

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Brucie Ball Educational Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Brucie Ball Educational Center

11001 SW 76TH ST, Miami, FL 33173

<http://merrick.dadeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Amrita Prakash J

Start Date for this Principal: 8/27/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Brucie Ball Educational Center

11001 SW 76TH ST, Miami, FL 33173

<http://merrick.dadeschools.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>Special Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/27/2020, Amrita Prakash J

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.*

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

20

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	0	12	25	16	20	22	18	18	22	39	38	48	59	337
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/27/2020

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	12	18	23	23	10	14	20	19	25	30	40	31	70	335
Attendance below 90 percent	11	7	5	7	9	7	13	20	19	38	31	33	13	213
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	9	4	4	7	9	14	7	0	0	62

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

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	63%	61%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	61%	59%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	57%	54%	0%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	67%	62%	0%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	52%	0%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	56%	0%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey															
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	23%	60%	-37%	58%	-35%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	24%	64%	-40%	58%	-34%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		24%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	15%	58%	-43%	54%	-39%
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
07	2019	52%	56%	-4%	52%	0%
	2018	36%	54%	-18%	51%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	46%	60%	-14%	56%	-10%
	2018	48%	59%	-11%	58%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
09	2019	37%	55%	-18%	55%	-18%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	53%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
10	2019	55%	53%	2%	53%	2%
	2018	38%	54%	-16%	53%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	15%	67%	-52%	62%	-47%
	2018	0%	67%	-67%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	18%	69%	-51%	64%	-46%
	2018	0%	68%	-68%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
05	2019	0%	65%	-65%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	66%	-66%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	17%	58%	-41%	55%	-38%
	2018	14%	56%	-42%	52%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
07	2019	50%	53%	-3%	54%	-4%
	2018	26%	52%	-26%	54%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		36%				
08	2019	32%	40%	-8%	46%	-14%
	2018	24%	38%	-14%	45%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

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

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	73%	-25%	71%	-23%
2018	44%	72%	-28%	71%	-27%
Compare		4%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	71%	-21%	70%	-20%
2018	42%	67%	-25%	68%	-26%
Compare		8%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	63%	-34%	61%	-32%
2018	28%	59%	-31%	62%	-34%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	28%	54%	-26%	57%	-29%
2018	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Compare		-10%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	36	57		29	43	27	27	42		32	
ELL	26	74		17	35		17				
BLK	33	36		35	42						
HSP	39	63		27	44		32	43		15	
FRL	39	63		30	44		29	42		19	
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	36	57		29	43	27	27	42		32	
ELL	26	74		17	35		17				
BLK	33	36		35	42						
HSP	39	63		27	44		32	43		15	
FRL	39	63		30	44		29	42		19	
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
SWD	36	57		29	43	27	27	42		32	
ELL	26	74		17	35		17				
BLK	33	36		35	42						
HSP	39	63		27	44		32	43		15	
FRL	39	63		30	44		29	42		19	

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	319
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	92%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	37
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	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

According to the 2019-2020 Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) Biology End of Course Retake test proficiency levels, 43% of our school's Biology students passed the test with a proficiency score of a Level 3 or higher, as compared to the 2018-2019 test results where 55% of the students passed the assessment. This demonstrates a decrease of 12 percentage points. Due to an influx of 10th grade students in the second nine weeks of the 2019-2020 school year, our Biology End of Course test scores decreased from the previous school year because they were too medically fragile to receive academic interventions.

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

According to the 2019-2020 Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) United States History End of Course (EOC) Retake test proficiency levels, 45% of our school's United States History students passed the test with a Proficiency score of a Level 3 or higher, as compared to the 2018-2019 test results where 63% of the students passed the assessment. This demonstrates a decrease of 18 percentage points.

This decrease was influenced by an influx of 11th grade students in the second nine weeks of the 2019-2020 schools year. This hindered the ability of our teachers to provide remediation to students that were performing below grade level upon entry into our program.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

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

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

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

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

Upon reflection of the EWS data, a potential area of concern that 83% of our students were absent for 18 or more days. Due to the nature of the Hospital/Home-bound program, this population of students often miss more school than their peers because of their fragile medical conditions. However, this is still an area of concern that we will address.

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

1. ELA Learning Gains for grades 4-10
2. ELA Proficiency for grades 3-10
3. Algebra 1 EOC Learning Gains
4. FSA Math Learning Gains 4-10

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is differentiated instruction (DI) which is geared towards student centered learning. Differentiated instruction is the instructional practice that will be implemented based on current student data and designed to remediate skills not mastered in the whole group setting. If DI is implemented with fidelity and explicitly instructed using the appropriate resources aligned to standards, students will make notable progress. We chose this as an area of focus because our data indicates that given our high number of medically fragile students in 10th grade, this data affirms that student-centered instruction/ DI has positively impacted the learning gains of students with special medical conditions and special needs.

Measurable Outcome: If Student-Centered Learning practices are employed to include: taking ownership for students' learning and believing in students' ability to learn regardless of barriers, then students' learning needs will be met as evidenced by increased performance on bi-weekly assessments and academic progress can be tracked to ensure that students meet the 41% threshold per Federal Index of the Every Student Succeeds Act.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amrita Prakash (pr9732@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Quarterly data chat sheets will serve as a guide for students to help them take ownership of their learning and monitor their progress. Teachers can use this tool to adjust instructional focus according to the student's areas of academic strengths and areas in need of improvement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If student-centered instruction facilitated through differentiated instruction is implemented with the appropriate resources, intention and fidelity, then the percentage of students making adequate growth will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

The department chairperson will facilitate the use of technology in instruction weekly and provide opportunities for common planning to share best practices in regards to student centered instruction and learning.

Person Responsible Jackie Stille (jstille@dadeschools.net)

The department chairperson will facilitate the use of assistive technology in instruction weekly and provide opportunities for common planning to share best practices in regards to student centered instruction and learning.

Person Responsible Jackie Stille (jstille@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will conduct quarterly data chats with all enrolled students, including but not limited to the following subgroups of students: Black, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners, and parents to discuss progress in level of assistance on teacher made assessments for IND. students on modified curriculum.

Person Responsible Amrita Prakash (pr9732@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The area of focus is Student-Centered Learning. The actions needed to sustain Student-Centered Learning which will be led by the leadership team are the following: taking ownership for students' learning and believing in students' ability to learn regardless of barriers. Additionally, the leadership team will ensure that teachers are also well versed in the technology programs being implemented so that it's use is a complement to the teacher/student instruction being given as well as knowing when to make adjustments based on student data. Teachers will also be taught how to properly schedule students to take advantage of the technology provided.

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 Brucie Ball Educational Center works rigorously to keep parents informed of their child's academic progress. Parents are provided with quarterly progress reports, report cards, and they participate in parent/teacher conferences. Team parent conferences for identified under-performing Home-bound students are routinely scheduled to address their academic and behavioral needs. In addition, quarterly student progress reports are issued to all students to provide parents student's current academic performance. The school's social worker is used as a family resource to assist them with making contact and referrals to outside agencies as needed. Staff works with families and school to ensure their successful transition back to the student's home school following dismissal from Home-bound placement. Our school creates safe learning environments in multiple educational settings for students living in Miami-Dade County. The Alternative Distance Learning Program encourages students to feel comfortable and safe verbalizing school and/or personal issues. Students/parents can ask to speak privately with the teacher should the need arise. Itinerant Hospitalized/Home-bound and Community Based teachers respect the environment and culture of the home/educational setting of their students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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