

Broward County Public Schools

Somerset Preparatory Academy Charter School At



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	23
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Somerset Preparatory Academy Charter School At North Lauderdale

7101 KIMBERLY BLVD, North Lauderdale, FL 33068

somersetprep.com

Demographics

Principal: Donyale Mcghee

Start Date for this Principal: 1/1/2015

2019-20 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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	23
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Somerset Preparatory Academy Charter School At North Lauderdale

7101 KIMBERLY BLVD, North Lauderdale, FL 33068

somersetprep.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	91%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	98%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

It is our mission to provide our students with opportunities designed to meet individual student needs and experiences that promote growth in each area of development. We will celebrate our achievements and forgive our failures. We will be student centered and curriculum driven, but most of all it is the charge of our professional craft to strive daily to make a positive difference in the life of a child.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Somerset Academy, Inc. is dedicated to providing equitable high-quality education for all students.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McGhee , Donyale	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School-wide Policies and Procedures • Personnel Concerns • Budget • Title I • Facilities • Athletics • Personnel Concerns K-5 • Staff Attendance K-5 • Accident/Incident Reporting K-5 • Faculty Observations K-5 • Gradebook K-5 • Gradebook Articulation K-5 • Teacher Assistants
Maura, Kionnie	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies and Procedures • Personnel Concerns 6-12 • Staff Attendance 6-12 • Accident/Incident Reporting 6-12 • Faculty Observations 6-12 • Master Schedule 6-12 • SIP • Curriculum 6-12 • Gradebook 6-12 • Morning/Afterschool Care • Lunch Program/Personnel • Lunch Eligibilities (Supervising) • ELL/ESE Department • Certification K-12 • OOF Waivers K-12 • Charter Tools
Jackson, Chantae	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AP Coordinator • K-12 Incident Reporting/Abuse • 6-12 Guidance • Supervising K-5 Guidance • Academic Advising • 6-12 Testing Supervisor • Front Office • Retention • Designated Mental Health Employee • Specials/ Electives Department • Science Curriculum (SDAs & IFCs) • 6-12 PLCs
Nesbitt, Chimere	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDAs Grades K-5 Reading & Grades 6-12 Math • SIP • iReady Reading and Math Grades K-5 • Math Software Programs

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-5 Curriculum and Lesson Planning • K-5 Data Collection • K-5 PLCs and Math PLCs 6-12 • K-5 Instructional Focus Calendars • Grades 6-12 Mathematics Instructional Focus Calendars • BAS Testing • K-5 Testing Supervisor • 3rd Grade Keystones/Portfolio • Gradebook Manager K-5 • Interim and Report Card Distribution K-5 • Elementary Master Schedule • Class Size • Supervising/Training Textbook Inventory K-12 (Sec. Williams) • Teacher concerns regarding Curriculum and Instruction

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 1/1/2015, Donyale Mcghee

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

413

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	51	61	74	72	84	81	107	100	113	0	0	0	0	743
Attendance below 90 percent	22	13	22	13	25	26	10	15	19	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	22	25	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	3	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	24	30	18	31	0	0	0	0	108
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	34	15	26	0	0	0	0	101
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	8	4	10	5	65	74	92	0	0	0	0	260

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	3	10	4	12	23	51	40	54	0	0	0	0	200

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	11	6	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	3	0	0	0	0	15

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/22/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Number of students enrolled														
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA														
Course failure in Math														
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment														
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment														

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				42%	58%	61%	41%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	58%	59%	55%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	52%	54%	51%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				50%	58%	62%	53%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				54%	58%	59%	59%	56%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	51%	52%	53%	49%	52%

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement				33%	51%	56%	26%	52%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				79%	74%	78%	78%	75%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	62%	-22%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	59%	-23%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
06	2021					
	2019	35%	57%	-22%	54%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
07	2021					
	2019	44%	55%	-11%	52%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2021					
	2019	43%	59%	-16%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	50%	65%	-15%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	41%	67%	-26%	64%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	64%	-13%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
06	2021					
	2019	35%	58%	-23%	55%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
07	2021					
	2019	33%	53%	-20%	54%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2021					
	2019	65%	45%	20%	46%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	33%	49%	-16%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	33%	43%	-10%	48%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	77%	71%	6%	71%	6%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	78%	61%	17%	61%	17%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	56%	-56%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

We used iReady as the progress monitoring tool for Reading and Math for the 2020-2021.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	59	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25	29	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	35	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42	49	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	45	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
Civics	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	5	21	31	3	21	23	6				
ELL	29	38	31	22	24	28	12	40	42		
BLK	38	38	35	19	16	19	14	61	22		
HSP	30	40	26	23	27	24	17	30	36		
MUL	50			45							
WHT	31	10		38	20						
FRL	35	37	30	22	19	23	16	53	26		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	8	33	38	24	51	54		77			
ELL	35	47	49	45	49	41	20	68	75		
BLK	41	47	44	48	56	60	30	79	82		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	41	55	48	49	47	42	37	74	74		
MUL	50	70									
WHT	44	33		75	67						
FRL	43	50	44	49	53	52	35	79	78		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	13	43	44	27	50	47					
ELL	33	55	49	52	59	53	15	67			
BLK	40	53	49	49	57	53	25	75	57		
HSP	42	61	56	61	62	56	27	78			
MUL	46	45		85	73						
WHT	50	63		56	56						
FRL	42	55	51	53	59	54	27	79	48		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	29
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	23
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	287
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	27
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	25
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Using progress monitoring data (iReady), one can see that the Reading Comprehension domain deficiency grows when the grade level has a significant Phonics domain deficiency. The deficiency becomes significant beginning in 1st grade and is seen throughout until 5th grade. Progress monitoring data collected in the spring of 2020 (AP3) show that current 1st graders were 70% proficient in Phonics and 80% proficient in Comprehension. Current 2nd graders were 53% proficient in Phonics and 48% proficient in Comprehension.

In 2019, state assessment data shows that there was a decrease in performance for SWD from 13% to 8%, Hispanic from 42% to 41%, and white students from 50% to 44%. However we did see a 2-percentage point increase for our ELL population from 33% to 35%, a 1-percentage point increase for Black students from 40% to 41%, and a 1-percentage point increase for students who receive Free or Reduced Lunch from 42% to 43%.

In 2021, state assessment data shows that there was an overall decrease in proficiency with the exception of 4th grade who increased 3-percentage points from 40% to 43%. The race/ethnicity subgroups shows a decrease in performance for white, Hispanic, and black students, while maintaining a 50% proficiency rate for multi-racial students. The ELL population decreased 11-percentage points from 16% to 5%. Students with disabilities proficiency decreased 8-percentage points from 13% to 5%. Finally, our economically disadvantaged students showed an 8-percentage point increase from 33% to 41%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based off progress monitoring data collected in the Fall of 2021 for kindergarten through 5th grade students, 15% of the student population is performing one or more grade levels below in the Phonological Awareness domain and 41% of the student population is performing one or more grade levels below in the Phonics domain.

In 2021, state assessment data shows that there was a significant decrease in Reading Comprehension for our current 4th and 5th grade students which correlates directly with the lack of Phonics proficiency demonstrated by our progress monitoring assessments. Our current 4th graders were 32% proficient in the 2021 FSA in comparison to the 2021 AP1 progress monitoring data where 28% of students tested on grade level with Reading Comprehension domain. Likely, our current 5th grade students were 43% proficient in the 2021 FSA in comparison to the 2021 AP1 progress monitoring data 35% of students tested on grade level with Reading Comprehension domain.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors to the deficiencies in Phonological Awareness and Phonics come from the lack of in-person instruction for the latter part of the 2019-2020 school year and the majority of the 2020-2021 school year due to the pandemic.

For the 2021-2022 school year, the school day was extended to allow time at the end of the day for additional remediation called our intervention block. Teachers will have an hour to provide additional remediation to students that have deficiencies. Remediation will be provided to students using differentiated instruction to make sure that we are addressing individual student needs. Additionally, students will be offered Fall and Spring tutoring as an additional form of support to help bridge the gaps that students have attained within the last 2 years.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

In 2019, state assessment data shows there was a 2-percentage point increase for our ELL population from 33% to 35%, a 1-percentage point increase for Black students from 40% to 41%, and a 1-percentage point increase for students who receive Free or Reduced Lunch from 42% to 43%.

In 2021, state assessment data shows that there was an overall decrease in performance with the exception of 4th grade who increased 3-percentage points from 40% to 43%. The race/ethnicity subgroups shows that multi-racial students maintained a 50% proficiency rate. Finally, our economically disadvantaged students showed an 8-percentage point increase from 33% to 41%.

The 2020-2021 progress monitoring data showed that our students performing on grade level increased 12-percentage points from 32% to 44%. Students performing one grade level below decreased 6-percentage points from 31% to 25% and students performing 2 or more grade levels below decreased 5-percentage points from 37% to 32%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Increased usage of our progress monitoring tool could be the contributing factor to the improvement indicated above during the 2020-2021 school year. Additionally, a greater number of students attending brick and mortar by the end of the school year could have affected student engagement and increased test validity and reliability since the assessment was taken on campus.

Our teachers provided more information to parents of the importance of the iReady assessments. Moreover, they were explained how the progress monitoring tool worked and how the algorithm worked to ensure children were placed at the correct level for them. Once in school, teachers were able to guarantee that students used the necessary tools to be successful in their assessment such as providing an environment conducive to taking an assessment, providing headphones, and allowing times for breaks to avoid assessment fatigue.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

For the current year, the school has conducted various reflection meetings and data analysis trainings to ensure the plan would be the best fit for improving student achievement. Having decided to implement these adjustments, monthly standard-specific assessments will be conducted by administration to pinpoint areas of weakness. Weekly progress monitoring is conducted through the classroom focusing on foundational, vocabulary, and reading standards in accordance to grade level pacing guides. This allows for teachers to pinpoint areas of weakness and provide the supplemental instruction necessary for each skill or standard before moving on to the next one while still ensuring

that the teacher is covering new standards/skills. The weekly assessments also allow for differentiation where each student can receive supplemental help and practice in their particular areas of weakness, fostering growth individually and collectively in the school.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning meetings with the instructional coach and use that opportunity to share best practices and resources that will assist in targeting a specific benchmark. Additionally, teachers will also break down their classroom reading data weekly to be able to target specific student deficiencies in small groups. The school has planned Professional Learning Communities within the school to provide professional development for teachers to enable all children in the school to meet state academic content standards. These PLC's are based on specific needs in target areas for the different core subject areas of Reading, Mathematics, and classroom management. Regular meetings will occur throughout the 2021-2022 school year to ensure higher success rates in student achievement.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services that will be provided to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond include Fall and Spring tutoring, each focusing on a target group of students. During Fall tutoring, our school will target the lowest 30% of students. We will use iReady data and FSA data to identify the students that meet this criteria. Our lowest 30% percent will receive foundational skills practice targeting specific areas that will help increase the student's reading level and decoding abilities. For Spring tutoring, we will focus on bubble students. Bubble students are also identified using iReady and FSA data. For this tutoring session, students will receive on-grade level skill practice and test preparation to ensure the student's success on their end of year assessments. Additionally, we will assign teacher assistants as a push-in service to work with students during the reading block to continue to strengthen on-grade level skills being taught in the classroom.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Overall, in accordance with our AP1 progress monitoring data, only 23% of our students are performing at grade level. This indicates that 77% of students are not performing on grade level. Furthermore, our 2021 FSA ELA data shows that 38% of our current 4th and 5th grade students were proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, 60% of students in grades K through 2 will achieve proficiency on end of year assessments in Reading. By June 2022, the percentage of students that achieve proficiency (level 3 or higher) in grades 3 through 5 in reading will increase by 10 percentage points from 35% to 45%.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored using iReady growth monitoring assessments in between each progress monitoring assessment window in addition to the weekly assessments given by teachers using the newly adopted curriculum, Benchmark Advance. Weekly data will allow teachers to track progress, provide instant feedback to students, and remediate areas of weakness specific to each student. Growth monitoring assessments will provide data for the instructional coaches and administrators to plan ongoing interventions and provide classroom support for the teachers during their intervention blocks.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chimere Nesbitt (cnesbitt@somersetprep.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to effectively address the area of focus, the leadership team decided that differentiated instruction will be the strategy used to address the deficiencies in the area of focus based on student need. Teachers will use the data collected through progress monitoring and in class assessments. To promote student growth, teachers will pinpoint areas of weakness for each student and design instruction tailored to address specific benchmarks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We selected differentiated instruction due to the significant amount of students performing below grade level. Differentiated instruction allows teachers the opportunity to create lessons that vary according to strength, weakness, and learning ability. The leadership team concluded that when used with fidelity, differentiated instruction is a powerful tool in addressing learning needs of individual or groups of students and closing the achievement gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning meetings with the instructional coach and use that opportunity to break down their classroom reading data to be able to target specific student deficiencies individually or in small groups using differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Chimere Nesbitt (cnesbitt@somersetprep.com)

The school has planned Professional Learning Communities within the school to provide continuous professional development for teachers to enable all children in the school to meet state academic content standards. These PLC's are based on specific needs in target areas for Reading.

Person Responsible Chimere Nesbitt (cnesbitt@somersetprep.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

n/a