

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Bridgeprep Academy Of Village Green School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Bridgeprep Academy Of Village Green

13300 SW 120TH ST, Miami, FL 33186

<http://bavillagegreen.bridgeprepacademy.com>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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 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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Garcia, Patricia	Principal	Creates and/or monitors foundational school's documents which include: master schedule, student rosters, culture rubric, campus operating mechanisms, school discipline plan, leadership core calendar, school year-long calendar, campus specific staff handbook, and emergency response plan. Plans for the use of discretionary school funds, monitors and manages student discipline, organizes and leads campus professional development, leads weekly instructional rounds with leadership team, monitors progress toward campus goals and makes school-wide adjustments as needed.
Suarez, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Responds to school culture concerns for specified grade levels, participates in weekly data calls, conducts weekly classroom observations, provides feedback on lesson plans and/or lesson internalization, and assigns and tracks completion of action steps assigned to teachers. Coaches teachers to master assigned action steps (real-time coaching), approves absences and tracks attendance for direct reports, and completes the staff development cycle with each direct report.
Latorre, Vanessa	Assistant Principal	Responds to student culture concerns for specified grade levels, participates in weekly data calls, conducts weekly classroom observations for all direct reports, provides feedback on lesson plans or lesson internalization. Assigns and tracks completion of action steps assigned to teachers. Hold weekly check-ins with direct reports, approves absences and tracks attendance for direct reports. Completes the staff development cycle with each direct report. First line of discipline and parent communication.
Maytin, Eileen	Instructional Coach	Responds to student culture concerns for specified grade levels, participates in weekly data chats, conducts weekly classroom observations for all direct reports, provides feedback on lesson plans or lesson internalization, assigns and tracks completion of action steps assigned to teachers. Holds weekly check-ins with direct reports, coaches teachers to master assigned action steps (real-time coaching), completes the staff development coaching cycle with each direct report and follow-ups to ensure skill proficiency. Conducts data chats with Lead team.
Diaz, Cynthia	ELL Compliance Specialist	Responds to student culture concerns for specified grade levels. Participates in weekly data calls. Conducts weekly classroom observations for all direct reports. Provides feedback on lesson plans or lesson internalization. Holds weekly check-ins with direct reports. ESOL Liaison, ESOL compliance/ C.U.M.S., School Assessment Coordinator (SAC) for State Testing K-5, Kinder FLKRS, WIDA. Monitor data/progress of ELL population · Monitor Level 1 use of Imagine Learning. Beginning of school placement tests. Completes other roles and responsibilities that are assigned by the principal

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Input for the SIP's development process was obtained hosting a roundtable discussion involving the school's leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents and students. Review of data revealed areas of concern and all stakeholders brainstormed ideas of what adjustments needed to happen.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards by the leadership team. Assistant principals will monitor ELA data in all grades, while the instructional coach will monitor K-5 Math and Science. The principal will hold bi-weekly data meetings to check-in with the leadership team and revise the plan as needed to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-10
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	96%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	59%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C

	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	4	0	1	1	2	6	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	1	2	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	6	25	18	19	22	0	0	0	0	90	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	25	9	22	14	22	0	0	0	0	92	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	36	16	85	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	22	26	72	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	36	16	85	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	8	10	3	24	46	55	55	38	239

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61	61	53	54	62	55	54		
ELA Learning Gains				52			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			30		
Math Achievement*	57	63	55	44	51	42	40		
Math Learning Gains				51			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			30		
Science Achievement*	47	56	52	37	60	54	42		
Social Studies Achievement*		77	68	68	68	59	62		
Middle School Acceleration		75	70	27	61	51	53		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	66	62	55	74	75	70	64		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	300
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	514
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	4	2
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	50			
BLK	51			
HSP	51			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	61			57			47					66
SWD	15			23							2	
ELL	58			46			30				5	66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	61			57			47				5	65
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	75			58							2	
FRL	53			51			45				5	65

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	54	52	49	44	51	58	37	68	27			74
SWD	23	42	35	17	32	37	7					
ELL	43	45	42	34	45	57	28	65				74
AMI												
ASN	45			55								
BLK	57	60		36	50							
HSP	54	52	49	44	51	59	37	70	23			73
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54	44		48	69							
FRL	49	49	51	39	48	59	35	67	30			74

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	54	47	30	40	35	30	42	62	53			64
SWD	13	13	15	15	16	13	17					50
ELL	42	43	34	32	33	33	33	48				64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	62			31								
HSP	55	48	29	41	36	30	43	61	53			64
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	36	36		24	20							
FRL	50	45	27	36	33	32	33	55	48			62

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
05	2023 - Spring	53%	56%	-3%	54%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	58%	7%	58%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	63%	52%	11%	50%	13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	66%	63%	3%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	64%	0%	61%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	58%	-13%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	44%	50%	-6%	51%	-7%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 5th grade for Math, Science, and ELA. Contributing factors to last year's low performance were teacher turnover rate as well as lack of experience necessary to unpack state standards and implement differentiated instruction as needed. Another factor was the delayed receipt of instructional materials as well as lack of professional development internalizing the material.

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

When comparing data from the prior year to 2022-2023, 5th grade learning gains indicate a downward trend in ELA, Math, and Science. The factors that contribute to this decline is teacher turnover rate and lack of experienced teachers.

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

The data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average was 5th grade ELA and Science with 1% difference between our school and the state. A factor that could've contributed to this gap was lack of foundational skills due to the pandemic as well as insufficient differentiated instruction.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 3rd grade Math with a 10% increase in proficiency from 2021-22 school year to 2022-23. A significant difference which could have led to this increase is the amount of coaching time spent in this grade level. Common planning for this grade level was consistent and teachers were able to observe differentiated instruction from experience teachers.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Reflecting on data, a potential area of concern will be the subgroup, Students with Disabilities scoring below 41% proficiency. A breakdown of the scores indicate ELA proficiency in this subgroup was only 23%, Math 17%, and Science 7%.

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

1. 5th Science
2. 5th Math
3. 5th ELA
4. P.B.I.S.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

BridgePrep Academy Village Green strives to provide a working environment that is supportive and conducive to learning and growing. In order for our teachers to feel supported and meet the needs of all our students, we must ensure that clear expectations are set forth and that coaching and high expectations are evident throughout the entire school year.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The 2023-2024 school will begin with implementation of a Positive Behavior Intervention System as well as Classroom Culture lessons. All teachers, staff, and students will participate in the "Bulldog Buddies" P.B.I.S. program which will positively enhance our school's culture and should improve behavior and academics among students. The morale of our school should increase by 20 percentage points as evidenced by the end-of-year School Climate Survey of 2023-2024.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The area of Positive Culture and Environment will be monitored by having teachers and staff complete a feedback form on a quarterly. This will help the leadership team address areas of concerns as specified by the comments listed on the form. The feedback form will be emailed to the staff and reviewed by the principal and the leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patricia Garcia (pgarcia@bridgeprepacademy.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Within the Targeted Element of Specific Teacher Feedback, we will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Promoting the Morale and Performance of the team. By implementing this strategy, it will ensure that leaders check in with staff members regularly and identify needs by boosting morale through incentive programs, rewards, and positive reinforcement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Promoting the Morale and Performance of the Team will support teachers and help them feel that their input is valued, thus increasing their engagement among their team and department. The leadership team will support this process by being a part of their common planning meetings.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Data from 2021-2022 indicates that the subgroup, Students with Disabilities, scored below 41% proficiency. This subgroup has not been proficient for 3 consecutive years which means it is crucial that steps are taken to ensure achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

With the implementation of differentiated instruction, an increase in proficiency of at least 5 percentage points in ELA and Math should occur in grades 3-5th as evidenced by the F.A.S.T. progress monitoring assessment of 2023-2024.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Differentiated instruction will be implemented school wide in grades K-5th. A pacing guide created by our curriculum team will help keep teachers on track in terms of lessons and assessments. Teaching materials and assessments will be utilized to meet the needs of each student so that all students can learn effectively at their current academic level, regardless of learning styles.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patricia Garcia (pgarcia@bridgeprepacademy.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Differentiated instruction will provide students different opportunities for learning and addressing weaknesses within their subject areas. The leadership team will conduct walk-throughs to ensure that differentiated instruction is occurring regularly, and that support is being provided.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data-drive differentiated instruction is targeted in helping students bridge the gaps that exist from their pandemic days. Teachers will provide differentiated instruction based on student needs as evidence by their weekly/bi-weekly assessments and class observations.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the data review from the 2022-23 FAST Assessments in Science, only 44% of students were proficient. Data from the prior year indicates a 45% of students were proficient at a Level 3 or above. It is evident that we are not meeting the unique needs of all learners and we must try to work harder to accelerate student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

If we provide more support to 5th grade Science and allow for increase in coaching cycles, professional development, and PLCs, then we expect proficiency levels in all our subgroups to increase by 10% as evidenced by the 2023-24 F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Teachers will use progress monitoring data from Performance Matters as well as Unit assessments to target at risk students and address those benchmarks that need remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patricia Garcia (pgarcia@bridgeprepacademy.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students will receive differentiated instruction in small groups with the teacher as well as intervention at least two times a week for 30 minutes. Additionally, the Science coach will model the evidence-based strategy of Gradual Release of Responsibilities (GRRM) for new teachers which will assist teachers in explicitly executing lessons that follow a systematic approach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model (GRMM) will ensure that teachers are explicitly guiding students through the learning process allowing for transfer of conceptual understanding to the procedural understanding of science concepts. The GRMM model guarantees that students are supported in their acquisition of the skills and strategies necessary to achieve proficiency in their assessments.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Monies have been earmarked to address the needs of the subgroup: Students with Disabilities. An ESE specialist has been hired to support the ESE teacher and ensure contact hours are met with fidelity. All students requiring support facilitation have been placed strategically rostered.