Somerset Academy Silver Palms

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Somerset Academy Silver Palms

23255 SW 115TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33032

http://somersetsilverpalms.dadeschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Kerri Ann O'sullivan

Start Date for this Principal: 11/10/2012

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
2021-22 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (67%) 2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (70%)
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	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

N/A

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

Somerset Academy Silver Palms

23255 SW 115TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33032

http://somersetsilverpalms.dadeschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	97%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Somerset Academy Inc. promotes a culture that maximizes student achievement and fosters the development of responsible, self-directed life-long learners in a safe and enriching environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Set high expectations
Objective
Meaningful curriculum
Effective
Resources and responsible life-long learners
Students who achieve proficiency and beyond
Evaluate continuously and use data to drive curriculum
Teachers who are highly qualified

School Leadership Team

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
O'Sullivan, Kerri	Principal	Responsible for all school operations, curriculum, budget and safety.
Mongeotti, Maria	Assistant Principal	Academics and Curriculum Student Data. SPED Program Testing Accounting Activities Elementary Athletics Cafeteria Before/Aftercare Program Summer Camp Emergency Procedures Registrar/Attendance Parent Club Maintenance/Facilities Discipline
Santana, Martha	Administrative Support	Academics and Curriculum Dual Enrollment Teacher Observations SPED Program Master Schedule Activities Middle School Athletics Cafeteria Emergency Procedures Registrar/Attendance Maintenance/Facilities Discipline Academics and Curriculum Student Data Testing Saturday School Tutoring Program Curriculum Binders ESOL Technology Programs Computer Lab Schedule
Paz, Raquel	Instructional Coach	Provide Instructional Support, planning, coach new teachers, model lessons, push into classes.
Penas, D'Andrea	Assistant Principal	Academics and Curriculum Teacher Observations Master Schedule Activities Cafeteria Emergency Procedures

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Registrar/Attendance Maintenance/Facilities Discipline Academics and Curriculum Student Data Testing Curriculum Binders ESOL Technology Programs Computer Lab Schedule
Castro, Maura	Staffing Specialist	ESE Coordinator Attend Staffings Oversee RTI Process
Cuervo, Marcus	Administrative Support	Data Discipline Teacher Support
Petisco, Gabriela	School Counselor	Monitors grades, attendance, behavior.
Barton, Alexandra	School Counselor	Monitors grades, attendance, behavior.
Meade, Adriana	School Counselor	Monitors grades, attendance, behavior.
Laguna, Nilda	School Counselor	Mental Health, monitor grades and attendance.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 11/10/2012, Kerri Ann O'sullivan

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
83

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,931

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
15

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	203	193	186	186	187	180	271	265	257	0	0	0	0	1928
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	7	12	5	35	36	14	0	0	0	0	112
Course failure in ELA	0	13	11	5	4	1	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	2	5	5	20	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	8	6	10	5	9	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	10	16	11	7	15	0	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	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 who have 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	2	6	15	1	45	69	51	49	0	0	0	0	0	238

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 8/25/2022

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	190	185	190	195	185	181	274	270	284	0	0	0	0	1954
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	8	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	10	14	16	5	4	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	9	15	18	22	25	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	30	27	37	28	32	0	0	0	0	155
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	12	0	39	41	65	52	52	0	0	0	0	266

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	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	190	185	190	195	185	181	274	270	284	0	0	0	0	1954
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	8	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	10	14	16	5	4	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	9	15	18	22	25	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	30	27	37	28	32	0	0	0	0	155
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	12	0	39	41	65	52	52	0	0	0	0	266

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	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	73%	62%	55%				78%	63%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						68%	61%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						59%	57%	54%
Math Achievement	71%	51%	42%				84%	67%	62%
Math Learning Gains	66%						67%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						64%	56%	52%
Science Achievement	70%	60%	54%				71%	56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	88%	68%	59%				88%	80%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	75%	60%	15%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	64%	16%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	80%	60%	20%	56%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
06	2022					
	2019	74%	58%	16%	54%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
07	2022					
	2019	76%	56%	20%	52%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
08	2022					
	2019	88%	60%	28%	56%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	84%	67%	17%	62%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	89%	69%	20%	64%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2022					
	2019	91%	65%	26%	60%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
06	2022					
	2019	80%	58%	22%	55%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
07	2022					
	2019	79%	53%	26%	54%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
08	2022					
	2019	70%	40%	30%	46%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

			SCIENCE				
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	78%	53%	25%	53%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	52%	43%	9%	48%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

	BIOLOGY EOC				
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	68%	32%	67%	33%
	CIVICS EOC				
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	87%	73%	14%	71%	16%
	HISTORY EOC				
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
	ALGEBRA EOC				
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	94%	63%	31%	61%	33%
	GEOMETRY EOC				
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	96%	54%	42%	57%	39%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	34	46	36	32	51	46	21	69			
ELL	66	60	49	65	62	57	57	85	42		
ASN	75	61		83	72						
BLK	65	63	58	66	63	66	47	85	64		
HSP	73	61	48	70	66	64	72	88	62		
MUL	86	60		50	50						
WHT	79	67		81	72	58	69		73		
FRL	72	61	50	70	65	63	70	87	62		

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	37	46	38	32	23	26	19	45			
ELL	71	63	48	58	32	38	55	68			
ASN	76	59		81	35						
BLK	62	54	32	53	29	23	53	63	55		
HSP	72	60	49	62	34	33	66	72	61		
MUL	67			75							
WHT	72	53		57	29		71	80	50		
FRL	70	59	46	61	33	31	62	71	57		

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	41	38	37	43	52	50					
ELL	75	64	48	80	63	56	69	85	53		
ASN	94	67		94	67						
BLK	72	59	50	73	57	50	58	69	38		
HSP	79	69	60	86	69	65	72	88	65		
WHT	78	64		78	57	45	79	100			
FRL	77	68	59	83	66	61	70	88	63		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	672

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	73
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	64
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	67
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Across all grade-levels Math made considerable gains of 76 points. ELA maintained steady gains of 10 points.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

We will concentrate on ELA grades 3rd-8th to increase gains.

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

We will shift additional resources such as interventionists, after school tutoring/homework help, Reading Coach push in/pull out and additional professional development for teacher.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Across all grade-levels Math made considerable gains of 76 points.

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

We added additional interventionists to push into Math classes and pull out lowest 25% and students with SLD. We will provide homework help after school and during lunch. This year will continue this initiative and promote class incentives for IREADY achievement and Progress Monitoring.

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

We will monitor EACH student's individual progress through data chats and observations. With this information we will individualize instruction and enrich content based on their needs.

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.

We will provide the following professional development:
-Small group instruction/Differentiated Instruction
-Desegregation of Data
-Share good practices

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

We will provide after school clubs that enrich the love of ELA:
-Book Club
-Writer's Club
Writing Contests
-Book Fair/Reading Under the Stars Event

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities 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 critical need from the data reviewed.**	Based on our 2022 FSA scores, we identified a need in ELA. There was not sufficient growth in grades 3rd-8th. When dissecting the data, we recognized that the lowest 25% only made 46% proficiency and our Students with Disabilities scored 42% achievement.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our goal in ELA for the 2022-23 State Assessment is to increase by 10% proficiency. Our goal in ELA for the Lowest 25% in the 2022-23 State Assessment is to increase by 5% proficiency. Our goal in ELA for the Student's with Disabilities in the 2022-23 State Assessment if to increase by 5% proficiency.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will be using state designated Progress Monitoring, as well as IREADY and classroom data. We will conduct quarterly data chats with teachers, as well as students to discuss areas of growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maria Mongeotti (mmongeotti@somersetsilverpalms.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	We will use the Evidence Based Wonder Series K-5th grade and My Perspectives grades 6th-8th. IREADY will be used and monitored for student progress. Additional intervention staff and a Curriculum Coach.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Based on our 2022 FSA scores, we identified a need in ELA. There was not sufficient growth in grades 3rd-8th. When dissecting the data, we recognized that the lowest 25% only made 46% proficiency and our Students with Disabilities scored 42% achievement.

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.

Identify individual needs based on data.
Discuss findings with teachers, interventionist and curriculum coach.
Assist teachers in designing an individualized plan for each student.
Strategically assign interventionist and curriculum coach to work with the lowest 25% and Students with Disabilities.
Reassess and evaluate biweekly to insure that needs are being met.

Person Responsible	Maria Mongeotti (mmongeotti@somersetsilverpalms.net)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

The 3 areas of focus are decoding, reading comprehension and fluency.

The percentage of students not on track to score a level 3 or above on the state ELA Assessment is 15%.

Forms of Data we will be utilizing is the iReady baseline, midyear and end of year (AP #1-AP#3), IReady growth Monitoring, biweekly Wonders assessments, Weekly Formative Assessments of Sight Words and or Fluency.

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

The 3 areas of focus are fluency, vocabulary and comprehension.

The percentage of students not on track to score a level 3 or above on the state ELA Assessment is 30%.

Forms of Data we will be utilizing is the iReady baseline, midyear and end of year (AP #1-AP#3), IReady growth Monitoring, biweekly Wonders assessments, Weekly Formative Assessments of Sight Words and or Fluency.

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percentage of students not on track to score a level 3 or above on the state ELA Assessment is 15%.Our goal is to decrease this percentage to 10%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our Measurable Outcome for this year in the statewide ELA Assessment is the following:

Grades 3 ELA to increase from 70% in 2022 to 75% in 2023.
Grades 4 ELA to increase from 73% in 2022 to 75% in 2023.
Grades 5 ELA to increase from 76% in 2022 to 80% in 2023.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

To Monitor Outcomes we will be utilizing the iReady baseline, midyear and end of year (AP #1-AP#3), IReady growth Monitoring, biweekly Wonders assessments, Weekly Formative Assessments of Vocabulary and or Fluency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Mongeotti, Maria, mmongeotti@somersetsilverpalms.net

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Our strategy is to utilize differentiation of intervention programs to lessen the learning gap and build the foundational skills. This year our students will use personal data trackers to track their growth data by benchmark.

Driven by insights from the i-Ready Diagnostic, the platform prescribes a path of online lessons that provide instruction tailored to each student's needs and encourages students as they develop new skills. i-Ready Personalized Instruction's online lessons are rigorous, offering students explicit instruction and providing systematic practice and scaffolded feedback that promotes a growth mindset. Once students have completed their first Diagnostic assessment, i-Ready Personalized Instruction builds a unique lesson plan consisting of online instructional lessons based on assessment performance, with a personalized starting point for each student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Utilizing this strategy allows the parents, students, and teachers a clear understanding of how students are performing in each content area/standard. Students will be assessed at the beginning of the year on all benchmarks, this data will then be analyzed and logged in their data folders. Teachers then will use the data folders to group students by strengths and weaknesses. During small groups, students will be provided remediation and continuously reassessed to show growth. As needed, the students will be moved between groups in order to ensure that their learning needs are continuously being met. The data folders will facilitate open communication and understanding by all parties involved in how to best support our students.

Once students have completed their first Diagnostic assessment, i-Ready Personalized Instruction builds a unique lesson plan consisting of online instructional lessons based on assessment performance, with a personalized starting point for each student.

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

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
As a collaborative effort we have developed an action plan that will monitor the learning gains of the students in order to ensure that even with our barriers our students are achieving at the necessary levels of rigor and understanding. Our plan includes progress monitoring and instructional support through professional development. In order to monitor the effectiveness of our action plan both administration and instructional leaders such as department heads will meet biweekly to discuss progress and data. These meetings will run throughout the calendar school year from August through June. Within these meetings the participants will discuss the evidence collected such as, lesson plans, assessments data, and personal data trackers.	Mongeotti, Maria, mmongeotti@somersetsilverpalms.net

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The leadership team fosters a culture consistent with the school's goals and purpose. All stakeholders collaborate and share responsibility in improving the school. Stakeholders feel empowered to give input and recommendations for continued improvement. All stakeholders enjoy their experience at the school and feel a part of a shared vision of success. All students have access to resources that address their social and emotional needs. All stakeholders collaborate and share responsibility in improving the school through our ESSAC meetings, faculty meetings, department meetings, and grade level meetings. The ESSAC meetings give parents and community members the opportunity to share their input and recommendations for continued improvement. The faculty, department, and grade level meetings give teachers and staff the opportunities to share their ideas on how the school can continuously improve. All stakeholders enjoy their experience at school and feel a part of the shared vision of success by including students on incentive field trips and through staff team-building activities throughout the year. Students are able to access resources for their social and emotional needs through our counselors and teachers. These practices will be sustained in years to come by having an open line of communication between our stakeholders.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Kerri Ann O'Sullivan- Principal
Maria Mongeotti- Vice Principal
DAndrea Santana-Penas- Assistant Principal
Martha Santana- ESOL Coordinator/ Curriculum Specialist
Maura Castro- ESE Specialist
Juliet Chanying- ESE Teacher
Raquel Paz- Curriculum Support
Marcus Cuervo- Dean of Students
Nilda Laguna- Mental Health Counselor
Ali Barton- School Counselor
Adriana Meade- School Counselor
Early Coalition, FDLERS- Early Childhood Providers
Miami Dade and FIE- Community Colleges and Universities
Agape- Social Services