

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

| Table of Contents              |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Demographics            | 3  |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Title I Requirements           | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 20 |

# Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami

137 NE 19TH ST, Miami, FL 33180

www.bridgepreacademygreatermiami.com

## Demographics

Principal: Guillermo Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/3/2017

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 72%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (53%)<br>2017-18: C (52%)<br>2016-17: B (59%)<br>2015-16: C (49%)<br>2014-15: A (62%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I  |

\* 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](http://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               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Title I Requirements           | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 20 |

## Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami

137 NE 19TH ST, Miami, FL 33180

www.bridgepreacademygreatermiami.com

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>KG-5                        | No                     | 81%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | Yes                    | 95%  |

### School Grades History

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

### 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 as a result, 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   |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Ortiz, Mitzie    | Principal           | <p>Manage all school operations and activities. Oversee teachers and other staff and class schedules. Implement curriculum standards set by the school district, state, and/or federal regulations. Ensures the teachers have the necessary resources and equipment to reach the school's academic goals.</p> <p>Counsels and disciplines students or may assist teachers in managing students behavior. Meet with parents and teachers to discuss the student's behavior and progress. In addition they address and resolve concerns of parents and community members when possible. Organizes professional development programs and workshops for staff and observe teachers and classroom activities.</p> <p>Responsible for managing the school's budget, ordering school supplies, and arranging maintenance schedules. Ensure proper school security and procedures for teachers, students, staff, and visitors.</p> <p>Plan and attend school functions, parent workshops and/or community events.</p> |
| March , Mary     | Assistant Principal | <p>Meets with parents to discuss student behavioral or learning problems. Responds to disciplinary issues.</p> <p>Coordinates use of school facilities for day-to-day activities and special events. Observes teachers and evaluates learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed. Orders equipment and supplies. Maintains systems for attendance, performance, planning and other reports. Supervises grounds and facilities maintenance. Responds to concerns from teachers, parents and community members.</p>   |
| Garza, Guadalupe | Instructional Coach | <p>Provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.</p>  |
| Tirado , Hilda   | Teacher, ESE        | <p>Oversees and implement the MTSS in the school. Teacher provides support and accommodation to students along with classroom teachers.</p>   |
| Cime , Stephanie | School Counselor    | <p>Oversees and implements the students services as well as the RtIB and PBIS in the school.</p>  |

## 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     | 73          | 91 | 78 | 71 | 75 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 447   |
| 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  | 3  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 6  | 30 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 53    |

#### 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     | 1           | 2 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

22

#### 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     | 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                            | 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             | 47%    | 62%      | 57%   | 58%    | 57%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 57%    | 62%      | 58%   | 55%    | 61%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 46%    | 58%      | 53%   | 38%    | 58%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 57%    | 69%      | 63%   | 73%    | 66%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 60%    | 66%      | 62%   | 74%    | 65%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48%    | 55%      | 51%   | 52%    | 57%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 56%    | 55%      | 53%   | 63%    | 52%      | 51%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |        |        |        |        |        | Total   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      |         |
| Number of students enrolled     | 73 (0)                            | 91 (0) | 78 (0) | 71 (0) | 75 (0) | 59 (0) | 447 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 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)  | 3 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 3 (0)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 ( )                             | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 6 (0)  | 30 (0) | 17 (0) | 53 (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 | 33%    | 60%      | -27%                       | 58%   | -25%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 60%    | 61%      | -1%                        | 57%   | 3%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -27%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 52%    | 64%      | -12%                       | 58%   | -6%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 40%    | 60%      | -20%                       | 56%   | -16%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 12%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -8%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 45%    | 60%      | -15%                       | 56%   | -11%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 49%    | 59%      | -10%                       | 55%   | -6%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 48%    | 67%      | -19%                       | 62%   | -14%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 57%    | 67%      | -10%                       | 62%   | -5%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 54%    | 69%      | -15%                       | 64%   | -10%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 55%    | 68%      | -13%                       | 62%   | -7%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 59%    | 65%      | -6%                        | 60%   | -1%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 62%    | 66%      | -4%                        | 61%   | 1%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 52%    | 53%      | -1%                        | 53%   | -1%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 43%    | 56%      | -13%                       | 55%   | -12%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 23       |        |             | 15        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 47       | 64     | 53          | 57        | 63      | 44           | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 37       | 39     |             | 39        | 43      |              | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 49       | 60     | 50          | 61        | 65      | 47           | 63       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 43       | 54     | 48          | 56        | 57      | 48           | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 33       |        |             | 33        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 44       | 51     | 57          | 54        | 55      | 28           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 47       | 40     | 50          | 47        | 46      | 45           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 55       | 57     | 61          | 65        | 64      | 44           | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 50       | 45     |             | 59        | 41      |              | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 47       | 50     |             | 59        | 64      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 51       | 42     | 21          | 71        | 77      | 64           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 42       | 40     |             | 61        | 75      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 65       | 56     | 35          | 76        | 76      | 50           | 67       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 63       | 73     |             | 74        | 60      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data

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

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 55   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 2    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 72   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 443  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 19   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |     |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 57  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| 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                                | 40  |
| 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  | 58  |
| 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                                | 54  |
| 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.**

Based on our overall data for FSA 2019, ELA was the overall lowest component in the school. The contributing factors were due to the use of data to drive instruction effectively and systematically. Another contributing factor has been the turnover of teachers in the school which are new to the profession and require continuous professional development on expectation of state standards and explicit instruction.

**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 SWD subgroup. Their overall all achievement went from 33% to 15% in Math. The contributing factor to this decline has been derived from the fidelity of support to our SWD in the classrooms. This may also be contributed to the new teachers using the accommodation and differentiated instruction with fidelity.

**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 component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was ELA. Factors that contributed to this was due lack of teacher experience with data driven instruction.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the Math Lowest 25th percent students which went from 39% to 48% when comparing 2018 and 2019 school year. The factors that contributed to this improvement was due to the focus based instruction with our lowest 25 percent students during small group instruction. Another factor was due to the teacher retention of Math and Science teachers in the school which led to experience with State Standards, data driven instruction and implementation of school-wide instructional strategies and best practices.

Students participated in after-school tutoring program that was data aligned with area of needs.

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

The potential area of concern for the school's EWS data, is the amount of current 5th graders that earned a level 1 on the 2019 FSA for ELA or Math.

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

1. Data Driven Instruction
2. SWD
3. Cross-curricular ELA implementation
4. New Teacher Development

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | Data Driven Instruction   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | According to the FSA 2018-2019 data, our lowest overall data in ELA decreased from 57% to 47% as well as the SWD subgroup which went from 33% to 15 % in Math. The contributing factors for both areas led to the needs of improvement for the data driven instruction across the board.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Leadership team and teachers will retrieve data and engage in data chats every 20 instructional days to identify secondary standards and focus for differentiated instruction as well as intervention support.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Mitzie Ortiz (mitzieortiz@dadeschools.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Multi-Tiered System of Support  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | According to Florida's Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (2019), the integrated instruction and intervention are delivered to students in varying intensities based on student need. "Need-driven" decision-making sees to ensure that district resources reach the appropriate students at the appropriate levels to accelerate the performance. Closing the achievement gap earlier will reduce the amount of time needed to remediate deficiencies in reading and math.                    |
| Action Step   |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cross reference prior year data analysis with current student achievement assessment scores, content and technology, in order to appropriately identify student tiers.</li> <li>2. Training of supplemental learning/programs to all staff thus ensuring use with fidelity.</li> <li>3. Teacher Data Chats</li> <li>4. Weekly lesson plan feedback to ensure alignment of standards and proper usage of supplemental learning and data</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Guadalupe Garza (ggarza@bridgeprepgreatermiami.com)   |



| #2  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | Cross-Curricular Literacy   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Based on the 2018-2019 FSA, our lowest component was ELA. In order to sustain and improve student outcomes, there is a need to focus on Literacy instruction across the board.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | If the school implement school-wide literacy strategies in all content area, then the school will have a larger number of students achieving proficiency and making learning gains.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Mitzie Ortiz (mitzieortiz@dadeschools.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Cross-Curricular Literacy   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | When lessons connect multiple subjects, students can gain a deeper understanding of the different subjects taught daily. Cross-curricular teaching aims to apply knowledge, principles, and/or values to more than one academic discipline simultaneously to encourage students to integrate learning experiences and broaden their understanding the world around them Starting Point: Teaching and Learning Economics, 2019)  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implementation of PLCs to improve instruction in ELA and Writing as well as usage of Lucy Calkins Strategies, Socratic Seminars and Literature Circles cross curricular.</li> <li>2. Implementation of the use of novels.</li> <li>3. Writing across curriculum</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-RACE Strategy</li> <li>-SAY MEAN MATTER</li> <li>-Lucy Calkins</li> <li>-Explicit Corrective Feedback</li> </ul> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Guadalupe Garza (ggarza@bridgeprepgreatermiami.com)   |

| #3  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | New Teacher Development  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Due to teacher turnover, new teachers need additional support in explicit and systematic instruction along with professional development.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Establish New Teacher Development that builds teacher capacity and allows them to grow in their field of expertise thus increase teacher retention, student performance and building a positive school culture and climate.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Mitzie Ortiz (mitzieortiz@dadeschools.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Teacher Mentoring Program  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Most of the studies reviewed provide empirical support for the claim that support and assistance for beginning teachers have a positive impact on three sets of outcomes: teacher commitment and retention, teacher classroom instructional practices, and student achievement (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011).   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assign mentors</li> <li>2. Training of supplemental learning/programs, CBC, Lesson Plans, Differentiated Instruction, Gradual Release</li> <li>3. Provide coaching cycles</li> <li>4. Informal and Formal Observations via Marzano, Peer Book Study, Peer observations via PQS, PQS, Walk-throughs.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Mary March (mmarch@bridgeprepgreatermiami.com)   |

#### 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 of Greater Miami 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 of Greater Miami, 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 2-3 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 along with the school-wide PBIS and Values Matter.

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

Bridgeprep Academy of Greater Miami holds a meet and greet meeting for our incoming kindergartners and new students in which the school and classroom procedures are addressed. Incoming kindergartners are tested with the STAR Early Literacy Assessments to help educators monitor students' growing literacy skills and students' progress toward becoming independent readers.

Bridgeprep Academy of Greater Miami invite neighboring middle schools to provide information about their school along with subject selection to our fifth grade students.

#### **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 of Greater Miami 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.**

Bridgeprep Academy of Greater Miami has partnered up with the KAPOW program. Kapow is a national network of business/elementary school partnerships which connects students to the world of work through professionally designed lessons taught by business volunteers in the classroom and through visits by children to the worksite.

Part V: Budget

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

|        |        |   |        |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Data Driven Instruction   | \$0.00 |
| 2      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Cross-Curricular Literacy | \$0.00 |
| 3      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: New Teacher Development   | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |   | \$0.00 |