Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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

Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus

621 BEACOM BLVD, Miami, FL 33135

www.bridgeprepacademy.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/7/2017, Lourdes Pena

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

12

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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](#).

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	37	24	34	42	18	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/2/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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		
Course failure in ELA or Math	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	

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	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					
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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	69
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Based on our iStation data, our 2019-20 Kindergarteners averaged the lowest with 55% proficiency. Contributing factors were first-year teacher, the majority of students were coming directly from home with little to no pre-school experience and most students were ELL.

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

Our ELA primary grades of Kindergarten and first grade showed the largest decline. Kindergarten averaged 55% proficiency and first grade 50% proficiency. Contributing factors were first-year teacher, the majority of students were coming directly from home with little to no pre-school experience and most students were ELL in Kindergarten and first grade went through 3 total teachers.

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.

Third grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state of 32% proficient compared to 58% from the state. The cohort has performed below average since first grade. The reasons for this are inexperienced teachers, lack of interventions, and change of teachers.

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

Our 4th-grade cohort showed the greatest improvement. They averaged 66% proficiency in ELA. Ths cohort had our lead teacher has their main teacher and they have been together since Kindergarten.

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

Our current 4th-grade cohort has been performing below grade level since 1st grade. The cohort will continue to receive ELA and Math interventions via interventionist.

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

1. MTSS
2. Level I Students
3. Differentiated Instruction
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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. 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. In order to sustain increases and improve student outcomes, there is a need to focus on targeted interventions to ensure school improvement.
Measurable Outcome:	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:	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.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

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

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				$90,890.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	590-Other Materials and Supplies	5020 - Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus	Title, I Part A		$6,777.82
			Notes: LLI Intervention Kit; SEL Program Second Step; Grades 3/4 Novels			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	5020 - Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus	Title, I Part A		$8,676.25
			Notes: iStation Reading Achieve 3000 Literacy			
	5000	100-Salaries	5020 - Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus	Title, I Part A	4.0	$3,108.00
			Notes: After-School Tutoring			
	5000	100-Salaries	5020 - Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus	Title, I Part A	1.0	$19,180.80
			Notes: Interventionist Position			

	5000	100-Salaries	5020 - Bridgeprep Academy Interamerican Campus	Title, I Part A	1.0	$53,147.13
			Notes: Reading Coach			
					Total:	**$90,890.00**