Somerset Arts Academy

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Somerset Arts Academy

1700 N KROME AVE, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetcityarts.com

Demographics

Principal: Idalia Suarez M

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2008

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (65%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%)
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 Arts Academy

1700 N KROME AVE, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetcityarts.com

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)
Elementary School KG-5	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	88%

School Grades History

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

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.

The mission of Somerset Arts Academy is to develop flexible leaders who continuously grow through diverse learning opportunities that promote meaningful connections through the arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Somerset City Arts is to build 21st-century lifelong leaders who are creative, collaborative, innovative and resilient.

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
Suarez, Idalia	Principal	The principal oversees the overall functioning of the school concerning personnel, facilities, academics, activities, and budget. The principal will evaluate the effectiveness of the leadership team and staff by conducting walkthroughs, observations, and data chats. The principal will conduct weekly leadership team meetings to discuss data, curriculum, and concerns across all grade levels and content areas.
Rodriguez, Laura	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal will support the principal in areas concerning personnel, facilities, academics, activities, and budget. Together, with the principal, the AP will evaluate the effectiveness of the schools academic program through walkthroughs, weekly monitoring of lesson plans, teacher professionalism, communication, and teacher observations.
Lorenzo, Nicole	Instructional Coach	As instructional coach, she will provide immediate support across grade levels in all subject areas. She will help support the implementation of the school wide reading, writing, math, science and STEM academic programs as well as model and provide feedback and resources to assist teachers. Additionally, the instructional coach works closely with the principal and assistant principal in making school decisions, assists in parent meetings to communicate student performance and participates in data chats with teachers to guide instructional practices.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 8/15/2008, Idalia Suarez M

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
29

Total number of students enrolled at the school
412

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
4

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	64	72	64	68	65	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	399
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	9	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	3	3	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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

Tuesday 9/27/2022

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	66	73	64	75	65	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	17	15	12	13	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	4	16	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	3	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	66	73	64	75	65	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	17	15	12	13	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	4	16	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	3	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	62%	62%	56%				67%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	72%						70%	62%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	77%						53%	58%	53%
Math Achievement	60%	58%	50%				61%	69%	63%
Math Learning Gains	78%						49%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						39%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	64%	59%				55%	55%	53%

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	63%	60%	3%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	75%	64%	11%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

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	63%	67%	-4%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	74%	69%	5%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	65%	-16%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	54%	53%	1%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

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	41	69	83	45	62	64	13				
ELL	49	76	64	44	72		27				
HSP	58	72	76	57	77	71	36				
WHT	91	85		78	92						
FRL	59	70	73	57	75	68	38				

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	24	44	40	16	24		7				
ELL	45	69		18	13		33				
HSP	55	57	38	32	19	17	20				
WHT	79	45		57	18		55				
FRL	57	61	46	34	23	17	22				

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	31	75		35	67	60					
ELL	57	61	47	57	59	45	41				
HSP	64	69	52	61	48	39	51				
WHT	76	77		64	53	40	69				
FRL	63	71	55	57	47	41	50				

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	66
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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	524
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54

Students With Disabilities	
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	57
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	87
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	63
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?

After analyzing state assessment data and progress monitoring data it is evident that our overall proficiency levels in ELA, Math, and 5th grade science have increased since our 2021 state assessments. Our Lowest 25% showed the largest gains in both ELA and Math from 2021 to 2022.

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

The 2022 state assessment data as well as our progress monitoring data indicate that the greatest need for improvement is rising proficiency levels in in ELA and Mathematics.

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

Contributing factors include the learning loss due to the pandemic shutdowns and learning gaps. Many students started the year well below proficiency. While much gains were made and evident in our growth scores, we need to continuing improving proficiency. We will continue to implement differentiated instruction in the classroom and use data driven instruction to meet the needs of all students. In addition, identified students will receive reading and/or math intervention as evident by student progress monitoring data.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was our 5th grade science proficiency based off the 2019 assessments. In addition, our Lowest 25th percentiles in both Reading and Math showed significant increases.

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

The contributing factors for this improvement was constant data analysis to implement data driven instruction along with individual student-teacher data chats to discuss areas of needed improvements and celebrate successes. In addition, we implemented a new curriculum for our Tier 3 reading interventions and provided additional pull out and push in support for math to target students.

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

The strategies that need to be implemented include differentiated instruction as well as reading and math interventions. There will continue to be a strong emphasis on data driven instruction as well as student/teacher data chats. Teachers will also receive training and support as we transition this year to the new state standards utilizing student data to target instruction.

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.

The school will propose and organize professional development on differentiated instruction, data driven instruction, and BEST standards. Our Instructional Coach and curriculum support will provide coaching and feedback via classroom walkthroughs and coaching cycles to support teachers and their instruction.

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

School administrators will monitor the fidelity of the interventions taking place by conducting walkthroughs as well tracking of progress monitoring data to determine needs and growth. Administrators will conduct data chats with teachers to ensure progress and targets are being met. The instructional coach will provide professional development opportunities to teachers as part of our continuous improvement plan.

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 B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	In reviewing our data and needs assessment, we identified a critical area of need related to the adoption of our state's new standards in order to ensure that our instruction meets the benchmark demands of the B.E.S.T. Standards.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The school will work towards ensuring that 100% of our instructional staff is trained and implements effectively the new standards.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The leadership team will conduct classroom observations to observe that instruction provided is standards based and that the ELA Expectations and Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning standards are implemented with fidelity. In addition to our instructional coach, we have two curriculum support teachers assisting in providing support to teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Our school will focus on effectively implementing professional development to train our instructional staff on the B.E.S.T. Standards and best practices. In addition, we will provide assistance in lesson planning, coaching and modeling of lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Due to the changes in standards and assessments this year, it is imperative that we provide professional development to our teachers so that they can provide the most effective instruction within their classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Provide initial training to teachers
2. Provide ongoing coaching in standards based instruction
3. Meet with teachers for data chats to identify needs
4. Progress monitor students

Person Responsible	Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)

#2. 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.**	After analyzing the assessment data, it is evident that there is a need to improve proficiency scores in ELA.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The school will work towards increasing ELA proficiency by 3% on the state assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The leadership team will conduct classroom observations to observe differentiated instruction taking place in the classroom. Administrators will conduct data chats with teachers to see progress and areas of need. Assessment and progress monitoring data will be assess and analyzed to determine how student are responding to instruction and identify needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laura Rodriguez (lrodriguez@somersetcityarts.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Our school will focus on effectively implementing differentiated instruction as well as data driven instruction. This data driven instruction will assist in closing learning gaps by using targeted instruction to meet the needs of our students. This implementation will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, grade level planning sessions, as well as progress monitoring assessment data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Due to the learning gaps identified in our diagnostic assessments, it is imperative that we provide targeted instruction to close these gaps and increase reading proficiency. By implementing differentiated instruction, teachers will be able to meet the needs of all students and provided necessary instruction at their levels.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Provide ongoing coaching in differentiated instruction
2. Meet with teachers for data chats to identify needs
3. Progress monitor students

Person Responsible   Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	After analyzing the assessment data, while we have made improvements in math proficiency, it is still an area of need for our school.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The school's overall math proficiency will increase by 3% as measured by the FAST.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This implementation will be monitored through the checking of lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, grade level planning sessions, as well as assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The teacher will facilitate meaningful discourse that encourages all learners to develop deeper understanding of math concepts. The teacher will provide differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	In order to increase proficiency this strategy will increase rigor and deeper understanding for students.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Professional development on new curriculum & standards
2. Ongoing coaching on differentiated instruction
3. Progress monitoring
4. Student and teacher data chats

Person Responsible   Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)

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 school has adopted the Leader in Me Program as its social and emotional program. Leader in Me focuses on building leaders within the school community. This program promotes the idea that everyone has greatness and is capable of creating their best life. We implement Leader in Me by providing time in the master schedule to teach the Leader in Me curriculum and we hold monthly assemblies to highlight student leaders and promote the 7 habits. We have a lighthouse team comprised of students, teachers, staff and parents who meet monthly to discuss schoolwide initiatives and activities.

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

Key stakeholders include teachers, students, parents and community members. In order to promote a positive culture and environment in our school, we have implemented the Leader in Me SEL program as well as Leader in Me Lighthouse team meetings. These meetings include a variety of stakeholders that discuss was to build a character education program for our students. During this time, feedback is solicited from all stakeholder groups.