Orange County Public Schools

Bridgeprep Academy Charter

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
mission
students
school improvement
family and community involvement
needs assessment
striving
achievement
ambitious
teaching
relationships
success
areas of focus
instruction
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
resources
supportive environment
growth

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bridgeprep Academy Charter

5710 LA COSTA DR, Orlando, FL 32807

www.bridgeprepacademy.com

Demographics

Principal: Joy Fernandez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: D (34%) 2017-18: D (33%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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 Orange 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Our MISSION at BridgePrep Academy of Orange, 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 of Orange 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gordon Fernandez, Joy	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS, evaluates instructional staff and gives timely corrective feedback, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, provides professional development to support effective teaching and learning, and communicates with parents regarding school based plans and activities.
Aldahondo, Elizabeth	Dean	Assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with leadership team to identify appropriate, evidence based intervention strategies
Aldahondo, Ziada	Instructional Coach	Facilitate implementation of core content instruction, by working with teachers to build instructional capacity using the coaching cycle. Guides the student data collection process, develops & helps with delivery of Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborates with staff to develop Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
Gordon Fernandez, Joy	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS, evaluates instructional staff and gives timely corrective feedback, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, provides professional development to support effective teaching and learning, and communicates with parents regarding school based plans and activities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2016, Joy Fernandez

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

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (34%) 2017-18: D (33%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: No Grade

2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	34	53	39	40	31	30	39	54	42	0	0	0	0	362
Attendance below 90 percent	3	7	1	1	3	1	11	9	7	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	4
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	25	12	16	22	14	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 6/4/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	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
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	29%	62%	61%	25%	60%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	60%	59%	38%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	55%	54%	40%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	21%	61%	62%	17%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	40%	60%	59%	29%	60%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	54%	52%	34%	55%	52%
Science Achievement	19%	56%	56%	45%	56%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	. 34%	74%	78%	36%	74%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**									**Total**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	19%	55%	-36%	58%	-39%
	2018	21%	55%	-34%	57%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	10%	57%	-47%	58%	-48%
	2018	21%	54%	-33%	56%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison	-11%					
Cohort Comparison	-11%					
05	2019	14%	54%	-40%	56%	-42%
	2018	29%	55%	-26%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison	-15%					
Cohort Comparison	-7%					
06	2019	32%	52%	-20%	˙54%	-22%
	2018	31%	48%	-17%	52%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison	3%					
07	2019	27%	48%	-21%	52%	-25%
	2018	17%	48%	-31%	51%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison	10%					
Cohort Comparison	-4%					
08	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison	23%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	2%	62%	-60%	62%	-60%
	2018	14%	61%	-47%	62%	-48%
Same Grade Comparison	-12%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	23%	63%	-40%	64%	-41%
	2018	20%	62%	-42%	62%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	18%	57%	-39%	60%	-42%
	2018	26%	59%	-33%	61%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019	29%	43%	-14%	55%	-26%
	2018	14%	35%	-21%	52%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
07	2019	7%	49%	-42%	54%	-47%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
08	2019	35%	36%	-1%	46%	-11%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	14%	54%	-40%	53%	-39%
	2018	38%	53%	-15%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	15%	49%	-34%	48%	-33%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

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	32%	66%	-34%	71%	-39%
2018	32%	66%	-34%	71%	-39%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	70%	-70%
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	20%	63%	-43%	61%	-41%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
Compare		20%			

GEOMETRY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%
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
SWD	7	28	25	15	35	30					
ELL	22	43	44	23	42	47	10	22			
BLK	7	15		7	38						
HSP	30	48	53	21	39	49	19	33	11		
WHT	43	54		38	58						
FRL	28	48	55	22	41	48	22	44	24		

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
SWD	18	23	30	16	13						
ELL	14	37	41	10	23	30	12	33			
BLK	24	30		18	20						
HSP	23	36	37	14	27	36	40	37			
WHT	47	57		40	43						
FRL	23	37	39	15	27	30	40	40			

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	348
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	17
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	34
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
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

3rd grade students performed poorly in FSA ELA and Math. This was due in the main to change of teacher in one class twice in the year, leading to break in teacher relationship/ connection
5th performed very poorly in Science - due to limited hands on experience/labs

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

5th grade science showed the greatest decline with a fall from 45% to 16% proficiency. Limited assessment with corrective feedback, limited hands-on experience

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

5th grade Science

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

Middle School ELA - experience, committed teacher with consistency of planned instruction

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

Attendance and Tardiness

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

1. Build teacher capacity to raise student engagement levels
2. Improve attendance
3. Increase staff capacity to implement our school-wide expectations with fidelity
4. Implement the MTSS framework with fidelity
5. To narrow the achievement gap in ELA and math ,for all groups of students-subgroups,
lowest 25%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Research shows that learning improves when students are inquisitive, interested, or inspired, and that learning tends to suffer when students are bored, dispassionate, disaffected, or otherwise "disengaged." Our teachers need to build instructional capacity in order to build stronger student engagement / improved student engagement
Measureable Outcome:	Administrators and instructional coaches will monitor teachers for engaging standards based instruction during classroom observations and provide actionable feedback to enhance teacher instructional practices. Administrators and Instructional Coaches will monitor teachers use of differentiated instructional strategies during classroom observations and provide actionable feedback to meet the needs of all students. Administrators and Instructional Coaches will conduct bi-monthly professional developments on rigor and relevance which will include Webb's Depth of Knowledge, Florida State Standards, and Marzano instructional strategies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joy Gordon Fernandez (joy.gordonfernandez@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	With support from coaches and administration, teachers will be able to increase their capacity to implement engaging, rigorous standards-based instruction: 1. Present students with at least three higher-order-thinking ("HOT") questions during the lesson 2. Build in daily opportunities for students to summarize to bring the lesson to a close 3. Create lessons that have challenging activities and move at a brisk/ effective learning pace 4. Reviewing growth among both class and grade level. 5. Teachers use the data to form flexible groups and students have opportunities for additional tutorials within the school day and after the school day
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Current research findings acknowledge that active learning in groups, peer relationships, and social skills are important in engaging learners.Providing professional development on engagement strategies and differentiated instruction will assist teachers in improving their instructional delivery to enable them to target specific student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Admin and coaches will model engaging instructional strategies during common planning and in classrooms.
2. Bi-weekly data chats - classroom walk-through feedback, informal and formal observation data, common assessment data
3.Administrators and coaches will work with teachers to examine data sources
4. Students will be taught at their instructional level in small groups of 6 to 8 students.
5. Groupings will be flexible based on data reviewed during weekly meetings

Person Responsible Joy Gordon Fernandez (joy.gordonfernandez@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Research indicates that learning is maximized when school-wide expectations are defined and taught to all students and school staff in each of the settings within the school. Our current teaching staff are inconsistent in their knowledge of and approach to school-wide expectations and student behaviors. Our goal is to increase staff capacity to implement our school-wide expectations with fidelity so that our students experience a common language, common practices, and consistent application of positive and negative reinforcement at a school-wide level
Measureable Outcome:	Consistent discipline and procedures among classrooms An orderly environment and mutual respect between students, teachers, and all staff Less number of students out of class to other teachers classrooms or to the office
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joy Gordon Fernandez (joy.gordonfernandez@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A. Consistent classroom expectations B. Reinforcement of good behavior more often C. Increase communication with parents D. School-wide expectations taught and posted E. Promote positive attitude towards learning and school
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All teachers will consistently implement PBIS/Schoolwide expectations and will develop and implement classroom expectations to be used in conjunction with OCPS school code of conduct to plan for behavior management and intervention. These expectations are developed by the team and will be taught to students by their regular classroom teachers, administrators or others who have contact with all students. This gives greater ownership to our school-wide expectations

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development to teachers to help them better understand ways to de-escalate behavior
Counseling staff will meet with students in class during the fall semester to implement a Bullying
Prevention program utilizing the Bully-Free Schools program.
School-wide review of procedures
Intervene in behaviors before they reach a level 2 offense.

Person Responsible Joy Gordon Fernandez (joy.gordonfernandez@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There is limited parental and community involvement that purposefully promotes student learning for all subgroups. In addition parents and community partners have limited resources and knowledge to support student who in all subgroups
Measureable Outcome:	Attendance below 90 percent- After two consecutive absences, teachers make communication with the parent regarding students absences. An incentive program is implemented for the classrooms with 90% or better attendance. One or more suspensions- BPA utilizes a school-wide discipline program. Through this program, students are taught positive behavior strategies and teachers communicate consistent routines and procedures throughout the learning day. A level 1 score on the statewide, standardized assessments- Individual student data to include the lowest 30% is analyzed and disaggregated during weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLC) meetings. Reading deficiency letters and possible retention letters are drafted and communicated to parents during the beginning and mid-point of the school year. Additional intervention strategies to be used at BPA include: --attendance contracts with parents --before/after school tutoring --parent conferences (academic, attendance and behavior) --Social Worker and School Psychologist referrals, as needed --intervention and enrichment via small group instruction --Reading and Math computer programs (iReady) --Saturday school --parent liaison --Summer Reading Camp
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joy Gordon Fernandez (joy.gordonfernandez@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	BPA has implemented an attendance plan for Perfect Attendance. Parent Liaison will monitor students with poor attendance patterns as a means to intervene and improve chronic absenteeism. Through these efforts attendance will improve among targeted students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By identify our students with poor attendance, Admin, Parent Liaison and teachers now know and are working towards the needs of these students. That way we can put the strategies above in palce and·monitor closely

Action Steps to Implement

We will provide School Attendance Policies to parents in both English and Spanish
An Intervention Team consisting of the counselor, coaches, Title I coordinator and

Administrator will meet regularly to target students who have >10% absence
Create an incentive program that highlights perfect attendance per month for students
Create a character counts program that highlights identified desired character traits in students and adults
Counselors will work with small groups of students monthly
Parent of students who are experiencing attendance issues will attend workshop to be held during 1st semester 2020 that will cover the benefits of good attendance
During faculty meetings, the data team will discuss and provide attendance and discipline strategies to teachers to provide information to parents to reinforce with their children at home

Person Responsible   Joy Gordon Fernandez (joy.gordonfernandez@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**Planning for rigorous, standards-based assessment requires flexibility and regular progress
monitoring to ensure fidelity
Admin and Coaches will monitor lesson plans, iObservation, common assessment, iReady,
Achieve 3000, iStation and state-wide assessment data to ensure that standards-based lesson planning, is helping students progress toward their academic goals.
Professional development will be provided to build teacher content knowledge of the standards and Teachers will receive ongoing support on implementing rigorous standards-based instruction to enhance their
knowledge and understanding of the standards
Common planning will focus on deconstructing standards and teachers will use district provided resources to plan lessons which reach to intent of the standards
Reduce the number of Out-of & In-School Suspensions by providing professional development to teachers to help them better understand ways to de-escalate behavior**

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

To promote a positive school culture and environment we will do the following:

1. Offer parents/guardians flexible meeting times
2. Actively promote Back to School Night, Open House and Parent Conferences
3. Arrange quarterly school sponsored activity nights in which teachers, parents and students participate:
- Reading Nights
- Book Fair Night
- Parent Workshops in reading and Math
4. Advertise school activities and involvement opportunities through the school web site, newsletters and BPA communication App.
5. Conversational English for Parents and the Community

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00