

**V.E.**

**CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
Hartford**

**TO BE PROPOSED:**

April 5, 2017

**RESOLVED**, That the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (g) of Section 10-66bb of the Connecticut General Statutes, renews the charter of The Bridge Academy from July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2020, subject to the conditions noted in the Commissioner's April 5, 2017, memorandum to the State Board of Education, and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of \_\_\_\_\_, this fifth day of April, Two Thousand Seventeen.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dianna R. Wentzell, Secretary  
State Board of Education

**CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**Hartford**

**TO:** State Board of Education

**FROM:** Dr. Dianna R. Wentzell, Commissioner of Education

**DATE:** April 5, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Renewal of State Charter – The Bridge Academy, Bridgeport

*Executive Summary*

**Introduction**

In accordance with subsection (g) of Section 10-66bb of the Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.), charters may be renewed, upon application, in accordance with the provisions for the granting of new charters. The State Board of Education (SBE) may renew a charter for a period of up to five years. The SBE makes renewal decisions based on evidence of the following performance standards:

1. *School Performance:* Is the school a successful model resulting in strong student outcomes and a positive school climate?
2. *Stewardship, Governance and Management:* Is the school financially and organizationally healthy and viable?
3. *Student Population:* Is the school promoting equity by effectively attracting, enrolling and retaining students, particularly among targeted populations?
4. *Legal Compliance:* Is the school acting in compliance with applicable laws and regulations?

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) and the SBE carefully evaluate qualitative and quantitative evidence, and longitudinal data aligned to the four performance standards outlined above when making charter renewal decisions. The charter performance framework drives the CSDE's charter school accountability systems and processes, including initial approval decisions, annual monitoring and renewal determinations. From inception to renewal, charter schools must abide by the CSDE's charter school accountability procedures and performance framework. Charter monitoring takes place through annual reporting, meetings, and correspondence and site visits, as appropriate. In accordance with C.G.S. § 10-66bb(g), a charter may be renewed, upon application, if the charter school has demonstrated satisfactory performance relative to the four performance standards.

## **History/Background**

The Bridge Academy (The Bridge) opened in the fall of 1997 and currently serves 281 students in Grades 7-12, primarily students from the City of Bridgeport (the host district). Table 1 on page 13 of the attached Charter Renewal Report provides 2015-16 student enrollment and demographic data. The Bridge's mission states, in part, "to provide a small, caring, public charter school with a rigorous learning environment. All members of The Bridge community strive to listen and communicate with each other, respond to diverse needs and give consistent effort necessary for personal and academic growth."

## **Charter Renewal Process**

Application for Renewal of Charter: The CSDE accepted an application for the renewal of The Bridge's charter on September 2, 2016. The application detailed the charter school's progress, operations, and achievement in relation to the CSDE's charter school performance standards: (a) school performance; (b) stewardship, governance and management; (c) student population; and (d) legal compliance. The Bridge submitted data and evidence to substantiate the charter school's written responses.

A renewal team comprised of CSDE staff with expertise in curriculum, assessments, special education, English learners, school management, finance, and school governance reviewed the renewal application and requested clarification and additional information, where necessary. Overall, the team determined that the application responded effectively to the areas required and provided sufficient supporting evidence.

Renewal Site Visit: On December 13, 2016, the CSDE renewal team conducted an on-site visit at The Bridge. The purpose of the renewal on-site visit was to observe The Bridge's programs, policies, practices, and procedures to assess their efficacy and fidelity to the school's charter and aligned operating systems. Evidence was collected through on-site visit observations, document reviews, interviews and focus groups. The team spoke with board members, administrators, staff, parents and community members. The team used this process to ensure that the school is functioning in compliance with the law and the school's mission. The team verified the responses detailed in the renewal application regarding compliance with the law and the CSDE's performance framework and accountability plan.

Invitation for Written Comment: The CSDE solicited written comments on the renewal of The Bridge from the Superintendent of Bridgeport and from contiguous school districts: Fairfield, Stratford, and Trumbull. The CSDE received no letters for or against the renewal of the school's charter.

Public Hearing: Robert J. Trefry, member of the SBE, and CSDE staff held a public hearing on February 23, 2017, in Bridgeport, and heard from 30 individuals on the potential charter renewal of The Bridge and the impact it is having on the community. Public hearing participants included members of The Bridge community, including family members, students, alumni, school staff, school board members and community members. Over 60 people attended the public hearing. The responses generated during the public hearing were overwhelmingly positive, both in terms of the impact the charter school has had on the community and support for The Bridge in the context of school choice. No one spoke against the renewal of the school's charter.

## Site Visit Findings

The most recent available data and information contained in the Charter Renewal Report, Next Generation Accountability Report 2014-15, and Tables 2 and 4 on pages 13 and 14 display The Bridge's performance and success according to the four performance standards. The report highlights school strengths and areas for continued growth.

### Strengths include:

- ) No significant findings, conditions, or internal weaknesses were uncovered in The Bridge's last three certified financial audits.
- ) The Bridge meets or exceeds the ranges recommended by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers, signifying overall financial health.
- ) The Bridge's chronic absenteeism rate has remained below the 2015-16 state average of 9.6 percent over the last three years.
- ) The Bridge's average daily attendance rate has remained above 94.8 percent over the last three years.
- ) The Bridge's 4-year Graduation All Students (2015 Cohort) is 87.5 percent. This is 0.3 percentage points above the state average (87.2 percent).
- ) The Bridge's 6-year Graduation – High Needs Students (2013 Cohort) is 94.1 percent. This is 11.2 percentage points above the state average (78.6 percent).

### Areas of concern include:

- ) The 2015-16 Smarter Balanced Assessment percentage of The Bridge students achieving at or above proficiency (level 3 and 4) in English Language Arts (ELA), (Table 4) is 17.3 percent in Grades 7-8. This is 5.2 percentage points below Bridgeport (22.5 percent) and 38.3 percentage points below the state average (55.6 percent).
- ) The 2015-16 Smarter Balanced Assessment percentage of The Bridge students achieving at or above proficiency (level 3 and 4) in Mathematics, (Table 4) is 5.1 percent in Grades 7-8. This is 4.8 percentage points below Bridgeport (9.9 percent) and 38.9 percentage points below the state average (44.0 percent).
- ) The 2015-16 Smarter Balanced Assessment percentage of The Bridge students achieving at or above proficiency (level 3 and 4) in ELA, (Table 4) is 16.3 percent in Grade 7. This is 9.3 percentage points below Bridgeport (25.6 percent) and 38.9 percentage points below the state average (55.2 percent).
- ) The 2015-16 Smarter Balanced Assessment percentage of The Bridge students achieving at or above proficiency (level 3 and 4) in ELA, (Table 4) is 18.4 percent in Grade 8. This is 7.4 percentage points below Bridgeport (25.8 percent) and 37.1 percentage points below the state average (55.5 percent).

- J The 2015-16 Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) percentage of The Bridge students achieving at or above proficiency (level 3 and 4) in ELA, (Table 4) is 30.0 percent. This is 0.8 percentage points above Bridgeport (29.2 percent) and 35.0 percentage points below the state average (65.0 percent).
- J Going forward, The Bridge must reduce its suspension rate. The Bridge's 2015-16 suspension (in-school and out-school) rate of 18.4 percent exceeded the state average of 7.0 percent and Bridgeport's average of 15.4 percent.

### **Charter Renewal Recommendation**

The Bridge is a charter school with currently limited evidence to demonstrate it has developed a successful model resulting in strong student outcomes. The percentage of The Bridge students meeting or exceeding the achievement standard on the 2016 Smarter Balance Assessment never exceeded the Bridgeport or the state average for all students. The school culture and climate data (Table 2) show The Bridge 2014-15 Cohort Graduation rate and Six Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation rate exceeded the state average. Its student chronic absenteeism rate has remained below the state average over the last three years and its average daily attendance has remained above 94.8 percent over the last three years. However, the school's 2015-16 suspension rate of 18.4 percent is over double the state average and 3.0 percent greater than Bridgeport.

Based on The Bridge's performance indicators, the CSDE recommends that the SBE renew the school's charter for a period of three years, with the knowledge that pursuant to subsection (h) of Sec.10-66bb(h), of the C.G.S., the Commissioner will place The Bridge on probation and require the charter school to file a corrective action plan within the statutorily-prescribed timelines.

While the Commissioner recommends the renewal of The Bridge from July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2020, the Commissioner's letter of probation, separate from this action, will include the following provisions:

1. By April 10, 2017, as required by C.G.S. § 10-66bb(h), the Commissioner shall provide written notice to The Bridge of the length and reasons for probation.
2. By April 10, 2017, as required by C.G.S. § 10-66bb(h), the Commissioner shall notify parents and guardians of students attending the school of the probationary status and the reasons for such status.

3. By May 5, 2017, The Bridge shall submit a plan for CSDE review and approval to minimize behavioral incidents resulting in suspensions and by adopting a restorative discipline model for the school including: (a) pre-teaching and re-teaching expected behaviors; (b) isolating the root causes of behavioral issues; (c) identifying interventions to target root causes; (d) strengthening school discipline policies and procedures; (e) monitoring interventions, and applying midcourse corrections, as necessary; (f) establishing suspension targets to ensure dramatic improvement; and (g) detailed plans to engage school stakeholders, particularly parents, teachers and administrators, in developing a corrective action. Additionally, The Bridge shall submit its year-to-date number of suspensions, and the concentration of students with one or more suspension to the CSDE twice annually, once in September via the annual reporting process and again at the midyear in January. The plan shall be developed in consultation with CSDE's Turnaround Office. The Bridge shall implement the corrective actions within thirty days following the Commissioner's acceptance of the plan.
4. By May 5, 2017, The Bridge shall submit a corrective action plan acceptable to the Commissioner. The corrective action plan must include measures to improve student academic achievement. The plan shall be developed in consultation with CSDE's Turnaround Office. The Bridge shall implement the corrective actions within thirty days following the Commissioner's acceptance of the plan.
5. CSDE will, on a bi-monthly basis, review and monitor The Bridge's year-to-date number of suspensions.
6. CSDE will conduct an interim site visit in August 2017 and March 2018, to review and monitor year-to-date number of suspensions.
7. The Bridge must participate in relevant technical assistance organized by the CSDE.
8. In May 2018, pending State Board of Education notification, the Commissioner will evaluate The Bridge's satisfaction of the foregoing issues and determine the status of The Bridge's probation.

The CSDE will notify The Bridge Academy of action taken by the SBE following its meeting on April 5, 2017. The school will be advised and take advantage of relevant technical assistance opportunities designed to improve its educational program. The CSDE will conduct follow-up visits to ensure that The Bridge Academy addressed the issues raised in this memorandum.

Prepared by: Robert E. Kelly  
Charter School Program Manager  
Turnaround Office

Approved by: Desi D. Nesmith, Chief Turnaround Officer  
Turnaround Office

## CHARTER RENEWAL REPORT | SPRING 2017

Charter School Information:		
Charter School Name:	The Bridge Academy	
School Director:	Tim Dutton	
School Board Chairperson:	Sandra Lefkowitz	
Location (City/Town):	Bridgeport	
Rating Key:		
<b>Meets</b>	The school demonstrates effective policies and practices, resulting in positive outcomes.	
<b>Pending Action</b>	The school requires minor modifications to its policies and/or practices. The school is taking satisfactory measures to remedy and address these issues in a timely manner.	
<b>Does Not Meet</b>	The schools falls below performance expectations with significant concerns noted, which require immediate attention and intervention.	
Standard 1: School Performance Indicators	Points/Max	% Points Earned
Accountability Index:	897.3/1350	66.5
Notes and Evidence:		
Schools that meet Standard 1: School Performance Indicators are schools earning an accountability index score that is in the state’s top three quartiles. The Bridge’s accountability score of 66.5 places its performance in the bottom quartile by 0.4, which does not meet Standard 1. The Bridge Academy’s 2015-16 Next Generation Accountability Report is shown in detail on the next page.		



# Next Generation Accountability Report: 2015-16

Choose a District

The Bridge Academy District

No:	Indicator	Index/ Rate	Target	Points Earned	Max Points	% Points Earned	State Avg. Index/Rate
1a.	ELA Performance Index – All Students	48.1	75	32.1	50	64.1%	67.7
1b.	ELA Performance Index – High Needs Students	47.7	75	31.8	50	63.5%	56.7
1c.	Math Performance Index – All Students	45.1	75	30.1	50	60.1%	61.4
1d.	Math Performance Index – High Needs Students	45.0	75	30.0	50	60.0%	49.9
1e.	Science Performance Index – All Students	41.0	75	27.3	50	54.7%	57.5
1f.	Science Performance Index – High Needs Students	40.6	75	27.0	50	54.1%	47.0
2a.	ELA Avg. Percentage of Growth Target Achieved – All Students	45.0%	100	45.0	100	45.0%	63.8%
2b.	ELA Avg. Percentage of Growth Target Achieved – High Needs Students	45.0%	100	45.0	100	45.0%	58.3%
2c.	Math Avg. Percentage of Growth Target Achieved – All Students	70.3%	100	70.3	100	70.3%	65.0%
2d.	Math Avg. Percentage of Growth Target Achieved – High Needs Students	71.5%	100	71.5	100	71.5%	57.4%
4a.	Chronic Absenteeism – All Students	8.6%	<=5%	42.8	50	85.7%	9.6%
4b.	Chronic Absenteeism – High Needs Students	9.7%	<=5%	40.5	50	81.0%	15.6%
5	Preparation for CCR – % taking courses	0.0%	75%	0.0	50	0.0%	67.6%
6	Preparation for CCR – % passing exams	5.3%	75%	3.6	50	7.1%	40.7%
7	On-track to High School Graduation	90.2%	94%	48.0	50	96.0%	85.1%
8	4-year Graduation All Students (2015 Cohort)	87.5%	94%	93.1	100	93.1%	87.2%
9	6-year Graduation - High Needs Students (2013 Cohort)	94.1%	94%	100.0	100	100.0%	78.6%
10	Postsecondary Entrance (Class of 2015)	86.7%	75%	100.0	100	100.0%	71.9%
11	Physical Fitness (estimated part rate) and (fitness rate)	97.9%   34.4%	75%	22.9	50	45.9%	89.2%   50.5%
12	Arts Access	43.5%	60%	36.3	50	72.5%	47.5%
<b>Accountability Index</b>				<b>897.3</b>	<b>1350</b>	<b>66.5%</b>	

These statistics represent the results from the second year of Connecticut's Next Generation Accountability Model for districts and schools. For detailed information and resources about every indicator including the rationale for its inclusion, the methodology used as well as links to resources, research, and evidence-based strategies, please consult the document titled Using Accountability Results to Guide Improvement which is available on the [Next Generation Accountability Resources page of the CSDE Performance Office](#).

This model is the direct result of an extensive consultation process over a two year period. The CSDE sought feedback from district and school leaders, Connecticut educators, state and national experts, CSDE staff, and many others. This model was originally outlined in Connecticut's flexibility application to the U.S. Department of Education and formally approved by the USED in August 2015 and is now included in Connecticut's state plan for the Every Student Succeeds Act.

Gap Indicators	Non-High Needs Rate*	High Needs Rate	Size of Gap	State Gap Mean + 1 Stdev**	Is Gap an Outlier?
Achievement Gap Size Outlier?					N
ELA Performance Index Gap	N/A	47.7	N/A	16.5	
Math Performance Index Gap	N/A	45.0	N/A	18.9	
Science Performance Index Gap	N/A	40.6	N/A	17.2	
Graduation Rate Gap (2013 Cohort)	N/A	94.1%	N/A	15.3%	N

If the Non-High Needs Rate exceeds the ultimate target (75 for Performance Index and 94% for graduation rate), then the ultimate target is displayed and used for gap calculations. If size of gap exceeds the state mean gap plus one standard deviation, then the gap is an outlier.

Participation Rate	Rate
ELA – All Students	99.3%
ELA – High Needs Students	99.2%
Math – All Students	99.3%
Math – High Needs Students	99.2%
Science – All Students	100.0%
Science – High Needs Students	100.0%

Standard 2: Stewardship, Governance and Management Indicators:	Rating
2.1. Fiscal Management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
2.2. Financial Reporting and Compliance	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
2.3. Financial Viability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
2.4. Governance and Management	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
2.5. School Facility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
<b>Notes and Evidence:</b>	
<p data-bbox="201 535 1382 604">) <b>Indicator 2.1:</b> CSDE site visit staff reviewed The Bridge’s last three certified financial audits and uncovered no significant findings, conditions or internal control weakness.</p> <p data-bbox="201 638 1382 993">) <b>Indicator 2.2:</b> CSDE site visit staff reviewed The Bridge’s last three certified financial audits, accounting policies and procedures manual (APPM) and budgets, interviewed the school business manager, school principals and governing board members. The reviewers determined The Bridge completed on-time submission of certified audits and annual budgets. Staff from CSDE’s Office of Internal Audit (OIA) determined the APPM contains the standard sections of an APPM. OIA staff recommended that language about purchasing and cash deposits be strengthened and that the Board should review and approve school policy annually. The CSDE has issued to The Bridge a renewal report indicating the issues requiring corrective action. The Bridge is preparing its corrective action for CSDE review and approval. CSDE expects the process to be completed by April 2017.</p> <p data-bbox="201 1026 1382 1276">) <b>Indicator 2.3:</b> Staff from CSDE’s Office of Internal Audit reviewed The Bridge’s last three certified financial audits and determined The Bridge’s debt to asset ratio (total liabilities/total assets), days of unrestricted cash (unrestricted cash/((total expenditures–depreciation)/365)), cash flow (change in cash balance, and debt service coverage ratio (net income +depreciation + interest expense)/(annual principle, interest, and lease payments) meets or exceeds the ranges recommended by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA), signifying overall financial health.</p> <p data-bbox="201 1310 1382 1560">) <b>Indicator 2.4:</b> The Bridge’s policies and procedures regarding nepotism, open board meetings and board membership training were reviewed and found to comply with state and federal laws, rules and regulation. This finding was supported by a review of board training records and the review of the school’s website and governing board meeting minutes. A review of staff background check records found staff in compliance. CSDE site visit staff reviewed school policies and bylaws and determined the conflict of interest policy needs to be amended to meet the CSDE administrative oversight guidelines.</p> <p data-bbox="201 1593 1382 1738">) <b>Indicator 2.5:</b> As evidenced by the site visit, The Bridge has safe and well-maintained school facilities to support teaching and learning. Evidence included proof of property insurance, an approved Bridgeport Fire Marshal inspection and approved certificate of occupancy issued by the Bridgeport Building Department for the facility.</p>	

Standard 3: Student Population Indicators	Rating
3.1. Recruitment and Enrollment Process	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
3.2. Waitlist and Enrollment Data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
3.3. Demographic Representation	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
3.4. Family and Community Support	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
3.5. School Culture and Climate	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
<b>Notes and Evidence:</b>	
<p data-bbox="203 504 1404 646">J <b>Indicator 3.1:</b> The Bridge currently serves 281 students in Grades 7-12, primarily from the City of Bridgeport, the host district with about 2 percent residing in Stratford. A review of the school’s student enrollment policy, and interviews with school staff, board members and parents determined all students are admitted through a blind lottery.</p> <p data-bbox="203 682 1404 825">J <b>Indicator 3.2:</b> A review of The Bridge’s waitlist information (Table 3 page 13) determined that it maintains a large waitlist of families beyond the available number of seats. In 2016-17, 241 students were on the waiting list. The October 2016 student enrollment (281) is 100 percent of the 2016-17 projected student enrollment.</p> <p data-bbox="203 861 1404 1066">J <b>Indicator 3.3:</b> A review of The Bridge’s 2015-16 Public School Information System (PSIS) data reports students from minority groups represent 94.6 percent of The Bridge’s student population, and 85.3 percent of students qualify for free or reduced-price meals. The English learner population is 2.9 percent. The percentage of special education students at The Bridge is 16.9 percent. To better reflect the demographics of the surrounding community, the school must seek to enroll more students who are English learners.</p> <p data-bbox="203 1102 1404 1392">J <b>Indicator 3.4:</b> The Bridge demonstrates strong community support as evidenced at the on-site visit by the CSDE during the parent interviews. All described the strong communication between the school and families as a key component. Parents and community advocates conveyed overwhelming support for what they perceive is a school that provides a high-quality education and is successfully preparing their children for the future. Over 60 individuals attended the February 23, 2017, renewal public hearing, 30 individuals offered testimony supporting the school’s efforts and the renewal of its charter. No one spoke out against the renewal of the school’s charter.</p> <p data-bbox="203 1428 1404 1717">J <b>Indicator 3.5:</b> A review of The Bridge’s student average daily attendance, chronic absenteeism and suspension (Table 2 page 13) show promise and concern. <b>Promise:</b> The Bridge’s chronic absenteeism rate has remained below the 2015-16 state average of 9.6 percent over the last three years. The Bridge’s average daily attendance rate has remained above 94.8 over the last three years. <b>Concern:</b> The Bridge’s 2015-16 suspension rate of 18.4 percent is well above the 2015-16 state average of 7.0 percent and the Bridgeport average of 15.4 percent. The Bridge must take measures to remedy and address behavior management going forward. The CSDE Turnaround Office will work with the school to assist in these efforts.</p>	

Standard 4: Legal Compliance Indicators	Rating
4.1. Open Meetings/Information Management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
4.2. Students with Disabilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
4.3. English Learners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
4.4. Rights of Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
4.5. Teacher/Staff Credentials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM
4.6. Employee Rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> DNM

**Notes and Evidence:**

) **Indicator 4.1:** The school website and Governing Board documents demonstrate that Governing Board meetings are open and accessible to the public. The Governing Board meeting schedule for the year and meeting agenda are posted on the school’s website. Education records and testing data are secured in locked file cabinets in administration offices.

) **Indicator 4.2:** A review of The Bridge’s 2015-16 Public School Information System (PSIS) data reports the percentage of special education students at The Bridge was 16.9 percent. During the renewal site visit, CSDE staff reviewed student files and interviewed two special education teachers regarding how the school was meeting the needs of students receiving special education and related services pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The 46 students receiving special education services are served by two full-time certified special education teachers and two social workers; the host district provides a school psychologist and occupational therapy services as needed.

As required by IDEA, the school provides special education supports to each student as set forth in the student’s individualized education program (IEP) and provides support to the students so that they are able to access the general education curriculum as appropriate.

As evidenced by interviews with special education staff, The Bridge fulfills its obligation to locate and identify children who are in need of special education and related services. School staff members report that the school and the responsible local education agencies work together to schedule students’ planning and placement team meetings as needed.

Student education files are kept in a locked file cabinet in the special education office. All files reviewed had individual sign-in access sheets. The files were well organized and maintained.

File reviews and staff interviews indicate the special education students attending the Charter school are receiving specialized instruction and related services as set forth in their IEPs. As evident in the review of student files the school monitors student progress toward short-term IEP objectives and annual goals.

) **Indicator 4.3:** An interview with the school director determined The Bridge supports its ELs in the classroom through both push-in and differentiated instruction provided by the classroom teacher. A review of The Bridge’s EL identification policies and procedures determined them to be aligned to federal and state guidelines.

) **Indicator 4.4:** The Bridge’s student rights policies and procedures include admissions, handling of student information, due process protections and state nondiscrimination laws. Interviews with parents and staff at the school supported the proper implementation and use of the policies.

**Indicator 4.5:** Staff from the CSDE Bureau of Educator Standards and Certification (BESC) compared the state certified staff file to The Bridge’s employee roster and found at the time of the on-site visit that all staff were properly certified.

) **Indicator 4.6:** A review of The Bridge’s employment policies and procedures and interviews with school staff determined the school’s hiring and employment practices ensure protections under the Family Medical Leave Act, Americans with Disabilities Act and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and affirmative action and equal opportunity employment.

<b>Prepared by:</b>	<b>Approved by:</b>
Robert Kelly, Charter School Program Manager	Desi D. Nesmith, Chief Turnaround Officer

## THE BRIDGE ACADEMY DATA

**Table 1. 2015-16 Student Enrollment and Demographic Information**

Grades served:	7-12
Total enrollment:	281
Percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price meals:	85.3%
Percentage of special education students:	16.9%
Percentage of students with limited English proficiency:	2.9%
Percentage of minority students:	94.6%
Percentage American Indian or Alaska Native:	*
Percentage of Asian students:	*
Percentage of Black students:	58.1%
Percentage of Hispanic students:	36.6%
Percentage of Two or More Races:	*
Percentage of Caucasian students:	*

\*N<=5. Data suppressed to ensure student data privacy.

**Table 2: School Culture and Climate Data**

Performance Metric:	2013-14:	2014-15:	2015-16:	STATE
Average daily attendance rate:	95.2%	95.4%	94.9%	
Chronic absenteeism rate:	8.4%	7.7%	8.6%	9.6%
Number of in-school suspensions:	32	50	32	
Number of out-of-school suspensions:	48	52	63	
Suspension rate (% students with 1+ suspension):	14.6%	18.5%	18.4%	7.0%
Number of expulsions:	0	0	0	
Cohort graduation rate (if applicable):	88.9%	88.2%	87.5%	87.2%
Six Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (if applicable)	N/A	80.5%	94.1	78.6%

\*N<=5. Data suppressed to ensure student data privacy.

**Table 3: Student Waitlist and Mobility Information**

Performance Metric:	2014-15:	2015-16:	2016-17:
Waitlist number:	447	192	241
Number of enrolled students who left during the school year:	16	11	N/A
Number of students who did not re-enroll the next year and had not completed the highest grade at the school:	38	2	N/A

**THE BRIDGE ACADEMY**  
**SMARTER BALANCED ASSESSMENT AND SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TEST DATA**

<b>Table 4:</b>								
<b>Smarter Balanced Assessment - Percentage of students at level 3 and 4 (met/exceeded)</b>								
<b>Grades 7-8</b>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>District - 2015-16</b>			<b>State - 2015-16</b>	
<b>ELA</b>		<b>23.2</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>22.5</b>			<b>55.6</b>	
<b>MATH</b>		<b>**8.9</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>9.9</b>			<b>44.0</b>	
<b>Grades 7-8</b>								
<b>Smarter Balanced Assessment - Percentage of students at level 3 and 4 (met/exceeded)</b>								
<b>GRADE</b>	<b>ELA 2014-15</b>	<b>ELA 2015-16</b>	<b>DISTRICT 2015-16</b>	<b>STATE 2015-16</b>	<b>MATH 2014-15</b>	<b>MATH 2015-16</b>	<b>DISTRICT 2015-16</b>	<b>STATE 2015-16</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>25.6</b>	<b>55.2</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>41.8</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>25.8</b>	<b>55.5</b>	<b>19.1</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>40.3</b>
<b>SAT</b>		<b>ELA 2015-16</b>			<b>Math 2015-16</b>			
<b>Metric</b>		<b>The Bridge Academy</b>	<b>Bridgeport</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>The Bridge Academy</b>	<b>Bridgeport</b>	<b>State</b>	
<b>Percentage of students at level 3 and 4 (met/exceeded)</b>		<b>30.0</b>	<b>29.2</b>	<b>65.0</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>39.3</b>	

\*Data suppressed to ensure student data privacy.

**Table 5: 2015-16 Reading Performance**

Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)							
Grade	Total Sample	Fall 2015 # Students at Proficiency	Total Sample	Winter 2016 # Students at Proficiency	Total Sample	Spring 2016 # Students at Proficiency	Growth
7	50	11	50	26	48	28	+17
8	50	21	49	27	48	32	+11
9	52	29	50	31	49	29	0
10	51	44	47	47	46	51	+7
11	45	36	42	50	40	62	+26
12	33		33		32		

**Table 6: 2015-16 Math Performance**

Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)							
Grade	Total Sample	Fall 2015 # Students at Proficiency	Total Sample	Winter 2016 # Students at Proficiency	Total Sample	Spring 2016 # Students at Proficiency	Growth
7	50	16	50	10	48	18	+2
8	50	12	49	10	48	8	-4
9	52	12	50	20	49	16	+4
10	51	38	47	31	46	38	0
11	45	48	42	43	40	38	-10
12	33		33		32		

**Table 7: 2016-17 Reading Performance**

Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)							
Grade	Total Sample	Fall 2016 # Students at Proficiency	Total Sample	Winter 2017 # Students at Proficiency	Total Sample	Spring 2017 # Students at Proficiency	Growth
7	49	36	47	51			+5
8	48	26	42	40			+14
9	51	9	47	17			+8
10	53	28	50	34			+6
11	40	45	38	47			+2
12							

**Table 8: 2016-17 Math Performance**

<b>Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)</b>							
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Total Sample</b>	<b>Fall 2016 # Students at Proficiency</b>	<b>Total Sample</b>	<b>Winter 2017 # Students at Proficiency</b>	<b>Total Sample</b>	<b>Spring 2017 # Students at Proficiency</b>	<b>Growth</b>
<b>7</b>	49	17	47	26			+9
<b>8</b>	48	24	45	18			-6
<b>9</b>	51	4	47	15			+11
<b>10</b>	53	30	50	32			+2
<b>11</b>	40	45	38	53			+8
<b>12</b>							