

Duval County Public Schools

Bridgeprep Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Bridgeprep Academy

6400 ATLANTIC BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32211

www.bridgepreppeduval.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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

BridgePrep Academy believes that each child is a unique individual who needs a secure, nurturing and stimulating atmosphere in which to grow and mature emotionally, intellectually, physically, and socially. BridgePrep believes in a student-centered educational philosophy that emphasizes hands on learning and students actively participating in learning. Students will be able to discover through hands on, engaging activities that will incorporate different approaches to accommodate each child's learning style and as a result, raise academic achievement.

School Leadership Team, 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
Louis Deleon, Jose	Principal	Instructional coach and teacher development, behavior management, data disaggregation, master scheduling, and student intervention plans.
Sands, Katherine	Instructional Coach	Instructional coach and teacher development, behavior management, data disaggregation, and student intervention plans.

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 members of the school leadership team collaborate to review multiple data points, including: student performance, attendance, professional development surveys and parent feedback. The teams role is to analyze data and create action plans with specific growth targets based on current school data. The team will also use data to inform professional development plans and teacher mentoring. Specific roles of the team members are as follows:

Principal

*Provide leadership and organization to the school leadership team

*Facilitate implementation for the MTSS problem solving process *Assign staff to support goals of MTSS and PBS process *Monitor programs for efficiency and results and make changes when necessary
Title One Professional Development

*Develops teachers on data driven decision making as well as successful targeted intervention programs

*Models lessons for targeted students

*Attend MTSS meetings and provide data to determine intervention needed

Classroom Teacher

*Plan and teach for small groups of identified students

*Discuss problems and assist in the formulation of actions plans to move students into higher rates of academic and behavioral proficiency

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))

All students who score at Level I and Level II will be tested using a researched based Direct Instruction Decoding program to identify individual student gaps and provide reading instruct and intervention. Goal will be to grow 1.5 - 2 years in Reading for the 23-24 school year. Bi-weekly assessments in all core class will be used to track student progress towards mastery of daily learning objectives aligned to state standards.

Students with the greatest needs will be included in pull-out support during electives and push-in support during core classes as a double dose to increase the amount of intervention and remediation needed to close the gaps.

SIP plan will be revised accordingly each Quarter throughout the year.

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	88%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	80%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)*

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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: D 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 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	23	26	28	22	17	13	12	3	1	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	29	20	28	39	29	22	167
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	35	34	32	16	9	153
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	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	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) 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	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	

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	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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*	28	45	53	30	47	55	30		
ELA Learning Gains				52			32		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			27		
Math Achievement*	31	46	55	26	40	42	28		
Math Learning Gains				39			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			45		
Science Achievement*	11	45	52	21	45	54	28		
Social Studies Achievement*	59	62	68	28	50	59	36		
Middle School Acceleration	57	73	70	63	45	51	0		
Graduation Rate		72	74		41	50			
College and Career Acceleration		54	53		65	70			
ELP Progress	56	47	55	39	68	70	25		

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	268
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
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	23	Yes	4	2
ELL	26	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	28	Yes	4	1
HSP	36	Yes	2	
MUL	25	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	39	Yes	1	

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	38	Yes	2	

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	26	Yes	3	1
ELL	30	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	3	
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	41			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

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	28			31			11	59	57			56
SWD	18			27							2	
ELL	12			19			16	40			6	56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			28			4	65			5	
HSP	26			32			16	50			6	59
MUL	30			20							2	

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	37			41							2	
FRL	28			31			13	60	58		7	53

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	30	52	56	26	39	38	21	28	63			39
SWD	8	35	50	24	38	36	8	10				
ELL	23	53	54	20	38	31	7	7				39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	45	64	19	36	32	24	33				
HSP	34	57	54	29	46	43	13	22				38
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	41	69		36	29		32					
FRL	29	53	63	25	39	37	17	26	55			31

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	30	32	27	28	30	45	28	36	0			25
SWD	26	22	0	23	32	36	25					
ELL	26	39	45	23	32	59	10	21				25
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	23	13	21	26	37	21	29				
HSP	37	44	53	32	36	60	33	26				25
MUL	10			30								
PAC												
WHT	36	34		37	32		33	56				
FRL	29	29	24	27	26	42	25	34				

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	18%	47%	-29%	54%	-36%
07	2023 - Spring	25%	40%	-15%	47%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	28%	41%	-13%	47%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	50%	-12%	58%	-20%
06	2023 - Spring	24%	38%	-14%	47%	-23%
03	2023 - Spring	22%	46%	-24%	50%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	32%	43%	-11%	54%	-22%
07	2023 - Spring	44%	40%	4%	48%	-4%
03	2023 - Spring	22%	59%	-37%	59%	-37%
04	2023 - Spring	25%	58%	-33%	61%	-36%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	45%	13%	55%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	10%	52%	-42%	55%	-45%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	8%	35%	-27%	44%	-36%
05	2023 - Spring	10%	48%	-38%	51%	-41%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	52%	17%	50%	19%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	63%	-14%	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.

3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Mathematics had the largest percentage of students scoring at a Level 1; 50%, 67%, 67% respectively. Teacher turnover, chronic teacher absences, low student achievement expectations were the contributing factors to student performance. However, there was an increase in the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher from the previous year at 26.3% to 31%.

3rd, 5th, and 7th Reading had the largest percentage of students scoring at a Level 1; 54%, 55%, 51% respectively. Teacher turnover, chronic teacher absences, low student achievement expectations were the contributing factors to student performance. This is a decrease in the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher from the previous year at 29.8% to 25%.

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

Reading proficiency scores declined from the previous year and show the greatest gaps. Lack of intensive intervention, data tracking, and teacher coaching and development were the highest levers that did not address student needs and contributed to this decline.

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.

All four state tested content areas had almost twice as many students scoring a Level 1 compared to the state average. Lack of intensive intervention, data tracking, and teacher coaching and development were the highest levers that did not address student needs and contributed to this decline.

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

Math acceleration with Algebra I showed the most improvement increasing from 63% to 69%. Providing additional training, appropriate scheduling, support, resources and regular small group interventions contributed to an increase in this performance area.

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

Increase Mathematics and Reading grade level proficiency across all grade levels.

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

95% of all K-2 students are at grade level in both reading and math

60% of all 3rd - 8th grade reading and math student score a Level 3 or higher on FAST assessment

90% of K-8 student achieve 1.5 years growth from previous year

95% of student pass all their courses

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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 proficiency was identified as a critical need based on FAST ELA data. There was no growth in ELA proficiency. Student achievement in reading impacts student's overall achievement and academic success in school. Based on the BPA Duval charter contract after instruction in English language arts, at the end of Kindergarten, 90% of students will demonstrate readiness to enter first grade by scoring at or above the first grade level on the school Diagnostic Reading assessment; 90% of students in Grades 1-2 Diagnostic Reading assessment when compared to the score on the Fall assessment; 75% of students in grades 3-5 and 80% of students in grades 6-8 will score at or above proficiency as measured by the state-mandated assessment in English language arts (FAST- ELA). For the 2023-24 academic year, the percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency in reading will increase by ten percent each year as measured by the state-mandated assessment in English language arts (FAST-ELA). After instruction in English language arts, 60% in grades 3-5, 65% in grades 6-8 or more of students scoring in the lowest 25th percentile will demonstrate learning gains as measured by the state-mandated assessment in English language arts (FAST-ELA). Additional research-based reading intervention resources are needed to increase student achievement. These additional resources will be purchased by the second quarter of school.

The school is addressing low performing ESSA Subgroups by providing interventions for all students scoring a Level 1 and Level II on their FAST PM3 assessment.

Student daily attendance will be critical to ensuring our scholars receive quality first instruction from our teachers who have unpacked state standards and prepared Do Nows, exemplar responses, probing questions for students to Check for Understanding, and exit tickets to measure mastery of daily objectives.

Measurable Outcome:

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

After instruction in reading, 75% of students in grades 3-5 and 80% of students in grades 6-8 will score at or above proficiency as measured by state-mandated FAST ELA assessments. Sixty percent of the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 will show gains as well as sixty-five percent of the lowest quartile in grades 6-8.

Students from low performing ESSA Subgroups who are two or more reading levels behind will received targeted instruction to improve reading level by 1.5 years growth.

A 97.5% daily student attendance goal will be set for all staff and students at BridgePrep Academy.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by analyzing benchmark assessment data to determine trends and deficiencies. Targeted intervention will occur based on patterns of deficiencies identified.

Students from low performing ESSA Subgroups will be placed a Decoding A, B, or C depending of their pre-screen assessment and provided targeted instruction to improve reading fluency. Weekly progress monitoring will be conducted and tracked for each student by teacher and evaluated on a weekly basis.

Student attendance classroom trackers will be kept by Homeroom teachers to use for incentives, follow up with calls home, schedule parent meetings, and home visits as needed with students having excessive absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jose Louis Deleon (jdeleon@bridgeprepuval.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.)

All teachers will implement effective standards- and research-based teaching instruction, such as guided reading and small group differentiated instruction aligned with best practices for meeting the diverse needs of all students to increase ELA achievement and learning gains.

Students from low performing ESSA Subgroups will be given instruction using a research-based DI Decoding curriculum five days a week and supported with i-Ready grade level appropriate support and interventions three times a week for a minimum of 60 minutes weekly.

Strategies to improve students attendance will consist of creating a mission list of at-risk students with critical absenteeism, sending postcards home to students and parents about the importance of attending school every day, assigning teachers as persons of influence to students of concern who will serve as their mentors with regular follow-up, celebrate students meeting attendance goal, and recognize students who has shown improvement in their attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that guided reading and differentiated instruction improve student achievement in reading. According to Fountas & Pinnell guided reading and small group teaching for differentiated instruction in reading is an effective strategy for increasing student reading achievement. The United States Department of Education's "Use of Technology in Teaching and Learning" states that technology ushers in fundamental structural changes that can be integral to increasing student engagement and motivation and accelerating learning.

The primary rationale for high-quality attendance data is the relationship between student attendance and student achievement. Teacher effectiveness is the strongest school-related determinant of student success, but chronic student absence reduces even the best teacher's ability to provide learning opportunities.

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.

1. Guided Reading aligned to student data using Direct Instruction and Decoding; purchase Reading Mastery Signature Edition and Corrective Reading teacher and student materials.
2. Fluency and comprehension instruction and progress monitoring including core reading instruction that adheres to the depth and rigor of the Florida BEST Standards; purchase Reading Reconsidered student novels.
3. Modeling specific skills for students to master during core reading instruction, differentiated small group instruction, and core writing instruction; hire an MTSS/Reading Interventionist to support in this area.
4. Admin and student data chats
5. After-School Tutoring; budget for copy paper to print instructional materials for instruction.

6. Appropriate use of technology to support instruction, including i-Ready.
7. Attendance trackers by student and grade level to be discussed weekly at Team Meetings.

Person Responsible: Katherine Sands (ksands@bridgeprepuval.com)

By When: Implement beginning the 2nd week of school and ongoing throughout the school year.

#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 proficiency was identified as a critical need based on State assessment data. Student achievement in science at the elementary level impacts student's achievement in math at the secondary level. Achievement gaps must be closed to ensure students have the math foundation to be successful in secondary math classes and meet graduation requirements. Reading Rockets states that literature and inquiry-based along with discovery-focused science instruction is widely viewed as best practice. According to the BPA Duval charter contract after instruction in math, 60% of students in Grade 3 through Grade 8 will score at or above proficiency as measured by the State assessment in Math. Additional reading intervention resources, hands-on learning, and computer assisted instructional programs and materials are needed to increase math achievement that will also be used to increase student achievement in the ESE, Hispanic, and African-American subgroups. These additional resources will be purchased within the 1st quarter of school.

Student daily attendance will be critical to ensuring our scholars receive quality first instruction from our teachers who have unpacked state standards and prepared Do Nows, exemplar responses, probing questions for students to Check for Understanding, and exit tickets to measure mastery of daily objectives.

Measurable Outcome:

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

After instruction in science, 60% of students in Grade 3 through Grade 8 will score at or above proficiency as measured by the State assessment in math.

A 97.5% daily student attendance goal will be set for all staff and students at BridgePrep Academy.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by analyzing benchmark assessment data to determine trends and deficiencies. Targeted intervention will occur based on patterns of deficiencies identified.

Student attendance classroom trackers will be kept by Homeroom teachers to use for incentives, follow up with calls home, schedule parent meetings, and home visits as needed with students having excessive absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jose Louis Deleon (jdeleon@bridgeprepdual.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.)

All teachers will implement effective standards and research based teaching instruction, such as hands-on inquiry based lessons aligned with best practices for meeting the diverse needs of all students to increase math achievement.

Strategies to improve student attendance will consist of creating a mission list of at-risk students with critical absenteeism, sending postcards home to students and parents about the importance of attending school every day, assigning teachers as persons of influence to students of concern who will serve as their mentors with regular follow-up, celebrate students meeting attendance goal, and recognize students who has shown improvement in their attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to research students learn based on a developmental continuum. Inquiry based investigations and hands-on explorations as essential to a high quality math educational program.

The primary rationale for high-quality attendance data is the relationship between student attendance and student achievement. Teacher effectiveness is the strongest school-related determinant of student success, but chronic student absence reduces even the best teacher's ability to provide learning opportunities.

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.

1. Provide inquiry-based, hands-on, and engaging activities for students to make connections to real-life experiences, and explain and write about their results and experiences. Hands on inquiries once weekly. Budget for copy paper to print instructional materials for instruction.
2. Integrate literacy and literacy strategies in the math classroom in order to enhance critical mathematical meaning through writing, talking, and reading in math as student explore and justify their responses.
3. Interactive math journals will be used as a reference.
4. Anchor charts for every standard will be developed and used in instruction.
5. Integration of appropriate technology in the core and differentiated math instruction in grades K-8.
6. Hire an Instructional Coach to provide ongoing staff development, coaching and feedback, model instructional delivery, data tracking, and classroom management support.
7. Attendance trackers by student and grade level to be discussed weekly at Team Meetings.

Person Responsible: Katherine Sands (ksands@bridgeprepduval.com)

By When: Second week of school and on-going throughout the school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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 the 2022-2023, BPA of Duval had over 50% teacher turnover. Root causes were lack of teacher coaching and support, a poor behavior management plan, inadequate campus systems and procedures to hold staff and students accountable to high expectations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Goal is to retain 85% of our teachers who started August 7, 2023 and have 95% of teachers hired by the first day of school, be at 100% fully staffed by September 31st.

Monitoring:

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

Progress towards goals will be discuss and addressed during our weekly Lead Team Tactical to ensure we have the appropriate strategies and action steps in place to met the goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jose Deleon (jdeleon@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.)

Teacher will be observed and coached weekly to improve their instructional delivery and establish a culture of achievement where all leaders, teacher, and students consistently seek critical feedback to improve the performance outcomes and met academic goals. The target goal is to receive a campus rate of an "B" for the 2023-2024 school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that teachers who are consistently well coached, supported, who have materials needed to teach, and meet high achievable goals feel accomplished and satisfied with their job. By focusing on our teacher professional development and coaching, we will met our 85% teacher retention goal and be at 100% hired by the first day of school year after year.

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.

Weekly joint instructional rounds by leadership team for 100% of teacher weekly followed by individual direct manager and teacher coaching conversations.

Person Responsible: Jose Deleon (jdeleon@bridgeprepacademy.com)

By When: Weekly throughout the school year beginning August 14, 2023.

Weekly team meetings with each grade level team band with instructional leader to discuss teacher support needed, hold team members accountable to agreed action steps from meeting, and discuss students of concern and next steps to grade level teachers.

Person Responsible: Jose Deleon (jdeleon@bridgeprepacademy.com)

By When: Weekly throughout the school year beginning August 21, 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).

Task Description:

Review Coordination - Determine the timeline, schedule meetings, prepare agendas, facilitate meetings, monitor progress.

Data Collection - Obtain appropriate data points specific to the review and organize for analysis.

Data Analysis - Synthesize, analyze, and interpret data as a team.

Communicate - Provide communication and training. Ensure transparency by providing regular updates and the outcome to all stakeholders. Record any resource inequity identified and addressed in the improvement plan.

Develop a plan to address any resource inequity - Determine the solution(s) to resolve any resource inequity identified. Develop a plan to implement the solution that includes interim targets and a monitoring process.

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.

Information will be communicated to all staff, leaders and teachers, during week team meetings and faculty meetings. Students and parents will receive the information through our monthly newsletter and in person during parent Open House, Meet the Teacher event, and annual Town Hall meeting. Progress toward Goals will be visible in the front office and in our Newsletter. Continuous tracking of student average academic performance will be visible in the classrooms and tracked individually by teacher and student.

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))

Students and parents will receive the information through our monthly newsletter and in person during parent Open House, Meet the Teacher event, and annual Town Hall meeting.

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)

New researched-based curriculum in Grades K-8 Reading will implemented with fidelity across the campus. Network and campus specific training will prepare teachers to successfully deliver quality instruction and allow for accelerated learning for students who are progressing through the curriculum at a faster pace. Students in K-2 who are completing lessons at a higher rate will be re-grouped at certain intervals to allow for the progression to continue. Students in grades 3-8 will be engaging with a novel-based Reading curriculum that will target student critical thinking, annotating, summarizing, and writing skills.

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))

N/A

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: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$167,080.77
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5900	510	5611 - Bridgeprep Academy	UniSIG		\$101,023.00
			<i>Notes: Reading Mastery Signature Edition & Corrective Reading: 9 Teacher Resource Boxes, GrK-3 Student Materials for 300 students</i>			
	5900	510	5611 - Bridgeprep Academy	UniSIG		\$10,098.02
			<i>Notes: Reading Reconsidered Student Novel Sets: Gr3 - 4 novels for 66 students = \$1155.66; Gr4 - 4 novels for 75 students = \$1388.25; Gr5 - 4 novels for 75 students = \$1981.50; Gr6 - 4 novels for 75 students = \$1612.5; Gr7 - 4 novels for 100 students = \$2606; Gr8 - 5 novels for 75 students = \$1354.1</i>			
	5100	120	5611 - Bridgeprep Academy	UniSIG	1.0	\$53,295.00
			<i>Notes: MTSS/Reading Interventionist Salary</i>			
	5100	120	5611 - Bridgeprep Academy	UniSIG	1.0	\$2,664.75
			<i>Notes: MTSS/Reading Interventionist Benefits</i>			

2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math					\$57,605.63
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
	6400	130	5611 - Bridgeprep Academy	UniSIG	1.0	\$54,862.50	
			Notes: Instructional Coach Salary				
	6400	200	5611 - Bridgeprep Academy	UniSIG		\$2,743.13	
			Notes: Instructional Coach Benefits				
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment					\$0.00
Total:							\$224,686.40

Budget Approval

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

No