

Orange County Public Schools

Bridgewater Middle 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	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Bridgewater Middle

5600 TINY RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://bridgewaterms.ocps.net/>

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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Klauer, Amy	Principal	The Principal is responsible for the overall operation of the school. Some of these operations can include: being an instructional leader, hiring effective faculty and staff, providing teachers with actionable feedback to improve instructional pedagogy, creating a safe and positive school culture, supervising and evaluating faculty and staff, maintaining secure funding for the school, and conducting meetings to create academic action plans to address student needs and improve student achievement school-wide.
Hadley, Karla	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is responsible for observing instructional delivery, providing teachers with actionable feedback, participating in common planning, and assisting with professional development. Additional responsibilities include overseeing course scheduling, student placement and implementation of curriculum.
Gonzalez, Jose	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is responsible for observing instructional delivery, providing teachers with actionable feedback, participating in common planning, and assisting with professional development. Additional responsibilities include overseeing discipline, Restorative Practices, and safety or security.
Butler, Stephanie	Other	The Academic Dean provides individual and group professional development to improve the understanding of effective instruction. This may include providing personalized support, through the utilization of the coaching cycle (e.g. coaching, modeling, observation, conferencing, etc.) based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers and administrators. Additional responsibilities include providing support in analyzing student assessment data and making instructional decisions based on student needs.
Chalas, Delia	Reading Coach	The Reading Coach provides individual and group professional development to improve the understanding of effective instruction with a focus in the areas of language arts and reading. This may include providing personalized support, through the utilization of the coaching cycle (e.g. coaching, modeling, observation, conferencing, etc.) based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers and administrators. Additional responsibilities include providing support in analyzing student assessment data and making instructional decisions based on student needs.
Hawkins, Tynisa	Dean	The Dean is responsible for monitoring and supporting students who demonstrate social and emotional needs. They participate in the development of behavior plans for specific students and collect data on behavioral trends, while also monitoring and supporting the school wide behavior management plan. Additionally, they will communicate with parents and provide resources for families in need of support.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jacobson, Gina	School Counselor	The School Counselor supports the guidance department and Student Support Team with scheduling and providing guidance to students, academically, socially, emotionally, and behaviorally.
Wong, Caroline	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist provides services to students in which behaviors or other factors may impede their learning process. Provides guidance in designing educational settings that improve learning for all students by conducting/assisting with assessments, developing behavior intervention plans, conducting observations, and providing professional development to staff.
Soto, Dayanara	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The Curriculum Resource Teacher provides individual and group professional development to improve the understanding of effective instruction. This may include providing personalized support, through the utilization of the coaching cycle (e.g. coaching, modeling, observation, conferencing, etc.) based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers and administrators. Additional responsibilities include providing support in analyzing student assessment data and making instructional decisions based on student needs.

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.

The SIP development process began with input from members of the School Advisory Committee (comprised of teachers, school staff, parents, families, and community members). The committee reviewed school data and worked with school leadership to create three specific areas for growth during the 2023-24 school year. School leadership also met with students to collect additional feedback as the SIP was still in the development process.

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 by completing classroom walkthroughs, progress monitoring (focused on student data related to SIP goals), common planning meetings, and input from school stakeholders. Data will be monitored and shared monthly to track the SIP's impact on increasing student achievement and to identify the need to revisit and revise the current plan. The plan may be revised by changing instructional strategies, modifying monitoring activities, or adding or changing school leaders responsible for specific action steps.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	20%
Charter School	No
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	44	83	83	210	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	11	39	
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	1	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	71	54	158	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	39	20	111	
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		

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	32	55	30	117

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	66	88	215	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	11	22	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	28	56	119	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	28	37	117	
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		

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	0	0	0	0	0	34	22	40	96

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

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 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	66	88	215	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	11	22	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	28	56	119	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	28	37	117	
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		

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	0	0	0	0	0	34	22	40	96

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	0	0	
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*	70	48	49	71	49	50	72		
ELA Learning Gains				55			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			46		
Math Achievement*	81	57	56	73	36	36	68		
Math Learning Gains				66			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			37		
Science Achievement*	71	53	49	70	55	53	64		
Social Studies Achievement*	85	64	68	86	61	58	83		
Middle School Acceleration	71	77	73	77	52	49	80		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	64	43	40	66	79	76	76		

* 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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	662
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
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	42			
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	70			
HSP	66			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	68			

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	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	59			
HSP	61			

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%
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	62			

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	70			81			71	85	71			64
SWD	34			43			25	66			4	
ELL	53			67			49	72	49		6	64
AMI												
ASN	80			89			74	91	89		5	
BLK	60			67			71	79	75		5	
HSP	62			73			65	76	61		6	60
MUL	64			84							2	
PAC												
WHT	75			85			73	90	73		5	
FRL	64			69			67	76	63		6	70

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	71	55	42	73	66	56	70	86	77			66
SWD	21	25	27	27	44	44	17	45				
ELL	54	53	43	59	59	44	52	71	64			66
AMI												
ASN	81	68	31	86	76	81	79	95	89			

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
BLK	55	46	40	57	62	61	58	80	72			
HSP	64	53	42	63	62	52	61	82	71			64
MUL	70	67		74	68		75		92			
PAC												
WHT	76	56	44	81	68	58	76	88	77			70
FRL	64	52	41	63	63	44	64	84	73			75

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	72	64	46	68	47	37	64	83	80			76
SWD	24	36	28	21	28	25	30	44	50			
ELL	55	71	61	56	50	42	44	71	76			76
AMI												
ASN	82	74	42	82	58	61	70	93	96			
BLK	62	63	32	52	33	21	44	68	76			
HSP	66	64	52	62	50	41	58	78	77			77
MUL	81	68		69	39		64	93	83			
PAC												
WHT	75	63	42	73	47	34	70	87	80			81
FRL	62	57	39	55	43	34	52	68	81			68

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
07	2023 - Spring	73%	45%	28%	47%	26%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	46%	14%	47%	13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	67%	44%	23%	47%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	73%	53%	20%	54%	19%
07	2023 - Spring	69%	38%	31%	48%	21%
08	2023 - Spring	84%	58%	26%	55%	29%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	68%	50%	18%	44%	24%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	47%	51%	50%	48%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	45%	54%	48%	51%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	61%	22%	66%	17%

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.

Schoolwide 2023-23 data shows the lowest component performance was ELA Achievement for the ESE student subgroup (32%). Contributing factors to last year's low performance include a lack of differentiated instruction, scaffolding, and collaboration between school leadership, ESE support staff, and teachers to implement appropriate and targeted interventions.

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

ELA Achievement for all students showed the greatest decline from the previous school year falling 4 points from 71% to 67%. Some factors that contributed to this decline included a lack of differentiated instruction, scaffolding, and adaptation to new standards.

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.

Schoolwide 2022-23 data shows no gaps when compared to the state averages in all components.

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

Math achievement showed the most improvement with a gain of 4 points from 73% to 77%. Math teachers worked collaboratively with school leadership to adjust the focus calendar to meet the needs of all students, use appropriate scaffolding, and implement small-group instruction based on assessment data.

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

Two areas of potential concern identified from the Early Warning System data are students absent 10% or more days during the school year (a total of 210 students) and Level 1 on statewide ELA Assessment (a total of 158 students).

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

Our priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year from highest to lowest are; improving academic achievement for the ESSA subgroup specifically related to Students with Disabilities, Instructional practices specifically related to ELA (with a focus on literacy), and creating a positive school climate and environment.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

2022-23 statewide assessment data shows the lowest component of performance was ELA Achievement for the ESE student subgroup (32%). Historical data also shows that ESE student scores dropped from a federal index of 41 points in 2018-29 to 31 points in 2021-22. This combined data shows a continuing trend of low performance among students in the ESSA subgroup of Students with Disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Bridgewater Middle School will increase ELA achievement for the ESE student subgroup by 3% to 35% by the PM3 administration of FAST.

Monitoring:

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

The students with disabilities subgroup will be monitored through the F.A.S.T. platform progress monitoring activities in all tested categories. The progress monitoring will take place three times throughout the year. Additionally, administrators, coaches, and the Staffing Specialist will monitor teaching practices and ensure appropriate intervention strategies and differentiated instruction is occurring in all classrooms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jose Gonzalez (jose.gonzalez@ocps.net)

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.)

Common planning will be implemented for teachers, coaches, and ESE support staff to collaborate and plan for effective instruction specifically focused on differentiation for ESE students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaboration between general education teachers, coaches, and ESE support staff requires effective communication to meet the needs of individual learners. Teachers will develop and adjust instructional strategies using supporting data to maximize student learning for all ESE students.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Teachers will work collaboratively to design lesson plans that include differentiated activities and provide appropriate scaffolded instruction to support the need of students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Dayanara Soto (dayanara.soto@ocps.net)

By When: December 2023

Coaching and walkthrough observations will be conducted to monitor the implementation of differentiated instruction and appropriate scaffolding of instruction. Data from progress monitoring will be analyzed by coaches and teachers to track progress for all identified ESE students.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Butler (stephanie.butler@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly, beginning in September 2023.

Support facilitation and Learning Strategies will be provided to support students in the ESE subgroup as required by their IEP.

Person Responsible: Caroline Wong (caroline.wong@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023, ongoing throughout the year as needed.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

ELA Achievement for all students showed the greatest decline from the prior year falling 4 points from 71% to 67%. ELA Achievement has also been trending down over the past three years from 72% (2020-21), 71% (2021-22), and 67% (FAST PM3 2022-23). This combined data shows a need to focus on instructional practices related to literacy to support ELA achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Bridgewater Middle School will increase ELA achievement by 3% to 70% by the PM3 administration of FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA will be monitored through ELA FAST progress monitoring activities. The progress monitoring will take place three times throughout the year. Additionally, administrators, coaches, and the Reading Coach will monitor teaching practices and ensure appropriate intervention strategies emphasizing literacy are taking place in classrooms across all content areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Klaber (amy.klaber@ocps.net)

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.)

MTSS and literacy professional development will be implemented for this Area of Focus. Tier 1 data meetings will take place across all content areas to identify students that should be supported with Tier II interventions related to literacy or language arts. Additionally, targeted professional development will be provided to support the implementation of literacy strategies across all content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers must be effective at differentiation through MTSS to support the needs of all students. Collaboration through professional development will also support teachers across all content areas in supporting literacy skills to improve overall student achievement.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Coaches will work with all content area Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to analyze progress monitoring data and identify students that may need additional support through Tier II interventions.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Butler (stephanie.butler@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Targeted professional development will be provided to teachers to support the implementation of literacy strategies across all content areas.

Person Responsible: Delia Chalas (delia.chalas@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023, ongoing throughout the year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

In reviewing data from 2022-23 Early Warning Systems, 210 students were identified as absent 10% or more days during the school year. Creating a positive school culture and environment by building stronger relationships with students and the greater school community will support student attendance and family engagement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Bridgewater Middle School will decrease the number of students with 10% or more absences during the 2023-24 school year from 210 students (22-23 school year) to 189 students (10%).

Monitoring:

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

Administrators and members of student services will conduct monthly data meetings to review attendance data and communicate with students and families to identify barriers related to attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karla Hadley (karla.hadley@ocps.net)

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.)

Creating partnerships to support family and community involvement will be implemented for this focus. This intervention will create a positive school-wide culture modeling and promoting attendance with clear policies and procedures for students, teachers, and the school community.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Creating a school-based attendance support team will help struggling students by building a partnership between staff, students, and families in communicating attendance policies and identifying barriers or concerns. In addition, information about the importance of attendance and related policies will be shared through school messenger and discussed at SAC and PTSO meetings to build partnerships with the greater community to support attendance for all Bridgewater students.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Work with administrators, counselors, school registrar, and attendance clerk to monitor absences and communicate with families and students to identify attendance barriers and create interventions to support positive attendance practices.

Person Responsible: Gina Jacobson (gina.jacobson@ocps.net)

By When: November 2023

Promote clear and consistent communication with the School Advisory Committee (SAC), Parent Student Teacher Organization (PTSO), and the greater school community related to attendance policies, procedures and expectations.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Butler (stephanie.butler@ocps.net)

By When: November 2023

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).

Through collaboration with stakeholders and a review of school improvement funding allocations and resources, two key factors were identified. In the area of focus for Instructional Practices specifically related to ELA, high teacher turnover and vacancies may be contributing to low performance in ELA Achievement. To address this need, administrators will continue to identify qualified candidates for any vacant positions. In addition, the Reading Specialist and Academic Dean will work to provide support to long-term subs and ELA teachers as they meet the needs of all students. Professional development related to literacy strategies will also be provided to all teachers to support student achievement outcomes. In the area of focus for Positive Culture and Environment specifically related to Early Warning Systems, the lack of an attendance clerk was identified as a factor that may be contributing to low attendance performance. To address this need, an attendance clerk has been hired and has established clear policies and expectations for school attendance.