Brucie Ball Educational Center

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 7/24/2017

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2020-21 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	2020-21: No Grade 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: 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	
* 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.](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

Brucie Ball Educational Center

11001 SW 76TH ST, Miami, FL 33173

http://merrick.dadeschools.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-12	No	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
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 expectation for all students and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS) and the appropriate Response to Intervention (RtI).
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 student's 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.
Corbin, Maria	Teacher, ESE	As an ESE instructor, Ms. Corbin provides direct instruction to students to improve and support student's 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/24/2017, 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.*

1

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

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

330

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	12	18	23	14	10	14	20	19	25	30	40	31	43	299
Attendance below 90 percent	2	7	5	0	5	6	3	4	5	3	7	4	6	57
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	2	3	4	4	9	14	7	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	3	10	7	9	11	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	6

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	1	2	0	0	1	4

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
Monday 8/16/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	
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	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	

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	

2020-21 - 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	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	
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	3	2	3	4	4	9	14	7	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	3	10	7	9	11	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	2	0	0	1	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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 Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement					63%	61%		62%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					61%	59%		61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					57%	54%		57%	52%
Math Achievement					67%	62%		65%	61%
Math Learning Gains					63%	59%		61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					56%	52%		55%	52%
Science Achievement					56%	56%		57%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					80%	78%		79%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	23%	60%	-37%	58%	-35%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	24%	64%	-40%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
05	2021					
	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
06	2021					
	2019	15%	58%	-43%	54%	-39%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	52%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
08	2021					

				ELA			
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	46%	60%	-14%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
09	2021					
	2019	37%	55%	-18%	55%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
10	2021					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

				MATH			
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	15%	67%	-52%	62%	-47%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	18%	69%	-51%	64%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2021					
	2019	0%	65%	-65%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
06	2021					
	2019	17%	58%	-41%	55%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	50%	53%	-3%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
08	2021					
	2019	32%	40%	-8%	46%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

				SCIENCE			
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	13%	43%	-30%	48%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	48%	68%	-20%	67%	-19%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	48%	73%	-25%	71%	-23%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	50%	71%	-21%	70%	-20%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	29%	63%	-34%	61%	-32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	28%	54%	-26%	57%	-29%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tools used to compile the data below are the SAT-10 for Grades 1-2, i-Ready diagnostics for Grades 3-8 Reading and Math, district baseline and mid-year assessments in the Performance Matters platform for Grades 5 and 8 Science, and Grades 9-10 Reading, as well as all End-of-Course Assessment Content Area courses such as Civics, Biology, U.S. History, Algebra, and Geometry.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25	35	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	33	45
	Students With Disabilities	55	65	72
	English Language Learners	12	15	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25	33	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	36	45
	Students With Disabilities	42	47	51
	English Language Learners	16	19	22

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	30	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	48	52
	Students With Disabilities	33	32	40
	English Language Learners	20	23	27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25	20	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	51	53
	Students With Disabilities	37	42	49
	English Language Learners	12	18	25

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10	33	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	35	40
	Students With Disabilities	27	34	39
	English Language Learners	14	15	23
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11	22	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	40	42
	Students With Disabilities	30	34	41
	English Language Learners	9	12	15

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	45	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	47	53
	Students With Disabilities	34	35	40
	English Language Learners	11	17	23
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7	18	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	18	20
	Students With Disabilities	42	40	45
	English Language Learners	8	10	10

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	23	27	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	39	47
	Students With Disabilities	48	50	53
	English Language Learners	14	17	18
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	8	11	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	33	37
	Students With Disabilities	40	47	52
	English Language Learners	12	17	22
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students	14	19	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	27	38
	Students With Disabilities	41	45	46
	English Language Learners	16	18	21

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	24	42	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	41	47
	Students With Disabilities	26	37	41
	English Language Learners	13	17	22
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	13	23	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	45	48
	Students With Disabilities	48	52	59
	English Language Learners	6	10	11

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	31	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	41	42
	Students With Disabilities	55	57	61
	English Language Learners	20	20	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	23	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	45	44
	Students With Disabilities	41	44	50
	English Language Learners	10	11	15
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	30	41	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	39	43
	Students With Disabilities	22	26	35
	English Language Learners	25	27	30

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27	44	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	42	51
	Students With Disabilities	34	36	41
	English Language Learners	14	17	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	17	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	50	52
	Students With Disabilities	42	55	56
	English Language Learners	12	15	15
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	25	39	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	34	40
	Students With Disabilities	45	50	57
	English Language Learners	20	24	26

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	40	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	30	32
	Students With Disabilities	45	45	50
	English Language Learners	10	14	16
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30	33	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	36	40
	Students With Disabilities	50	56	60
	English Language Learners	20	21	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	36	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	41	45
	Students With Disabilities	45	50	55
	English Language Learners	10	15	15
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	50	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	37	40
	Students With Disabilities	40	42	45
	English Language Learners	15	17	20
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	35	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	36	41
	Students With Disabilities	45	47	55
	English Language Learners	12	15	20
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	33	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	36	41
	Students With Disabilities	47	48	50
	English Language Learners	8	10	13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35	36	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	42	45
	Students With Disabilities	51	55	56
	English Language Learners	20	22	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	15	23	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	35	35
	Students With Disabilities	46	50	51
	English Language Learners	15	18	20

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36	45	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	36	37
	Students With Disabilities	44	47	55
	English Language Learners	16	19	25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13	26	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	42	46
	Students With Disabilities	51	55	58
	English Language Learners	22	25	25
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	43	36		30	31					60	
HSP	41	36		31	40					38	
FRL	47	38		31	33					22	

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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	29
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	174
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	13%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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

Native American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	31
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) End-of-Course (EOC) school data trend that emerges across grades eight through ten, in our ESSA subgroups, and in the core content area of Algebra 1, is the small percentage of first-time test taking students passing the Florida Standards Algebra 1 EOC Assessment when compared to the state average percentage. According to the 2020-2021 FSA Algebra 1 EOC test proficiency levels, 43% of our school's Algebra 1 students passed the test with a proficiency score of Level 3 or higher. One of the major factors that contribute to this data component 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/Homebound 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/Homebound students who are considered "Algebra 1 Retake" students. Many of our students enroll into our program having previously taken the Algebra 1 Course at his/her home school, without having taken the End-of-Course Assessment due to medical complexity issues. 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.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

According to the 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment Algebra 1 End of Course test proficiency levels, 43% of our school's Algebra 1 students passed the test with a proficiency score of a Level 3 or higher, as compared to the 2019 state test results where 55% of the students passed the assessment. This demonstrates a decrease of 12 percentage points.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Due to an influx of 9th grade students in the second nine weeks of the 2020-2021 school year, our Algebra 1 End of Course test scores decreased from the previous school year because they were too medically fragile to receive academic interventions. The action needed to address this need for improvement is the use of accelerated learning strategies being utilized for those students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, 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. According to the 2019-2020 Florida Standards Assessment English Language Arts Assessment proficiency levels, 68% of our school's Grade 10 English Language Arts students passed the test with a proficiency score of a Level 3 or higher, as compared to the 2018-2019 test results where 59% of the students passed the assessment. This demonstrates an increase of 9 percentage points.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

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.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The strategies needed to accelerate learning are building content knowledge and vocabulary, including a variety of assistive technology for students to access, scaffolding instruction, differentiating instruction, and utilizing i-Ready progress monitoring.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school by teacher leaders will discuss academic strategies and methods to increase student engagement during instruction. Additional sessions will be conducted to share and discuss various resources to provide informal and formal assessments that are the most appropriate for their student's individual needs.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

In order to ensure the sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond, we will continue assessing students' academic progress, offer peer mentoring, and continue meeting annually with our parents in order to discuss students' academic progress and changes in student individualized educational plans.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency levels, 40% of our school's Grades 3-10 ELA 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 23 percentage points. Based on the 2020-2021 end of year i-Ready diagnostic assessment and progress monitoring data, 35% of the students in Kindergarten through Grade 3 are not on track to score a Level 3 or above on the Grade 3 FSA English Language Arts assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	If Differentiated Instructional practices are employed, then students' learning needs will be met as evidenced by an increase of 5 percentage points or more, of Grade 3 students scoring a Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment. Their academic progress will be tracked using i-Ready diagnostic assessments and progress monitoring tests, to ensure that students in all grades, meet the 41% threshold per Federal Index of the Every Student Succeeds Act, regardless of barriers, and the 50% or more threshold per the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence, House Bill (HB) 7011.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through the implementation of monthly collaborative planning meetings with content area teachers to ensure that lessons include a variety of instructional strategies that allow all students to access rigorous academic English Language Arts content.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, consulting, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless or differences in ability.
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 on their i-Ready Reading diagnostic assessments and Florida Standards Assessments English Language Arts tests will increase. This evidenced-based strategy has been proven effective for increasing academic reading skills, particularly with student reading one or two levels below grade level, through intensive research, case studies, and practices.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will collaborate once a month to develop rigorous, differentiated, English Language Arts lessons that allow for student driven projects and include higher-order thinking questioning from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will collaborate once a month to develop lessons that allow opportunities for students' to decrease their level of assistance and work towards academic independence through differentiated instructional English Language Arts materials from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will meet to discuss and implement rigorous English Language Arts lessons using best practices and instructional technology that can facilitate differentiated instruction from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will develop and implement rigorous English Language Arts differentiated lessons using best practices and instructional technology appropriate for IND students on modified curriculum from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 2020-2021 School Climate Survey feedback from staff, 57% of the teachers strongly agreed or agreed with the statement that our school personnel felt empowered as teacher and/or teacher leader, as compared to the 2019-2020 survey where 89% strongly agreed or agreed with the same statement. This demonstrates a decrease of 32 percentage points.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers regularly attend Professional Development (PD) workshops and are given the opportunity to collaborate with their colleagues to share and teach the new knowledge they gain, then more than 90% of the staff will agree to feeling empowered as a teacher and/or teacher leader within the school, as evidenced by the School Climate Survey.
Monitoring:	The Assistant Principal will facilitate monthly curriculum council leadership team meetings to provide an opportunity for teachers to lead discussions, collaborate, and discuss academic skills for hospital/homebound students. He will monitor the implementation monthly through the review of teacher schedules and lesson plans.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is empowering teachers and staff to allow for opportunities to take a leadership role and recognize teachers/staff for their input and achievements. The leadership team provides support for teachers, students, and staff to be leaders, innovators, risk-takers, and designers of new ways to approach challenges.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is if we successfully implement the practice of empowering teachers and staff, then teachers/staff will have opportunities to express their input and concerns, which will improve morale and lead to increased classroom achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

The Assistant Principal will create a curriculum council leadership team that meets once a month to provide an opportunity for teachers and staff members to lead discussions, collaborate, and discuss academic pacing for hospital/homebound students from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

The Assistant Principal will facilitate monthly curriculum council leadership team meetings to provide an opportunity for community based instruction teachers to lead discussions, collaborate, and discuss academic and life skills pacing for IND hospital/homebound students from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

The Assistant Principal will facilitate curriculum council leadership team meetings where there will be opportunities for teachers to lead discussions, collaborate, and discuss academic needs and lesson pacing for hospital/homebound students from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

The Assistant Principal will facilitate monthly curriculum council leadership team meetings, where there will be opportunities for teachers to lead discussions, collaborate, and discuss academic and life skills

needs for IND hospital/homebound students receiving community based instruction from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible   Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 2020-2021 School Climate Survey feedback from staff, 63% of the teachers strongly agreed or agreed with the statement that our school personnel work together as a team, as compared to the 2019-2020 survey where 66% strongly agreed or agreed with the same statement. This demonstrates a decrease of 3 percentage points.
Measurable Outcome:	If the school can successfully implement the practice of monthly and/or bi-monthly team building activities and peer mentoring/collaboration meetings, then more than 66% of the school personnel will agree that the faculty and staff work together as a team, as evidenced by the School Climate Survey.
Monitoring:	The Assistant Principal will facilitate departmental and peer-mentoring meetings twice a month so teachers can discuss professional development activities and share best practices that can be used for future lessons.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategic teacher teams require teacher collaboration to share responsibilities for students' learning resulting in improved instruction. To promote strategic teacher teams, empower the teams by supporting a safe space for teachers to come together to share information, resources, ideas, and expertise so that learning becomes more accessible and effective for students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is that the overall school culture will become a positive one when all staff have the opportunity to foster an environment of collaboration and camaraderie.

Action Steps to Implement	

The Assistant Principal will facilitate departmental meetings twice a month so teachers can discuss professional development activities and share best practices that can be used for future lessons from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

The Assistant Principal will facilitate departmental meetings that will be held twice a month. During these meetings teachers will bring any professional development activity materials and share that information with their colleagues from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

The Assistant Principal will provide teacher shadowing opportunities monthly in order to see best practices being used in student centered instruction and learning settings from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will collaborate monthly to discuss best practices on how to effectively utilize assistive technology in daily lessons and instruction from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment Algebra 1 End of Course test proficiency levels, 43% of our school's Algebra 1 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.
Measurable Outcome:	If the school utilizes student centered learning plans, then hospital/homebound students enrolled in Algebra 1 will be able to achieve an increase of at least 5 points in a 3 month time frame, as evidenced by the comparison of their Fall Baseline Algebra 1 Assessment data to their Winter Mid-Year Assessment data.
Monitoring:	The Assistant Principal will facilitate the use of technology in instruction weekly and provide opportunities for one-to-one data chat sessions to identify best practice strategies in regards to student centered instruction and learning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The term Student-Centered Learning refers to a wide variety of educational programs, learning experiences, instructional approaches, and academic-support strategies (physical or virtual) that are intended to address the distinct learning needs, interests, aspirations, or cultural backgrounds of individual students and groups of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is the need to sustain student-centered learning and small group instruction in order to achieve the following: taking ownership for students' learning and believing in students' ability to learn regardless of barriers.

Action Steps to Implement	

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 their parents to discuss content covered, pacing, and data from assessments from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will discuss data from assessments with their students, including but not limited to the following subgroups of students: Black, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners, in order to help students take ownership of their learning and determine his or her areas of academic strengths and areas in need of improvement from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

The Assistant Principal 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 from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will review individualized student data chat academic goals on a monthly basis in order to provide rigorous, individualized instruction from August 31st to October 11th.

Person Responsible	Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Due to our school being a Hospital/Homebound center, where students are taught individually in their home and/or hospital setting, there is no discipline data. Our school culture and environment will continued to be monitored through teacher observation and participation checklists.

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.

Brucie Ball Educational Center creates a positive school culture and safe learning environment in multiple educational settings for students living in Miami-Dade County. The Online 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/Homebound and Community Based teachers respect the environment and culture of the home/educational setting of their students.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

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 Homebound 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 Homebound placement.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00