

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>19</b> |

# Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami

137 NE 19TH ST, Miami, FL 33180

www.bridgepreacademygreatermiami.com

## Demographics

Principal: Guillermo Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 8/22/2016

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 72%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (53%)<br>2017-18: C (52%)<br>2016-17: B (59%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

| Table of Contents              |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 18 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 19 |

## Bridgeprep Academy Of Greater Miami

137 NE 19TH ST, Miami, FL 33180

www.bridgepreacademygreatermiami.com

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>KG-5                        | Yes                    | 85%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | Yes                    | 94%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade |         | C       | C       | C       |

### 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.

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           | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|----------------|---------------------|---|
| Ortiz, Mitzie  | Principal           | Mrs. Ortiz oversees the daily activities and operations within a school. Her main duties include disciplining or advising students, approving Teachers' curriculums and ensuring the school environment is safe for all students and staff members. |
| March , Mary   | Assistant Principal | Mrs. March serves at the school's testing chair, oversees the Title 1 Program, and assists the principal of the school.   |
| Lopez, Johanna | Instructional Coach | As an instructional coaches, Ms. Lopez serves as the on-site professional developers who teach educators how to use proven instructional methods.   |
|                | Instructional Coach | As an instructional coaches, Mrs. Vidal serves as the on-site professional developers who teach educators how to use proven instructional methods.  |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 8/22/2016, 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.*

**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.*

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

28

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

425

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

14

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

14

### 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                              | 69          | 79 | 71 | 80 | 61 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 427   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 1           | 3  | 7  | 2  | 4  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 1  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1  | 1  | 2  | 4  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6  | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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           | 1 | 12 | 3 | 15 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 54    |

**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 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| 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 9/22/2021

## 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               | 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  |       |

## 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               | 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  |       |

## 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             |        |          |       | 47%    | 62%      | 57%   | 53%    | 62%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 57%    | 62%      | 58%   | 51%    | 62%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 46%    | 58%      | 53%   | 57%    | 59%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 57%    | 69%      | 63%   | 60%    | 69%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 60%    | 66%      | 62%   | 57%    | 64%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 48%    | 55%      | 51%   | 39%    | 55%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 56%    | 55%      | 53%   | 49%    | 58%      | 55%   |

### 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 | 33%    | 60%      | -27%                       | 58%   | -25%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 52%    | 64%      | -12%                       | 58%   | -6%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -33%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 45%    | 60%      | -15%                       | 56%   | -11%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -52%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 48%    | 67%      | -19%                       | 62%   | -14%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 54%    | 69%      | -15%                       | 64%   | -10%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -48%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 59%    | 65%      | -6%                        | 60%   | -1%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -54%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 52%    | 53%      | -1%                        | 53%   | -1%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

BridgePrep Academy of Greater Miami uses assessments via Mastery Connects and IStation to progress monitor the students.

| Grade 1               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 49   | 47     | 46     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 48   | 49     | 71     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 50   | 58     | 58     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 48   | 55     | 56     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 70   | 68     | 80     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 39   | 40     | 41     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 35   | 58     | 58     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 48   | 55     | 55     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
| Grade 2               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 53   | 52     | 52     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 42   | 44     | 47     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 59   | 60     | 60     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 39   | 48     | 55     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 47   | 25     | 43     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 42   | 48     | 44     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 33   | 66     | 67     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 50   | 68     | 69     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 3               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 69   | 63     | 73     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 41   | 47     | 50     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 45   | 53     | 53     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 32   | 32     | 36     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 49   | 39     | 53     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 39   | 42     | 45     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 24   | 48     | 48     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 24   | 31     | 40     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
| Grade 4               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 64   | 64     | 68     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 52   | 55     | 51     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 41   | 51     | 56     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 41   | 41     | 56     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 45   | 21     | 46     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 37   | 41     | 42     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 96   | 34     | 34     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 20   | 32     | 32     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 5               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 56   | 54     | 58     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 52   | 57     | 50     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 41   | 48     | 48     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 31   | 40     | 48     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 25   | 36     | 48     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 21   | 27     | 29     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 30   | 37     | 44     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 20   | 37     | 50     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 49   | 45     | 47     |
| Science               | Economically Disadvantaged | 42   | 48     | 29     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 41   | 42     | 39     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 37   | 38     | 40     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 49   | 45     | 47     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 42   | 48     | 29     |

## 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 |
| ELL                                       | 50       | 55     | 62          | 46        | 23      | 20           | 12       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 44       | 33     |             | 35        | 8       |              | 9        |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 52       | 54     | 64          | 49        | 30      | 20           | 16       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 49       | 53     | 56          | 46        | 27      | 24           | 11       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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  | 40  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 59  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 320 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 98% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      |     |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| English Language Learners   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 41  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        |     |
| Native American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%         |     |

| Asian Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 26  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 43  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                |     |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   |     |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 41  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| 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?**

HSP and ELL subgroups both showed improved across the board in their overall data (both progress monitoring and state assessment scores).

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

Based off of progress monitoring and the latest assessments scores-the greatest need for improvement is the area of 5th Grade Science.

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

Some of the contributing factors for this need for improvement was the lack of rigor in the primary grades. By monitoring rigor beginning in the primary grades in the area of science would need to be taken to address this need. In addition, weekly hands-on and virtual science experiments will need to take place to meet the needs of all learners.

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

The data components (based off progress monitoring) that showed the most improvement was in the area of ELA.

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

Some of the contributing factors for this improvement was the use of Achieve 3000, the use of IStation, and the support from a full time Reading Coach. By using these programs with fidelity, the students gained a better understanding of the standards that are assessed. In addition, the reading coach was able to assist teachers in best teaching these standards to the students.

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

Some of the strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning in the proper planning and implementation of strategic differentiated instruction in all subject areas to best meet the needs of all learners.

**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.**

All teachers are assigned specific professional developments that will target their particular area of need. In addition, teachers are participating in school-wide professional developments that will help improve their overall ability to become a stronger educator. These professional developments are offered by: outside vendors, in-house coaches, and by BPA's Curriculum Support Team. (All professional developments are research based.)

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

Some additional services that are now implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement are the assigned individualized professional developments and the implementation of weekly common plannings. The professional developments are as aforementioned. The common plannings are guided and lead by the two in-house instructional coaches and hosted on a group and individual basis based on teacher need. These common plannings will help ensure teachers are prepared to best teach their students the standards in a effective manner.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

*No activities were entered for this section.*

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

**One of the main concerns at BPA is the attendance. BPA has hosted parent workshops on the importance of daily at school holding on to the motto of "if you are not here, you are not learning". By attempting to educate the parents, the goal is for that desire to be present in school to trickle down to the students.**

**BPA has an in-house counselor that oversees students' attendance and communicates with the parents.**

**BPA has also implemented an in-house attendance behavior system that encourages students to attend school.**

### 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.

BPA is working on becoming a PBIS school. The in-house counselor is assisting in leading this endeavor. BPA uses a positive behavior system amongst the students to have all teachers and staff focus on disciplining the students in a positive way.

BPA believes that positive reinforcement reinforces what the student is doing right rather than concentrating on what the student doing wrong. BPA's goal is that this increases the likelihood that the positive behavior

will be repeated. BPA uses a school-wide app that focuses on positive deeds and qualities through enthusiasm, descriptive encouragement, and natural, logical rewards.

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

BPA's counselor leads the PBIS in partnership with Mrs. Ortiz (the principal) and Mrs. March (the assistant principal). As a team-all teachers and staff members are trained before the school year starts in order to implement it effectively. It is also communicated to all parents and families BPA's goals for the new school year and are in constant communication with families.

**Part V: Budget**

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

|        |        |
|--------|--------|
| Total: | \$0.00 |
|--------|--------|