**Miami-Dade County Public Schools** 

# **Somerset Oaks Academy**



2022-23 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       | 16 |
|                                |    |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0  |
|                                |    |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

## **Somerset Oaks Academy**

1000 OLD DIXIE HWY, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetoaks.com

### **Demographics**

Principal: Idalia Suarez M

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2014

|   | ·   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-8  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021-22 Title I School  | Yes   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 94%   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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: B (57%)<br>2018-19: C (49%)<br>2017-18: C (49%)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*   |  |  |  |  |  |
| SI Region   | Southeast   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regional Executive Director   | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Support Tier  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ESSA Status   | ATSI  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo  | or more information, <u>click here</u> .  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### **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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### 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       | 16 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

### **Somerset Oaks Academy**

1000 OLD DIXIE HWY, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetoaks.com

#### **School Demographics**

| hool Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)              |
|--|------------------------|---|
| Combination School<br>KG-8                     | Yes                    | 94%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)        | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education                         | Yes                    | 96%   |

#### **School Grades History**

| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | В       |         | С       | С       |

#### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### **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 Oaks Academy is to foster the development of responsible, self-directed, lifelong learners by maximizing student achievement. Somerset Oaks is committed to providing a safe environment where future leaders are inspired to learn, explore and create through student centered learning, all while developing the whole child.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Somerset Oaks Academy will provide a rigorous academic curriculum in a nurturing environment by setting high expectations for both students and teachers. The school will meet and exceed high standards of student achievement by delivering a rigorous school curriculum, where emphasis is given to personalization in student mastery of the State Standards. As well, it will supplement and enhance instructions through high-quality curricular and extra-curricular programs. The school will provide ample opportunities for students, families, and the community to be active educational partners in education. The school will continuously monitor, evaluate, and improve curriculum to achieve continuous student improvement each year.

#### 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<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|
| Gomez,<br>Marcelo   | Assistant<br>Principal | The vice principal will support the principal in areas concerning personnel, facilities, academics, activities, and budget. Together with the principal the vice principal will evaluate the effectiveness of the schools academic program through walkthroughs, weekly monitoring of lessons plans, teacher professionalism, communication, and teacher observations.  |
| Cruz,<br>Ximena     | Assistant<br>Principal | The vice principal will support the principal in areas concerning personnel, facilities, academics, activities, and budget. Together, with the principal, the vice principal will evaluate the effectiveness of the schools academic program through walkthroughs, weekly monitoring of lesson plans, teacher professionalism, communication, and teacher observations. |
| Ochoa,<br>Yadira    | Instructional<br>Coach | She will provide immediate support across grade levels in mathematics and science. She will help support the implementation of school wide math, science and STEM academic programs as well as model and provide feedback and resources to assist teachers.   |
| Garcia,<br>Annette  | Teacher,<br>ESE        | Will oversee the special education program at the school and help monitor all ESE students and that they receive the services required by their IEP.  |
| Detres,<br>Vashti   | School<br>Counselor    | She will oversee the school wide leadership program. She works directly with our ESE Department to provide support and services for our students.   |
| Gonzalez,<br>Carlos | Dean                   | He will oversee the overall implementation of the school code of conduct across all grade levels. He helps ensure the school wide behavior management system is in place and will support and monitor the effectiveness. He will also assist teachers in the implementation of the program along with provide guidance for individual classroom systems                 |

#### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Friday 8/1/2014, 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.

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.

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

#### Total number of students enrolled at the school

623

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

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

**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  |    |    |    |    | C  | <b>3rad</b> | le Le | evel |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|-------------|-------|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5           | 6     | 7    | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 91 | 71 | 69 | 54 | 48 | 75          | 90    | 57   | 55 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 610   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1           | 2     | 5    | 2  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 32 | 2  | 1  | 0  | 2  | 15          | 18    | 19   | 25 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 114   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 4  | 6  | 9  | 2  | 1  | 2           | 2     | 2    | 1  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0  | 5  | 5  | 1  | 3  | 3           | 7     | 5    | 2  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8  | 9  | 17          | 19    | 16   | 10 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 79    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 7  | 33          | 22    | 16   | 15 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 97    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1  | 10 | 28 | 26 | 17 | 51          | 49    | 42   | 27 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 251   |

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 |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                            | K           | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 3           | 11 | 15 | 3 | 11 | 12 | 43 | 38 | 29 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 165   |

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

| Indicator                           |    |    |   |   | ( | 3ra | de | Lev | /el |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|----|----|---|---|---|-----|----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                           | K  | 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5   | 6  | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 11 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0   | 2  | 3   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0   | 3  | 0   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/13/2022

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

| la dia atau  |    |    |    |    | (  | 3rad | le Le | evel |    |   |    |    |    | Tatal |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|------|-------|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator  | K  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5    | 6     | 7    | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 90 | 73 | 70 | 54 | 48 | 76   | 94    | 61   | 58 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 624   |
| 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  | 0  | 1    | 0     | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 3  | 7  | 8  | 8  | 0  | 1    | 21    | 3    | 3  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 54    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 3  | 12 | 4  | 12 | 4  | 9    | 24    | 8    | 6  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 82    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19 | 18 | 6    | 10    | 12   | 4  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 69    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29 | 25 | 19   | 7     | 5    | 2  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 87    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 26 | 7  | 22 | 8  | 4  | 42   | 31    | 27   | 22 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 189   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                            | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 3           | 13 | 13 | 12 | 20 | 47 | 60 | 40 | 32 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 240   |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 4 | 6           | 0 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |  |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |  |  |

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

| Indicator  |    |    |    |    | C  | arad | le Le | evel |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|------|-------|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5    | 6     | 7    | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 90 | 73 | 70 | 54 | 48 | 76   | 94    | 61   | 58 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 624   |
| 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  | 0  | 1    | 0     | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 3  | 7  | 8  | 8  | 0  | 1    | 21    | 3    | 3  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 54    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 3  | 12 | 4  | 12 | 4  | 9    | 24    | 8    | 6  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 82    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19 | 18 | 6    | 10    | 12   | 4  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 69    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29 | 25 | 19   | 7     | 5    | 2  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 87    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 26 | 7  | 22 | 8  | 4  | 42   | 31    | 27   | 22 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 189   |

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

| Indicator                            |   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    | Total |     |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|                                      |   | 1           | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12    |     |
| Students with two or more indicators | 3 | 13          | 13 | 12 | 20 | 47 | 60 | 40 | 32 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 240 |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| lu di cata u                        | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator                           |             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12    | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 4           | 6 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 31    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 3     |

## 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).

| Sahaal Grada Companent      |        | 2022     |       |        | 2021     |       | 2019   |          |       |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |
| ELA Achievement             | 44%    | 62%      | 55%   |        |          |       | 51%    | 63%      | 61%   |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 60%    |          |       |        |          |       | 57%    | 61%      | 59%   |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 61%    |          |       |        |          |       | 49%    | 57%      | 54%   |  |
| Math Achievement            | 44%    | 51%      | 42%   |        |          |       | 49%    | 67%      | 62%   |  |
| Math Learning Gains         | 71%    |          |       |        |          |       | 49%    | 63%      | 59%   |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 67%    |          |       |        |          |       | 43%    | 56%      | 52%   |  |
| Science Achievement         | 32%    | 60%      | 54%   |        |          |       | 39%    | 56%      | 56%   |  |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 37%    | 68%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 45%    | 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 01         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 02         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 03         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 56%    | 60%      | -4%                               | 58%   | -2%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 41%    | 64%      | -23%                              | 58%   | -17%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -56%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 52%    | 60%      | -8%                               | 56%   | -4%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -41%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 06         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 54%    | 58%      | -4%                               | 54%   | 0%                             |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -52%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 42%    | 56%      | -14%                              | 52%   | -10%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -54%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 46%    | 60%      | -14%                              | 56%   | -10%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -42%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            |          |        | MATH     | 1                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 01         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 02         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 03         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 47%    | 67%      | -20%                              | 62%   | -15%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 41%    | 69%      | -28%                              | 64%   | -23%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -47%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            |          |        | MATH     | ł                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
|            | 2019     | 33%    | 65%      | -32%                              | 60%   | -27%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -41%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 06         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 66%    | 58%      | 8%                                | 55%   | 11%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -33%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 56%    | 53%      | 3%                                | 54%   | 2%                             |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -66%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 23%    | 40%      | -17%                              | 46%   | -23%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -56%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            |          |        | SCIENC   | E                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 47%    | 53%      | -6%                               | 53%   | -6%                            |
| Cohort Co  | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 06         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Cor | mparison | -47%   | ·        |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Coi | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 19%    | 43%      | -24%                              | 48%   | -29%                           |
| Cohort Coi | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|      |          | BIOLO    | GY EOC                                  |       |                          |
|------|----------|----------|---|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School   | District | School<br>trict Minus State<br>District |       | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |          |          |   |       |                          |
| 2019 |          |          |   |       |                          |
|      |          | CIVIC    | CS EOC                                  |       |                          |
| Year | School   | District | School<br>Minus<br>District             | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |          |          |   |       |                          |
| 2019 | 46%      | 73%      | -27%                                    | 71%   | -25%                     |
|      |          | HISTO    | RY EOC                                  |       |                          |
| Year | School   | District | School<br>Minus<br>District             | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |   |       | <u> </u>                 |

|      |        | HISTO    | ORY EOC                     |          |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State    | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |          |                          |
|      |        | ALGE     | BRA EOC                     | <u> </u> |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State    | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |          |                          |
| 2019 | 62%    | 63%      | -1%                         | 61%      | 1%                       |
|      |        | GEOM     | TRY EOC                     |          |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State    | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |          |                          |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |          |                          |

### Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2022      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 |
| SWD       | 11          | 57        | 69                | 16           | 64         | 64                 | 11          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 29          | 52        | 63                | 39           | 69         | 70                 | 7           | 17         |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 35          | 58        |                   | 26           | 68         | 64                 |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 43          | 59        | 62                | 45           | 72         | 72                 | 32          | 33         | 92           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 62          | 71        |                   | 57           | 71         |                    | 50          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 43          | 59        | 60                | 44           | 70         | 66                 | 32          | 38         | 93           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2021      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMP     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 13          | 34        | 38                | 12           | 21         | 15                 | 21          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 30          | 44        | 54                | 21           | 21         | 17                 | 21          | 44         | 33           |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 29          | 17        |                   | 14           | 22         |                    | 9           |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 37          | 42        | 45                | 26           | 23         | 19                 | 30          | 47         | 50           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 48          | 47        |                   | 43           | 33         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 37          | 41        | 44                | 27           | 23         | 19                 | 27          | 48         | 48           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMP     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 21          | 38        | 37                | 17           | 29         | 31                 |             | 20         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 47          | 56        | 59                | 51           | 54         | 51                 | 37          | 21         |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 59          | 63        |                   | 38           | 47         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 50          | 57        | 51                | 48           | 49         | 43                 | 38          | 44         | 58           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 57          | 53        |                   | 62           | 60         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 50          | 56        | 52                | 48           | 50         | 42                 | 40          | 44         | 67           |                         |                           |

### **ESSA Data Review**

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

| This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.                     |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 58   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 72   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 581  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 38   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 46   |
| 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                                 | 50   |
| 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  | 58  |
| 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   | 62  |
| 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                                | 58  |
| 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 and desegregating the ELA FAST progress monitor data, our school, in grades 3-8 scored similar to the overall district and state data. The data reveled the 50% of our students scored level 1, 26% of our students scored at a level 2, 15% of our students scored at a level 3, 7% of our students scored at a level 4, and 2% of our students scored at a level 5. The FAST Math data demonstrated that 73% of students scored a level 1, 20% of our students scored a level 2, 6% of our students scored a level 3, and 1% of our students scored a level 4. The assessments are made to target instruction that will be taught during the entire school year. The data provided in this reports will help teachers identify small group instruction and where to target instruction.

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

The progress monitor data indicates several areas in need of improvement in both ELA and Math. The greatest need for improvements for ELA would be better target informational text, and for Math it would be geometric reasoning, measurement, and Data Analysis and Probability. The 2022 state assessment data reveled that our greatest need for improvement is 7th grade civics, and 8th grade science. As our score dropped from the previous school year.

## 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 were learning gaps based on the complexity of the components assess on the standardized assessments.

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

Based on sate assessment data, our most improvement is learning gains across the board. Almost every grade-level in grades 3-8, for both ELA and Math demonstrated tremendous by showing growth in learning gains and even significant growth in proficiency. Our Progress monitoring data for Kindergarten through second grade also showed great improvement as most students, achieved their typical growth for both reading and math.

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

After analyzing school data, new actions steps were taken to ensure success. New innovative curriculum was purchased to assist in closing learning gaps as well as maintain rigor. In addition, new support staff has been hired to provide student with targeted small group instruction.

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

New strategies have already been implemented in order to accerlerate learning. There is a new lesson plan format in which emphasizes the importance of accelerated learning and includes the components needed to ensure accelerated learning takes place. Research based strategies such as the gradual release are included in lesson plans to ensure accelerated instruction is taking place.

# 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.

Professional development and continuous improvement is an essential part of our school. Teachers and support staffed have been trained in accelerated learning and explicit instruction. School administrators check lesson plans weekly and conduct daily walkthroughs to ensure these strategies are being implemented with fidelity.

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

New support staff has been hired to provide teachers with additional support in differentiated instruction. Teachers receive support during intervention, DI in reading, and DI in math. In addition, new curriculum has been purchased to support student achievement specifically in ELA, and science. Observations are conducted daily to ensure implementation.

#### 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 Differentiation

**Area of Focus Description and** 

Rationale:

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 **Include a rationale that** improve proficiency scores in ELA, math and science. Differentiated instruction will assist in promoting student achievement as it will help teachers tailor instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve by implementing effective differentiated instruction is to increase reading, math, and 5th grade science proficiency by 10 points in each grade-level.

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:

Ximena Cruz (xcruz@somersetoaks.com)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the evidencebased strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Our school will focus on the evidence based strategy of effectively implementing differentiated instruction as well as data driven instruction. This data driven instruction will assist in closing learning gaps by using targeted instruction. This implementation will be monitored through the checking of lesson plans. classroom walkthroughs, grade level planning sessions, as well as assessment data.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: **Explain the rationale** for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used

for selecting this

strategy.

Differentiated instruction and data driven instruction will ensure that teachers are using data to guide planning and instruction to successfully target students. Adjustments will be made to plans and instruction as needed according to data.

#### **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.

The school will prepare professional development trainings on the topics of differentiated instruction and data driven instruction.

Yadira Ochoa (yochoa@somersetoaks.com) Person Responsible

#### #2. 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 our school wide data, we noticed we can benefit from increasing our math proficiency across all grade levels.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific

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

The measurable outcome would be to increase out Math Achievement levels by 10 points.

**Monitoring:** 

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

This will be monitored through checking lesson plans along with classroom walkthroughs, and constant monitoring of assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marcelo Gomez (mgomez@somersetoaks.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidencebased strategy being
implemented for this Area
of Focus.

The evidence based strategy that will be implemented for effectively increasing math achievements and learning gains will be a school wide fluency program and math interventions. Students will be provided with weekly drills and students who scored a level 1 or a level 2 on the FSA will be participating in Math Interventions 2 times a week.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Research indicates that students struggling with math may benefit from early intervention in math fluency aimed at improving their math ability. There is a high level of evidence that implementing these math fluency drill and interventions, will result in increased numbers of proficiency.

#### **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.

Data will be analyzed to identify level 1 and 2 students to add to math interventions. The leadership team will monitor for the effective implementation of the math interventions and fluency drills. The leadership team will schedule growth monitoring every 21 instructional days to see progress students have made.

Person Responsible Marce

Marcelo Gomez (mgomez@somersetoaks.com)

#### #3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

According to our 2022 school wide data, our students achievement in the ESSA subgroup specifically relating to students with disabilities is at 38% falling under the federal index of 41%. Although we have increased significantly since the previous school year, from 22% to 38% a 16 point increase, our goal is to be at or above the Federal Index of 41%.

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

The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to be at or above the Federal Index of 41%

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

ESE coordinator will created a schedule for ESE support department to provided students with small group instruction. Coordinator will monitor the fidelity of this small group instruction by completing daily walkthroughs as well as closely monitoring progress monitoring data. This will help support learning gains and student success and achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Annette Garcia (agarcia@somersetoaks.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

outcome.

Describe the evidencebased strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Students with disabilities will be provided with targeted small group instruction provided by our ESE support team to assist in raising proficiency levels and close learning gaps.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

ESE coordinator will created a schedule for ESE support department to provided students with small group instruction. Coordinator will monitor the fidelity of this small group instruction by completing daily walkthroughs as well as closely monitoring progress monitoring data.

#### **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.

ESE coordinator and ESE support staff will be scheduled into classes to provide DI support to provide SWD targeted instruction and additional support.

Person Responsible Annette Garcia (agarcia@somersetoaks.com)

#### **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

Instructional Practices specifically related to ELA for grades K-2 is our new I-Ready Magnetics program. This programs targets reading foundations skills that are aligned with the Florida Best Standards. This will target our area of focus, to increase ELA proficiency.

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

Instructional Practices specifically related to ELA for grades 3-5 is I-Ready, phonics for Reading as well as fluency for all students. These programs target reading foundations skills such as phonics that are aligned with the Florida Best Standards. This will target our area of focus, to increase ELA proficiency.

#### 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)**

Students in grades K-2 will graduate out of foundational skills by AP 3 and all students will show half their stretch goal by AP 2. In addition, all students will demonstrate growth in the progress monitoring assessments.

#### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Students in grades 3-5 will graduate out of foundational skills and phonics by AP 3 and all students will show half their stretch goal by AP 2. In addition, all students will demonstrate growth in the progress monitoring assessments.

#### **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.

Teachers will participate in ongoing data chats with admin and leadership team members to determine areas of needs and where to focus instruction. Data will be monitored weekly to see progress and implementation.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cruz, Ximena, xcruz@somersetoaks.com

#### **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 Evidencebased Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Differentiated instruction, a reached/evidence based strategy will be implemented daily as well as interventions to achieve the measurable outcomes. In addition, additional support staff has been hired to support teacher during DI time.

#### 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?

DI has proven to be an effective strategy at our school as our data indicates high percentage growth in student learning gains.

#### **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

New curriculum will be implemented to assist in closing learning gaps. This curriculum is state adopted and aligned with the best standards to ensure student success. Teachers have been participating in ongoing professional development to ensure mastery of the material being implemented.

Gomez, Marcelo , mgomez@somersetoaks.com

Admin will monitor implementation and ensure that instructional staff and support staff are implementing DI and reading interventions with fidelity. Our instructional coach will conduct meetings to plan with grade levels and provide them with assistance in DI and modeling lessons. Data chats will be held to analyze data to determine progress and identify areas for growth. Walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure classroom routines and strategies are being implemented effectively and consistently.

Cruz, Ximena, xcruz@somersetoaks.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 implements a wide variety of communication methods in order to inform parents about upcoming events. Some of these methods include: monthly school calendar (posted on school website and emailed by homeroom teacher), PALS (Parents as Liaisons) newsletters, Constant Contact emails, Shutterfly class webpages, classroom websites, Parent Academy workshops and Remind 101. Principal and Assistant Principal will monitor implementation and review sign in sheets to determine the number of parents attending school or community events for effectiveness. Teachers also use Class DOJO/ as a means of communication on a daily basis to the parents in regards to academic and behavioral progress and/or concerns.

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

Key stakeholders include teachers, students, and community. In order to promote a positive culture and environment in our school, we have implemented the Leader in me character development 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. Our parent association known as parent PALS, meets monthly to discuss events or other activities that can be implemented to create a positive culture in our school. Grade level meetings are also held monthly to discuss the needs of each grade level and what needs to be implemented to ensure students have a positive learning environment.