

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami

137 NE 19TH ST, Miami, FL 33180

www.bridgepreacademygreatermiami.com

Demographics

Principal: Guillermo Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	72%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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	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.

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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami

137 NE 19TH ST, Miami, FL 33180

www.bridgepreacademygreatermiami.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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	87%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	95%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	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 as a result, 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
Ortiz, Mitzie	Principal	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.
		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.
		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.
		Plan and attend school functions, parent workshops and/or community events.
March , Mary	Assistant Principal	Meets with parents to discuss student behavioral or learning problems. Responds to disciplinary issues. 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. Serves as school testing chair. Serves as the school's Title 1 point of contact.
Tirado , Hilda	Teacher, ESE	Oversees and implement the MTSS in the school. Teacher provides support and accommodation to students along with classroom teachers.
Lopez, Johanna	Instructional Coach	Ms. Lopez focuses on math and science for the school. Ms. Lopez works with the teachers to identify issues with students or curriculum, set goals, and solve problems. She also collaborates with the teachers and school administrators to develop curriculum and lesson plans. In addition, she also create teaching material for educators driven by the students' data.
Balboa, Katherine	Instructional Coach	Ms. Balboa focuses on reading and writing for the school. Ms. Balboa works with the teachers to identify issues with students or curriculum, set goals, and solve problems. She also collaborates with the teachers and school administrators to develop curriculum and lesson plans. In addition, she also create teaching material for educators driven by the students' data.
Saintil, Denise	School Counselor	Ms. Saintil works with students from kindergarten to grade 5 to help solve personal, social, and academic problems. In addition, she oversees the PBS curriculum.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Guillermo Gonzalez

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.*

17

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	72%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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	TS&I
* 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	69	73	86	63	68	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	433
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	5	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	2	9	0	6	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 9/9/2020

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	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	

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	73	91	78	71	75	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	447
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	2	9	0	6	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	

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	
	(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	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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							
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
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	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	
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	54
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.

Since there was no state testing for the 2019-2020 school year-based on the 2019 FSA, 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?

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 2018 FSA for ELA or Math.

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

Highest Priorities:

1. SWD
2. Data Driven Instruction
3. Cross-curricular ELA implementation
4. Professional Development for teachers and staff
5. Movement of ELL students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The focus on instructional practice specifically relating to ELA was chosen considered it is the lowest area based on our school data. Evidence also shows that if students are having difficulties reading then they will also have difficulties mastering other content areas. Therefore with targeted interventions, use of school wide reading strategies and differentiated instruction will help our school improve in our overall student achievement.

Measurable Outcome: Our 2019 FSA ELA Achievement data was at 47% and our goal is to increase at least to 50% this school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mitzie Ortiz (mitzieortiz@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Reading intervention using LLI and wonder works will be in place.
Literature Circles will be used
Socratic seminars will be used
School wide reading strategies will be in place

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our goal is to close the achievement gap with our low performing students including SWD and ELL students by providing reading intervention. Fountas and Pinnell is a evidenced-research based reading intervention program proven to student achievement. Students will be able to increase in reading comprehension and use of vocabulary, critical thinking, student engagement and cooperative learning through the use of literature circles and socratic seminars.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementation of reading intervention which includes the identification of students and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Katherine Balboa (kbalboa@bridgeprepgreatermiami.com)

Providing professional development for teachers on literature circles, Socratic seminars, school wide reading strategies and use of intervention programs.

Person Responsible Katherine Balboa (kbalboa@bridgeprepgreatermiami.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

This year there was minimal teacher turn-over. The school leadership team will work on further developing teachers to be able to best assist all students in addition to focusing on the targeted student groups.

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.

At BridgePrep Academy of Greater Miami we believe that a positive school culture and environment improves student achievement and a sense of belonging. This year we have planned out efficient, low-cost and effective ways to boost school achievement.

We strive to focus on empowerment, authentic, engagement, self-efficacy, and motivation. As administrators, we are consistently intentional in our practices and co-leading on a positive school climate. In order to best engage all stakeholders, we strive to:

1. provide multiple opportunities (e.g., meetings and forums) and modalities for stakeholders to learn about and begin to engage in the process.
2. Emphasize that we want everyone to engage and that everyone is a stakeholder in some way.
3. Plan orientation sessions that allow all our stakeholders to review and discuss suggested resource(s).
4. Provide opportunities for all our stakeholders to give input on the vision, mission, and plans for the overall effort.

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: ELA				\$173,499.26
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	590-Other Materials and Supplies	2013 - Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami	Title, I Part A		\$12,029.00
			Notes: LLI intervention kit, SEL Program Second Step, Science Kit			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	2013 - Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami	Title, I Part A		\$396.37
			Notes: Science Coding Program			
	5000	100-Salaries	2013 - Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami	Title, I Part A		\$4,662.00
			Notes: After School Tutoring			
	5000	100-Salaries	2013 - Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami	Title, I Part A		\$19,180.80

			<i>Notes: Interventionist</i>			
	5000	100-Salaries	2013 - Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami	Title, I Part A		\$101,690.00
			<i>Notes: Reading and Math Coach</i>			
	6120	100-Salaries	2013 - Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami	Title, I Part A		\$35,541.09
			<i>Notes: School Counselor</i>			
Total:						\$173,499.26