28%	71%	-27%
Compare		4%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	71%	-21%	70%	-20%
2018	42%	67%	-25%	68%	-26%
Compare		8%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	63%	-34%	61%	-32%
2018	28%	59%	-31%	62%	-34%
Compare		1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	28%	54%	-26%	57%	-29%
2018	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Compare		-10%			

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	36	57		29	43	27	27	42		32	
ELL	26	74		17	35		17				
BLK	33	36		35	42						
HSP	39	63		27	44		32	43		15	
FRL	39	63		30	44		29	42		19	
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	319
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	92%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 percentage of students making Mathematics Learning Gains. The major contributing factor to this component is the number of medically fragile students that were enrolled in our Hospital/Homebound program last year. Due to our students' medical status, direct instructional contact was often interrupted by medically necessary needs and care. This hindered the ability of our teachers to provide remediation to students that were already performing below grade level upon entry into our program.

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 percentage of 11th grade students that passed the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards United Stated History End-of-Course Assessment with a score of a Level 3 or higher. The factor that contributed to this decline was the sudden influx of 11th grade students in the third nine weeks of the school year. These students enrolled in our program after being out from their home schools for a little while due to their medical conditions, and therefore, were not able to receive direct instruction in their school courses, including United States History.

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 was the percentage of all first-time test taking students that passed the Florida Standards Assessment Algebra 1 End-of-Course Assessment. One of the major factors that contribute to this gap in percentage is the small total number of students our school tests, as compared to the large number of students tested across the state. The percentage of Hospital/Homebound students that are enrolled in an Algebra 1 course is remarkably smaller than the total amount of students enrolled in the same course across the state. This will naturally create a mathematically smaller percentage of passing students due to the denominator and numerator ratio. Another factor that contributed to this gap is the large number of Hospital/Homebound students who are considered "Algebra 1 Retake" students. Many of our students enroll into our program having previously taken the Algebra 1 End-of-Course Assessment at his/her home school. The students are often performing below academic grade level in all their courses or have missed a significant amount of time at school due to their medical conditions.

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 percentage of 10th grade students that passed the Florida Standards Assessment English Language Arts test. The new actions our school put into place in order to achieve these results were beginning data chats with students early in the school year to identify their areas in need of improvement and working on those content areas consistently. We monitored their quarterly progress using District Writing Tests and Mid Year Assessments in the Performance Matters platform.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Upon reflection of the EWS data, a potential area of concern is the number of students that were absent for 18 or more days. Due to the nature of the Hospital/Homebound program, this population of students often miss more school than their peers because of their fragile medical conditions. However, this is still an area of concern that we will address.

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

1. Student Attendance
2. Learning Gains in Mathematics
3. Reading proficiency in Grades 3 and 10

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Ongoing Progress Monitoring
Rationale	Given our high number of medically fragile students in Grades 5 and 8, this data and area of focus affirms that effective teaching strategies can impact the learning gains of a student with special medical conditions.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If students are provided with explicit instruction coupled with on-going progress monitoring, then there will be an increase in learning gains and proficiency in reading at all grade levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amrita Prakash (pr9732@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Gradual Release of Responsibility will be employed in all classrooms, ensuring that all subgroup needs are addressed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The Gradual Release of Responsibility is a style of teaching which is a structured method of pedagogy framed around a process beginning with explicit instruction. Students are guided through the learning process with clear statements about the purpose and rational for learning the new skill.

Action Step	
Description	1. Gradual Release of Responsibility Professional development 2. Weekly Common planning 3. Monthly shadowing opportunity 4. Data chats teacher with students and teachers with administrator 5. Monthly progress monitoring
Person Responsible	Amrita Prakash (pr9732@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

The faculty and staff at Brucie Ball works rigorously to keep parents informed of their child's academic progress. Parents are provided with quarterly progress reports, report cards, and they participate in parent/teacher conferences. Team parent conferences for identified underperforming Homebound

students are routinely scheduled to address their academic and behavioral needs. In addition, quarterly student progress reports are issued to all students to provide parents student's current academic performance. The school's social worker is used as a family resource to assist them with making contact and referrals to outside agencies as needed. Staff works with families and school to ensure their successful transition back to the student's home school following dismissal from Homebound placement.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Our school considers counseling for students entering the Hospitalized/Homebound program, especially those students with a psychiatric medical diagnosis. District clinicians provide counseling services to students identified through IEP team meetings to be in need of individual counseling. As needed, Functional Assessment of Behaviors (FAB) and Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIP) will be developed and implemented for identified students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Brucie Ball Educational Center administered the state-wide kindergarten screening tool Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS) to determine the readiness of each child entering kindergarten. Strategies will be implemented to involve parents to assist their children be more prepared for learning. Parents will be given a Guide to Grade Level Skills for the Florida Standards at open house. Our Staffing and Transition Specialists will work with parents, students, and home school staff to successfully transition students into and out of the Homebound/Hospitalized Instructional Program.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The school leadership team uses a multifaceted process to identify and align resources to meet the needs of students.The leadership team, comprised of the Principal, Assistant Principal, and three Department Heads, meets weekly. The team collaborates regarding decisions impacting student performance. Adjustments are made as necessary. The Principal has ultimate responsibility for all budgetary decisions, but input from the members of the leadership team is sought and valued. Assistant Principal Alex Sardinas is assigned to monitor the property control inventory including instructional materials and technology resources to ensure they are allocated
to maximize student performance. Most personnel are funded through state and local funds. Nutrition Program funds help provide free breakfast to all students school-based students and free or reduced lunch to qualifying students. IDEA funds are used to support Exceptional Education students and programs at Brucie Ball Educational Center.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

All students enrolled at Brucie Ball Educational Center have an individual education plan (IEP) developed, and annually thereafter if the student is still enrolled with us. Transition planning begins at age 14 for Brucie Ball Educational Center students as part of the development of their initial and annual IEPs. In this transition plan, the student provides input on future goals including career, educational and personal goals. The intake specialist goes over this plan, as well as the student's schedule of classes,

keeping in mind their chosen academic and career track. Electives are based on the school's course offerings as well as the student's interests. Twelfth graders (seniors) are provided with post secondary information from the school's counselor.

Transition meetings are also held with each graduating student specifically to assist them to prepare for post-secondary endeavors by providing them with information on two- and four- year colleges, universities, vocational and career schools and facilitating access to state vocational rehabilitation services when applicable.

Supporting Secondary School Reform, the Articulation, Transition, and Orientation board rule is in place to increase the percentage of graduating students that pursue and are successful in post-secondary areas of enrichment. Teachers implement lessons which focus on improving personal effectiveness, planning life after high school, surviving after high school and succeeding in post-secondary academic institutions.