

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Bridgeprep Academy Of Riverview School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 19 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 19 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 21 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 22 |

Bridgeprep Academy Of Riverview

6309 US HIGHWAY 301 S, Riverview, FL 33578

[no web address on file]

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.

Mission: 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.

Vision: 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 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 |
|---------------|----------------|---------------------------------|
| pitts, marvin | Principal | Educational Leadership |

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.

Parents, teachers and admin reviewed and analyzed the school data to create a plan to increase scores and culture.

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))

PLC meetings and data chats with teachers, parent nights and Bulldog parent team discussions. Looking at our data continuously throughout the year will help guide us to any needed changes or modifications.

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-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 93% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 85% |
| Charter School | Yes |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | TSI |
| 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)* 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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C |
| 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 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 10 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 10 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 200 | 100 | 105 | 67 | 21 | 618 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 75 | 75 | 104 | 100 | 50 | 504 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 55 | 50 | 30 | 56 | 25 | 266 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 61 | 60 | 80 | 40 | 41 | 341 |
| 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 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 10 |

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 | 7 | 2 | 13 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

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 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 41 | 38 | 44 | 44 | 47 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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* | 37 | 51 | 53 | 39 | 51 | 55 | 37 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 52 | | | 43 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 47 | | | 41 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 30 | 50 | 55 | 31 | 41 | 42 | 22 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 51 | | | 28 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 50 | | | 37 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 21 | 48 | 52 | 19 | 48 | 54 | 24 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 57 | 65 | 68 | 42 | 57 | 59 | 49 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 52 | 70 | 70 | 74 | 51 | 51 | 0 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | 83 | 74 | | 44 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 33 | 53 | | 68 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 34 | 52 | 55 | 45 | 73 | 70 | 46 | | |

* 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) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 38 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 263 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 45 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 450 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| 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 | 17 | Yes | 4 | 3 |
| ELL | 33 | Yes | 3 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | Yes | 4 | |
| HSP | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | 46 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 28 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| FRL | 36 | Yes | 1 | |

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 | 22 | Yes | 3 | 2 |
| ELL | 33 | Yes | 2 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | Yes | 3 | |
| HSP | 46 | | | |

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 | 50 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | | | |
| FRL | 43 | | | |

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 | 37 | | | 30 | | | 21 | 57 | 52 | | | 34 |
| SWD | 10 | | | 13 | | | 10 | 27 | | | 6 | 29 |
| ELL | 33 | | | 22 | | | 15 | 67 | | | 6 | 33 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | | | 25 | | | 18 | 50 | 69 | | 6 | |
| HSP | 38 | | | 33 | | | 23 | 61 | 31 | | 7 | 34 |
| MUL | 46 | | | 46 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 33 | | | 22 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| FRL | 35 | | | 28 | | | 17 | 57 | 52 | | 7 | 35 |

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 | 39 | 52 | 47 | 31 | 51 | 50 | 19 | 42 | 74 | | | 45 |
| SWD | 10 | 33 | 34 | 6 | 33 | 36 | 0 | 13 | | | | 32 |
| ELL | 29 | 52 | 49 | 17 | 44 | 46 | 6 | 12 | | | | 45 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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 | 35 | 44 | 42 | 25 | 51 | 53 | 18 | 47 | 40 | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 56 | 53 | 30 | 49 | 49 | 13 | 35 | 93 | | | 43 |
| MUL | 54 | 48 | | 49 | 60 | | 39 | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | 60 | 42 | 41 | 53 | | 29 | | | | | |
| FRL | 37 | 51 | 48 | 27 | 49 | 50 | 18 | 40 | 68 | | | 45 |

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 | 37 | 43 | 41 | 22 | 28 | 37 | 24 | 49 | 0 | | | 46 |
| SWD | 11 | 32 | 35 | 6 | 31 | 53 | 13 | 8 | | | | 37 |
| ELL | 28 | 42 | 37 | 13 | 15 | 24 | 19 | 27 | | | | 46 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 39 | 44 | 18 | 29 | 44 | 11 | 51 | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 48 | 36 | 21 | 23 | 26 | 29 | 38 | 0 | | | 48 |
| MUL | 48 | 33 | | 28 | 39 | | 50 | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 44 | 42 | | 31 | 48 | 50 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 46 | 44 | 19 | 27 | 36 | 27 | 42 | 0 | | | 46 |

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 | 48% | 53% | -5% | 54% | -6% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 30% | 47% | -17% | 47% | -17% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 44% | 0% | 47% | -3% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 43% | 54% | -11% | 58% | -15% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 27% | 47% | -20% | 47% | -20% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 46% | -14% | 50% | -18% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 29% | 53% | -24% | 54% | -25% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 36% | -4% | 48% | -16% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 33% | 55% | -22% | 59% | -26% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 28% | 59% | -31% | 61% | -33% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 57% | -25% | 55% | -23% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 31% | 53% | -22% | 55% | -24% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 10% | 41% | -31% | 44% | -34% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 47% | -15% | 51% | -19% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 55% | 0% | 50% | 5% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 53% | 64% | -11% | 66% | -13% |

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.

BridgePrep Academy Riverview's biggest need is to increase our math scores.

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

Our science achievement showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The increase of ESOL non speaking students to our school, need more training for science 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.

Our 5th grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. We believe some of this is from missing basic skills and math facts throughout the Covid time. Math facts and number sense are skills this group is struggling with.

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

The component with the most improvement was our 3rd grade ELA. This year we have a new reading curriculum for K-10. Our staff had a 2 week training in the summer for improving their pedagogical skills. Using engaging techniques from Teach Like a Champion program.

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

At BridgePrep we are working on our culture to ensure that all students feel safe, ask questions, and have positive culture with high expectations for themselves as teachers will do the same. Trying to eliminate one of our Early warning Signs for failure.

Secondly, increasing our math and science scores for our subgroups, SWD, Black, and ELL students is a deficit we would like to focus on improving. Administrators and instructional coaches will be pushing into classrooms and giving timely feedback to guide teachers with engaging and differentiated instruction. Weekly PLC meetings will be held to discuss pacing, data, and lesson planning checks. Individual check-ins with teachers will also occur to help with any additional needs.

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

1. Building a positive, highly engaged, high expectation belief culture to minimize behaviors.
2. Build teacher knowledge of engaging, rigorous, and responsive lessons through new curriculum and coaching with timely feedback.
3. Increase Math scores with engaging lessons and math fact practice for our subgroups; ELL, SWD, and our ELL populations.
4. Increase ELA scores for our subgroups; ELL, SWD, and our ELL populations.
- 5 Increase Science scores for our subgroups; ELL, SWD, and our ELL populations.

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 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.

Our area of focus this year is building a positive culture through planning the first 3 days of school as our culture camp. Teachers practiced and discussed expectations in all aspects of the classroom and building. Students were taught that high expectations are teachers goals and they will learn that for themselves through PBIS and timely specific feedback. Teachers will be supported through Administrators and Coaches being in the classrooms and giving specific timely feedback.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Administrators and coaches will actively coach all teachers and give specific timely feedback in addition will meet with teams biweekly to analyze data (PLC) to increase school data to 55% passing FAST ELA and 50% passing FAST Math Assessments by PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators and coaches will meet weekly to discuss PLC's, data, and coaching "glows and grows".

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pamela Barr (pamela.barr1@charter.hcps.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.)

The evidenced based intervention is data chats(PLC's), and the coaching model with timely specific feedback and goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our teachers need support because many of them are new or new to the field. That's why we put this support into place. We have heard from teachers in the past that they wanted more help.

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.

Administrators and coaches have been assigned teachers that they will work with and PLC's are on a calendar rotation for meeting with grade level teams. Administrators and coaches will meet weekly to discuss progress of the model of support.

Person Responsible: Pamela Barr (pamela.barr1@charter.hcps.net)

By When: This support has already started at BridgePrep Academy Riverview.

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

Math and science are areas of focus due to the low scores in math across the grade levels tested.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the students math scores from 93% below proficiency to 65% below proficiency on FAST State testing.

We will increase our science scores from 2022-2023 proficiency level of 20% to 40% for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Coaches and administrators will be pushing into classrooms for coaching and monitoring of student engagement, differentiated instruction, and student comprehension. PLC's, as well as individual teacher check-ins will occur weekly to discuss data, pacing, and detailed lesson plans that align to the state standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pamela Barr (pamela.barr1@charter.hcps.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 time allocated every day for specific intervention instruction, Daily IReady Math Program instruction, Leveled classrooms to work on specific student skills, Daily exit tickets to drive instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were chosen because the more specific leveled instruction will help fill the gaps in student learning. The IREADY math program is an adaptive learning program that meets each individual needs. Leveled classrooms are another way to meet individual needs.

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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

Another area of focus would be to increase academic performance for the following low scoring subgroups; SWD, ELL, and black students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the subgroup of SWD academic scores from below 32% proficiency to 45% proficiency on FAST State test.

We will increase our subgroup of ELL students academic scores from below 41% to 45% proficiency on the Fast state test.

We will increase the subgroup of black students academic scores from below 41% to 45% proficiency on the state Fast state test.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through weekly PLC data discussions of subgroups. MTSS group are also monitoring these subgroups through progress monitoring and data tracking.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pamela Barr (pamela.barr1@charter.hcps.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.)

Iready reading and math diagnostic is being used for evidence based intervention. Data discussions and data tracking with students. We use Reading Reconsidered reading program as a supplement this year which is a program that levels students in classrooms so we can efficiently teach and meet individual needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Iready diagnostic computer based program offers criterion referenced data. The program correlates to state assessments and benchmarks in education. Iready is an adaptive learning tool to fill the gaps in Individual students needs.

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)).

The Bulldogs in Action team and the administrative team will meet monthly to discuss funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on need.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Administrators and coaches are assigned specific grades level to coach and provide specific timely feedback for improving their practice. Then biweekly grade level teams will meet to analyze reading data and share what works and doesn't work.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Administrators and coaches will coach and provide timely specific feedback to teachers to allow them to reflect and improve instruction. Administrators and coaches will also provide Professional development on early release day Mondays.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

BridgePrep Academy Riverview grades K-2 will have 50% of our students scoring a level 3 at each grade level by PM3 state testing,

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

BridgePrep Academy Riverview grades 3-5 will have 50% of our students scoring a level 3 at each grade level by PM3 state testing,

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Biweekly PLC's are how we will monitor desired outcome for learning. We will also use PM1 and PM2 along with our authentic schools data to analyze along the way.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Barr, Pamela, pamela.barr@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The evidenced based practices are meeting to discuss data (PLC's) with grade level teams biweekly is best practice. Our teachers will be coached weekly and given feedback for teachers to reflect and improve.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

We use these practices to get teachers and students involved in the data analyzing process. We know that if they really know their data it can drive their instruction for each individual student.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|--|
| *Instructional coaching and feedback *Data chats (PLC) meetings biweekly * Individual teacher check-ins * Professional learning * Assessment | Barr, Pamela, pamela.barr1@charter.hcps.net |

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP plan will be shared with families on the Bridgeprep website and Parent Link. Teachers will be given a copy of the plan via email. The families will also be invited to a Bulldogs in Action meeting to hear about the plan.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

With our involvement in the Bulldogs in Action team. Doing a monthly newsletter to keep the stakeholders involved, Keeping our website updated and informational. Using the What's Up app to communicate daily between teachers and families. Progress reports, reports cards and conferences with parents to keep them informed.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

BridgePrep is using instructional coaches and administrators in the classroom daily to improve and monitor instruction. PLC's weekly and individual teacher check-ins weekly to monitor and check data and lesson plans.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No