

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus

621 BEACOM BLVD, Miami, FL 33135

www.bridgeprepacademy.com

Demographics

Principal: Lourdes Pena

Start Date for this Principal: 8/7/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
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 Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: C (42%)
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	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus

621 BEACOM BLVD, Miami, FL 33135

www.bridgeprepacademy.com

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 KG-8	No	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	99%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	B	B	B

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

BridgePrep Academy believes every child learns best in a safe, nurturing and stimulating environment where high academic expectations, self-esteem, good character, and an appreciation for the arts are promoted. BridgePrep Academy's mission is to provide a challenging academic curriculum that will encompass an enriched Spanish language program, technology and experiences that will enable students to develop in all areas. BridgePrep Academy's goal is to educate well rounded individuals and enable students to reach their maximum potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

BridgePrep Academy believes that each child is a unique individual who needs a secure, nurturing and stimulating environment in which to grow and mature emotionally, intellectually, physically and socially. BridgePrep believes in a student-centered educational philosophy that emphasizes hands on learning and students actively participating in learning. Students will be able to discover through hands on, engaging activities that will incorporate different approaches to accommodate each child's learning style and thus, raise academic achievements.

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
Gonzalez, Guillermo	Principal	As the school's principal, Mr. Gonzalez 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. Mr. Gonzalez establishes high expectations for all students, and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS).
Solis, Sofia	Instructional Coach	As the ELA instructional coach, Ms. Solis provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Solis utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.
Martinez, Sandra	Other	As the math lead, Ms. Martinez provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction for all grade levels.

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	24	41	38	23	24	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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)

12

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/11/2019

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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	

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	78%	63%	61%	58%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	75%	61%	59%	63%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	79%	57%	54%	57%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	69%	67%	62%	67%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	52%	63%	59%	56%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	56%	52%	50%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	88%	56%	56%	50%	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	
Number of students enrolled	24 (0)	41 (0)	38 (0)	23 (0)	24 (0)	31 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	181 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	2 (0)
One or more suspensions	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)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	7 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (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	86%	60%	26%	58%	28%
	2018	59%	61%	-2%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		27%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	64%	-3%	58%	3%
	2018	36%	60%	-24%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	96%	60%	36%	56%	40%
	2018	62%	59%	3%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		34%				
Cohort Comparison		60%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	90%	67%	23%	62%	28%
	2018	47%	67%	-20%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		43%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	69%	10%	64%	15%
	2018	79%	68%	11%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		32%				
05	2019	38%	65%	-27%	60%	-22%
	2018	59%	66%	-7%	61%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	88%	53%	35%	53%	35%
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		34%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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
ELL	80	83	73	63	50	40	89				
HSP	78	75	79	69	52	40	88				
FRL	76	73		67	51	36	84				
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
ELL	45	35	46	63	76	60	40				
HSP	57	44	44	65	69	57	63				
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
ELL	54	61	58	68	61	55	20				
HSP	58	64	57	68	57	50	50				
FRL	54	62	64	66	60	50	44				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	551
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	69
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	69
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	65
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

Math Lowest 25th Percentile—The lowest percentile consisted of mostly students who have repeated at least once and ELL students. Contributing factors were: Lack of additional intervention support provided.

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

Math Learning Gains--The biggest drop was in our 5th grade group. Contributing factors: Large class of 29 students; 1 teacher with all subjects; no additional staff to support and/or offer intervention.

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.

Math Lowest 25th Percentile—The lowest percentile consisted of mostly students who have repeated at least once and ELL students. Contributing factors were: Lack of additional intervention support provided.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile—Actions leading to this gain: Same cohort since Kindergarten; Lead ELA teacher has teacher; Lead teacher was able to provide specific strategies to ELL population

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

An area of concern would be our Level I state assessments. Our current 3rd grade cohort has been a lower performing cohort since Grade 1. Significant growth was observed last school year. This current year this cohort will receive intervention services daily via additional personnel.

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

1. MTSS
2. Level I Students
3. Differentiated Instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Interventions
	According to the FSA 2018-2019 data, math learning gains significantly decreased to 52% as compared to the FSA 2017-2018 data where the math learning gains were 68%, a decrease of 16 percentage points.
Rationale	<p>According to the FSA 2018-2019 data, the math lowest 25 percentile significantly decreased to 40% as compared to the FSA 2017-2018 data where the math lowest 25 percentile was 53%, a decrease of 13 percentage points.</p> <p>In order to sustain increases and improve student outcomes, there is a need to focus on targeted interventions to ensure school improvement.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we successfully address our targeted intervention groups, then the school will have a larger number of students achieving proficiency and making learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Guillermo Gonzalez (guillermogonzalez@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Multi-Tiered System of Support
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>According to Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (2019), the integrated instruction and intervention are delivered to students in varying intensities based on student need. "Need-driven" decision-making seeks to ensure that district resources reach the appropriate students at the appropriate levels to accelerate the performance of all students to achieve and/or exceed proficiency. If the lowest 25% percentage of struggling students are not targeted, the achievement gap will increase even more in both math and ELA. Closing this achievement gap earlier will reduce the amount of time needed to remediate deficiencies in reading and math.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide teachers with an opportunity to access and review appropriate curriculum and effective resources. 2. Provide classroom hourly teachers and hourly interventionists for supplemental instructional support that will include various delivery models to improve learning gains through small group instruction during extended learning opportunities before, during, or after the school day. 3. Provide supplemental textbooks and teacher's guides in reading & mathematics to support the reteaching of FSA standards during small group instruction by the interventionists and teachers to targeted students to increase learning gains in these subjects. 4. Instructional leads will maintain classroom collaboration with content area teachers to address student academic needs.
Person Responsible	Guillermo Gonzalez (guillermogonzalez@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 BridgePrep Academy InterAmerican work rigorously to keep parents informed of their child's academic progress. Parents are provided quarterly progress reports, report cards and participate in parent/teacher conferences. We encourage our parents to volunteer and be actively involved within the school. Additionally, all stakeholders are invited to attend our quarterly Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) meetings in which they receive school improvement, data and budget updates, school program information, and other pertinent topics that directly impact student achievement. Parents are invited to school activities such as Open House, Honor Roll assemblies, fundraising events, field trips, and literacy/curriculum/math nights throughout the school year

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.

At BridgePrep Academy InterAmerican, the social-emotional needs of all students are being met through several different systems. We have a school counselor that is assigned to our school 1-2 days a week. The counselor has small specific groups in which she meets with to discuss goals, areas of growth, and achievements. The counselor also leads our SEL program of Second Step. Now we deliver the program to K-1 on a weekly basis.

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

Title I Administration assists the school by providing supplemental funds. Funds are utilized for extended educational support through a full-time, highly qualified Reading Coach, interventionist, and LLI intervention program. This will enable our Reading Coach to be freed up from classroom duties to assist with the coaching piece and on boarding of new teachers, differentiated instruction, and focus on ELA instruction. The interventionist will provide ongoing support to our Level I students and ELL students. The LLI intervention program will be used as the main tool in the MTSS process

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.

BridgePrep Academy InterAmerican provides services to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through free after-school tutoring programs. Curriculum Coaches assist in the development, and evaluation of school core content standards/ programs; identifying and analyzing existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Interventions				\$61,875.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5000	590-Other Materials and Supplies	5020 - Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus	Title, I Part A		\$13,911.48
			<i>Notes: LLI Intervention Kits and After-School tutoring Materials</i>			
	5000	100-Salaries	5020 - Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus	Title, I Part A	0.5	\$9,504.00
			<i>Notes: Interventionist Position--Level I students</i>			
	5000	100-Salaries	5020 - Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus	Title, I Part A	0.75	\$35,379.52
			<i>Notes: Reading Coach</i>			
	5000	100-Salaries	5020 - Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus	Title, I Part A	4.0	\$3,080.00
			<i>Notes: After-School Tutoring</i>			
Total:						\$61,875.00