

Collier County Public Schools

Bridgeprep Academy Collier



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Bridgeprep Academy Collier

3161 SANTA BARBARA BLVD, Naples, FL 34116

www.bridgeprepcollier.com

Demographics

Principal: Dayana Philippi

Start Date for this Principal: 6/30/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-7
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (38%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Bridgeprep Academy Collier

3161 SANTA BARBARA BLVD, Naples, FL 34116

www.bridgeprepcollier.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) Combination School KG-7	2018-19 Title I School No	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) 72%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File) K-12 General Education	Charter School Yes	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) 83%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19
Grade	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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.

Our mission at BridgePrep Academy of Collier, in partnership with our stakeholders, is to foster a nurturing and rigorous academic environment that embraces the Spanish culture and language, incorporates innovative technology, and promotes civic responsibility that will prepare students to become lifelong learners and productive citizens in our society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

BridgePrep Academy believes that each child is a unique individual who needs a secure, nurturing and stimulating atmosphere 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 achievement.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

Philippi,
Dayana

Principal

As a school principal, Dr. Philippi manages all school operations and activities. She oversees teachers and other staff and class schedules. Dr. Philippi trains on and supports the implementation of curriculum standards set by the school district, state, and/or federal regulations. She ensures the teachers have the necessary resources and equipment to reach the school’s academic goals.

In addition, as the principals she counsels and disciplines students and assist teachers in managing students' behavior. Quite frequently she meets with parents and teachers to discuss students' behavior and academic progress. It is her responsibility to address and resolve concerns of parents and community members when possible. Dr. Philippi organizes professional development programs and workshops for staff and observes teachers and classroom activities. She has the responsibility of managing in part the school’s budget, ordering school supplies, and arranging maintenance schedules. Working with the local sheriff's offices she helps to ensure proper school security and procedures for teachers, students, staff, and visitors. Like all school principals, she serves as the public face of the school, meeting with district administrators, legislators, and community members to promote the school, and explain or request school funding.

Dr. Philippi works full-time and frequently attends school functions and community events that may affect or involve the school and the local school district.

Zolbrod,
Stephanie

Teacher,
K-12

Herrera,
Lany

Teacher,
ESE

Wagner,
Susan

Teacher,
K-12

Alba, Paul

Teacher,
K-12

Seaburg,
Christopher

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	57	48	24	21	21	23	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	227
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	1	5	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	3	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	24

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	2	0	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	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/30/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide 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	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	1	1	5	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	4	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	1	1	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	6	3	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	0	3	5	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	20

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	40%	59%	61%	0%	56%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	61%	59%	0%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	63%	54%	0%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	35%	66%	62%	0%	65%	61%
Math Learning Gains	23%	61%	59%	0%	63%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	58%	52%	0%	59%	52%
Science Achievement	0%	46%	56%	0%	62%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	83%	78%	0%	86%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)								Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Number of students enrolled	57 (0)	48 (0)	24 (0)	21 (0)	21 (0)	23 (0)	18 (0)	15 (0)	227 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 (0)	9 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	39 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	7 (0)	24 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	61%	-8%	58%	-5%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	58%	6%	58%	6%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		64%				
05	2019	20%	60%	-40%	56%	-36%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		20%				
06	2019	0%	56%	-56%	54%	-54%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	33%	68%	-35%	62%	-29%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	65%	-15%	64%	-14%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		50%				
05	2019	40%	67%	-27%	60%	-20%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		40%				
06	2019	0%	61%	-61%	55%	-55%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	56%	-16%	53%	-13%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
ELL	45	60		37	21						
HSP	41	53		38	17						
FRL	32	44		32	17						

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
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	209
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

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

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Mathematics achievement and learning gains showed the lowest performance across all tested grade levels and across all subgroups. One explanation for the lowest

performance is that the three teachers in grades 3-6 were novices with a combined 2.5 years elementary level teaching experience. Given the small cohort of 3 teachers, each was responsible for planning and implementing multiple subjects which was especially challenging with the 5th/6th grade combined class. Teachers lacked the knowledge necessary to unpack state standards and implement research-based instructional practices across multiple subjects. Also, math interventions were not implemented systematically because teachers lacked the expertise in data analysis and data-driven decision making. Additional supports were necessary in 5th Grade science instruction as well.

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

As a school in its second year, BridgePrep does not have prior year data that would enumerate the greatest decline. However, the component in which students underperformed greatly in the inaugural year was in mathematics as explained in section II.1.E.a. There is also indication that students qualifying for free and reduced lunch demonstrated the lowest achievement in both ELA (32%) and Math (32% and only 17% in learning gains). More specifically, in ELA, students' averaged a score of 4.3 in writing, which was 2 points below the district average of 6.3, indication of a significant gap in ELA analytical writing instruction.

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

When compared to the state's ELA average, last year's 5th grade students (this year's 6th graders) under performed by 36 percentage points. With respect to Mathematics performance on the State assessment, grade 3 students (this year's 4th graders) when compared to the State, under performed by 29 percentage points. Factors that lead to the gap in performance were reflected upon earlier, in section II.1.E.a. These factors included inexperienced teachers, need for increased professional development in data literacy, deficiencies in carrying out the mathematics RtI process.

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

BridgePrep of Collier first opened its door to students for the 2018-2019 school year, therefore comparison data to determine improvements is not available. However, the component that shows the best performance is English Language Arts where learning gains totaled 52%. Students in the English Language Learning subgroup demonstrated a learning gain of 60 percentage points on the Florida State Assessment (FSA) for English Language Arts which is also notable.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

One area of concern is the number of Level 1 students in grades 4, 6 and 7. One third of students in grades 4 and 6 earned a level 1 on the State assessment for ELA and/or Mathematics, while half the students in grades 7 earned a level 1 on either or both ELA and Mathematics Florida State Assessment.

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

1. Stronger implementation of Multi-Tiered System Support (MTSS)/Response to Intervention (Rti) for both English language Arts and Mathematics
2. Enhanced Mathematics instruction with emphasis on Math discourse and student collaboration
3. Professional Development- Focused on data analysis which includes- tracking, analysis and making data-driven decisions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Multi-Tiered System Support (MTSS)/Response to Intervention (Rti) for both English language Arts and Mathematics
Rationale	To ensure that students are receiving data-driven instruction that targets students' achievement and learning needs.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Increase ELA achievement levels by 3% points Increase ELA learning gains to 45% or greater Increase ELA Lowest 25% gains to 42% or greater</p> <p>Increase Math achievement levels by a minimum of 3% points Increase Math learning gains to 43% or greater Increase Math Lowest 25% gains to 42% or greater</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Zolbrod (szolbrod@bridgeprepcollier.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Gradual Release of Responsibility Model during Tier 1 instruction, Differentiated Instruction for Tier 2 instruction, and Response to Intervention for Tier 3 instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring using running records and logs. Utilize iStation Monthly ISIP results for Reading and Mathematics and goals to monitor individual student growth. Monthly data analysis of reports to identify Tier 3 (red) students and skill areas that are on-going struggles for students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify students 2019 FSA ELA and Mathematics performance and 504 and IEP accommodations 2. Conduct 3 professional development sessions focused on the MTSS/RTI process, specifically data collection and analysis 3. Monitor teachers' lesson plans for evidence of standards-based instruction and differentiation. 4. Provide on-site coaching for teachers that need additional assistance. Coaching provided by principal, interventionist, and/or subject-area expert from the district.
Person Responsible	Dayana Philippi (dphilippi@bridgeprepacademy.com)

#2	
Title	Enhanced Mathematics instruction
Rationale	Mathematics proved to be the lowest performing area for all tested grade levels and subgroups.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Through the provision of timely coaching and support, we aim for the following improvements in mathematics scores: Increase Math achievement levels by a minimum of 3% points Increase Math learning gains to 43% or greater Increase Math Lowest 25% gains to 42% or greater
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Paul Alba (ptajada@bridgeprepcollier.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Instructional coaching and professional development in mathematics with a focus on student-centered techniques. Math teachers will learn how to better engage students in more active and authentic ways, so they can transform math classrooms into lively learning environments in which students take charge of their own learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Instructional coaching can promote more effective and engaging learning in the classroom. Through math coaching, teachers receive timely support and helping students learn critical math skills by improving math instruction. The coach will focus on it's important to teach students how to do mathematical procedures as well the importance of helping students to understand the concepts behind them. An experience math coach can help teachers better engage students, thus helping students discover the relevancy and real-life application of math concepts.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional development in specific Mathematics digital programs, Go Math, iStation and Reflex Math, Carnegie (Mathia app). 2. PD on improving math discourse in the mathematics classroom, district support is available through BridgePrep and CCPS provide training on number talks. Per the data our focus should be the following 2 categories- Geometry and Measurement and Data (specifically questions pertaining to volume) 3. Led by a math subject expert, teachers will commence a coaching cycle 4. Self-reflection, comprised of video taping and review of math instruction (bell-to-bell sessions) with specific "look-fors" such as opportunities for discourse
Person Responsible	Dayana Philippi (dphilippi@bridgeprepacademy.com)

#3

Title	Professional Development- Data recording, tracking, and analysis
Rationale	Teachers often experience feelings of isolation and are burdened to understand and strategically utilize data to drive their instruction. Schools can support teachers' development of data literacy skills, the skills and habits of mind teachers need to responsibly use student data. This is especially important given that all teachers are expected to master as policy mandates a wealth of student generated data for the purpose of accountability.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	In the areas of ELA and math, teachers will increase their knowledge of assessments, standards, curriculum, content as evidenced by: Increase ELA achievement levels by 3% points Increase ELA learning gains to 45% or greater Increase ELA Lowest 25% gains to 42% or greater Increase Math achievement levels by a minimum of 3% points Increase Math learning gains to 43% or greater Increase Math Lowest 25% gains to 42% or greater
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dayana Philippi (dphilippi@bridgeprepacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Data literacy training is comprised of 5 parts: (1) identifying problems, (2) understanding data, (3) drawing information from data, (4) determining a decision/action step, and (5) evaluating outcomes. To make meaning out of data and then translate that meaning to instructional action, teachers must participate in this iterative process. As such, the scope of this year's PLC will be Data Literacy training. Select articles that focus on the 5 parts will be introduced, shared, and discussed among teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Professional learning communities (PLCs) are characterized by the powerful collaboration promoted among educational professionals. This systematic process encourages teachers to work together to analyze and improve their classroom practice. Teachers work in teams, engaging in an ongoing cycle of questions that promote deep team learning.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Schedule PLC's bi-weekly 2. Split into Primary and Intermediate/MJ teams 3. Introduce topics (5 stage cycle of data literacy) 4. Identify books, excerpts and articles which speak to the 5 stages. Present in order. 5. Schedule PLCs so that all 5 stages are discussed by the end of semester 1.
Person Responsible	Dayana Philippi (dphilippi@bridgeprepacademy.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Other priorities will be addressed by taking a close look at the predictive validity of last year's in-house assessments and tools. Our team will examine the performance of students who were "on the bubble" that is were approaching proficiency or merely proficient and the direction of their growth. Two explicit training sessions on CPalms as a resource for standard alignment and lessons will be provided. During observations, emphasis will be placed on the quality of core instruction to reduce the need for intervention and remediation.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

BPA did not qualify for Title I funding in during the 208-19 school year, as the school had 72% free and reduced lunch, but did not reach the required threshold for funding, 75%. Therefore, this section was left blank.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

- N/A- BPA did not qualify for Title I funding in during the 208-19 school year, as he school had 72% free and reduced lunch, but did not reach the required threshold for funding, 75%.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

- N/A- BPA did not qualify for Title I funding in during the 208-19 school year, as he school had 72% free and reduced lunch, but did not reach the required threshold for funding, 75%.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

- N/A- BPA did not qualify for Title I funding in during the 208-19 school year, as he school had 72% free and reduced lunch, but did not reach the required threshold for funding, 75%.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

- N/A- BPA did not qualify for Title I funding in during the 208-19 school year, as he school had 72% free and reduced lunch, but did not reach the required threshold for funding, 75%.