

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Somerset Academy Bay School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Somerset Academy Bay

9500 SW 97TH AVE, Miami, FL 33176

www.somersetacademybay.com

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission at Somerset Academy Bay is to provide a loving, caring, and supportive educational environment, which promote the total development of each child: moral, intellectual, social, emotional, and physical; while holding exemplary, high expectations of all stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Somerset Academy Bay we strive to create a thirst for knowledge in all disciplines of the curriculum and enrich every student with a sense of purpose, a belief in their own efficacy, and a commitment to the common good.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hernandez, Sali	Principal	The Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making. The Principal ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS, intervention and documentation, and adequate professional development to support staff. The Principal oversees the implementation of Rtl skills of school staff and communicates with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities. The Principal ensures that instruction is aligned to state academic standards, monitors student achievement, encourages parental involvement, enforces policies and procedures, manages the school's budget, hires and evaluates staff, oversees the facility, and maintains a safe learning environment for all students and staff.
Menendez, Magaly	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the school principal in the leadership, coordination, supervision and management of the school program and daily operation. The Assistant Principal assists in enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty, with emphasis on monitoring the effective implementation of the school's Exceptional Student Education program. As the test chair, I create schedules to ensure all assessments are being done in a timely matter and I also create the master schedules so that students are in the correct courses.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Section 1114(b)(2), the School Improvement Plan (SIP) development process involves engaging a variety of stakeholders to ensure a comprehensive and collaborative approach.

Identification of Stakeholders: The first step is to identify the key stakeholders who have a vested interest in the school's success. Includes the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students, families, and potentially business or community leaders.

Initial Communication: Once stakeholders are identified, the school administration initiates communication to inform them about the upcoming SIP development process. This could involve emails, letters, meetings, or any other appropriate means of communication.

Meetings and Workshops: The school holds meetings, workshops, and focus group sessions to gather input from the various stakeholder groups. These sessions can be held in person, virtually, or through a combination of both to accommodate everyone's availability.

Review of Data: The school leadership team and relevant staff review various types of data, including academic performance, attendance rates, disciplinary records, and more. This helps to identify the specific areas that need improvement and informs the development of the SIP goals.

Collaborative Goal Setting: During the engagement sessions, stakeholders are asked to contribute their perspectives on the school's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges. Collaboratively, the stakeholders and school leadership team set specific goals for improvement, aligning them with the identified areas of need.

Action Plan Development: Based on the established goals, the school leadership team works on developing a detailed action plan. This plan outlines the strategies, activities, timelines, and resources required to achieve the identified goals.

Drafting the SIP: The school leadership team drafts the School Improvement Plan, incorporating the input and suggestions from stakeholders. This document should clearly outline the goals, strategies, responsible parties, and assessment methods.

Feedback and Revisions: The drafted SIP is shared with stakeholders for their review and feedback. This process ensures that their input is accurately reflected, and any necessary revisions are made to the plan.

Final Approval: Once the SIP has been revised and aligned with stakeholder input, it is presented for final approval. This often involves presenting the plan to the governing board, and other relevant decision-making bodies.

Implementation and Monitoring: After approval, the school begins implementing the strategies outlined in the SIP. Regular monitoring and assessment take place to track progress towards the established goals. Adjustments are made as needed based on ongoing feedback and data analysis.

Continuous Communication: Throughout the implementation process, the school maintains open communication with stakeholders, keeping them informed about progress, successes, challenges, and adjustments to the plan.

The involvement of stakeholders is critical to the success of the SIP, as it ensures that the plan is well-rounded, inclusive, and aligned with the needs and priorities of the entire school community.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Data Collection and Analysis: The school collects various types of data, including academic performance data (test scores, grades, etc.), attendance rates, disciplinary records, and other relevant metrics. These data points provide a clear picture of student progress and areas that need improvement.

Establishing Baseline and Targets: Compare the collected data to the baseline established before implementing the SIP. This baseline helps determine whether progress is being made toward the desired outcomes. Targets for improvement are set based on the State's academic standards and the goals outlined in the SIP.

Regular Progress Monitoring: Consistently monitor progress at scheduled intervals, such as quarterly or semi-annually. This involves analyzing the data to see if the strategies outlined in the SIP are yielding the intended results and if there is an impact on closing the achievement gap.

Identifying Successes and Challenges: Through data analysis, we will identify areas of success and challenges. This could involve recognizing strategies that are proving effective and pinpointing areas where further improvements are needed, particularly for students facing achievement gaps.

Stakeholder Input: We will continue to engage stakeholders, including teachers, parents, students, and community members, in the monitoring process. Their input helps provide a comprehensive view of the plan's effectiveness and impact on students.

Ongoing Analysis: The school leadership team, often with the assistance of data analysts or specialists, delves into the data to understand trends and patterns. This analysis helps to identify root causes of challenges and opportunities for improvement.

Revision of Strategies: Based on the analysis, if certain strategies are not yielding the desired results, the school revises them. This could involve modifying the approach, reallocating resources, or trying new methods altogether. Strategies that are proving successful might be expanded or enhanced.

Adjusting Targets: If progress is not aligning with the set targets, the school may adjust the targets to ensure they are ambitious yet achievable. This helps maintain momentum and motivation toward continuous improvement.

Professional Development: Identify opportunities for professional development for teachers and staff based on the data analysis. This ensures that educators have the necessary skills and knowledge to implement the revised strategies effectively.

Communication and Transparency: Throughout the monitoring and revision process, we will communicate transparently with stakeholders. Share the progress made, challenges faced, and the changes being implemented to improve student achievement.

Documentation: Maintains records of the monitoring process, data analysis, revisions made, and the rationale behind those revisions. This documentation serves as evidence of the school's commitment to continuous improvement.

By consistently monitoring the SIP's implementation and its impact on student achievement, we can make informed decisions, address challenges promptly, and ensure that the plan remains effective in narrowing the achievement gap and improving educational outcomes for all students.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	95%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	17%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	6	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	9	1	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	72	60	53	83	62	56	85		
ELA Learning Gains				78			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				78			55		
Math Achievement*	83	66	59	79	58	50	77		
Math Learning Gains				68			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			18		
Science Achievement*	64	58	54	61	64	59	61		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		63	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	491
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	75			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	60			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	69			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	86			
FRL	60			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	72			83			64					
SWD												
ELL	80			80			36				3	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	71			83			63				4	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75			75							2	
FRL	61			69			50				3	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	83	78	78	79	68	44	61					
SWD	45			30								
ELL	77	58		75	64		50					
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK												
HSP	82	76	76	80	69	43	60					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	92	100		67								
FRL	70	72	73	67	50	36	50					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	85	64	55	77	38	18	61					
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	84	62	55	77	40		60					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	91			82								
FRL	66			72								

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	74%	56%	18%	54%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	58%	19%	58%	19%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	82%	52%	30%	50%	32%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	94%	63%	31%	59%	35%
04	2023 - Spring	88%	64%	24%	61%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	79%	58%	21%	55%	24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	64%	50%	14%	51%	13%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Based on our school data, Students With Disabilities earned a 38% in Math demonstrating to be the lowest performance group.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The contributing factors and challenges were:

1. closing the gaps after Covid
2. student interest decline
3. teacher retention

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our school has surpassed the state data.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The component that showed the most improvement was reading. Teachers offered morning tutoring. An interventionist provided small group instruction during reading. The interventionist pulled out students to work on reading comprehension skills.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Students with Disabilities

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

I. Improve SWD in Math

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with Disabilities were identified as a low-performing subgroup earning an 38%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase Students with Disabilities achievement by 3% from 38% to 41% or higher by the state-wide assessment 2023-24.

Monitoring:

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

The Administration Team and the Grade Level Chairs, along with curriculum support, will conduct walk-throughs and data chats on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Magaly Menendez (maggiemenendez@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Somerset Academy Bay will be using FAST PM1, PM2 data, iReady and Performance Matters to help support our students. Our school has hired an interventionist in order to support and ensure that our students are being helped in their specific need. Somerset Academy Bay has purchased additional digital resources for teachers and students to utilize.

Differentiated instruction, data chat, reading, and math interventions will be tailored to students needs. Progress monitoring and vertical planning will assist in developing lessons to target students needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Limitations on interventionists, lack of attention, the number of percent of students that were targeted through intervention, vertical alignment did not occur.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

All stakeholders work together to promote a positive culture and environment. The administration team has an open-door policy and welcomes ideas from all stakeholders. Somerset Academy Bay is proud of the parental involvement that has been established at our school. The school staff, business partners, parents, and students are involved because they participate in EESAC meetings and our school events.

During PTO school meetings, parents can discuss any information they would like to share or inform the school about. We also address the SWD to encourage and support our subgroups. We ensure that we offer before-school tutoring, pull-out sessions, and push-ins.

Somerset Academy Bay strives to establish and maintain a positive school culture and environment by implementing incentive programs that promote attendance, good behavior, and academic achievement for all students. Efforts also focus on strengthening collegial relationships and enhancing staff morale. Student attendance is encouraged through parental involvement and school-wide activities, such as Student of the Month and honor roll assemblies. Furthermore, we foster a positive school culture and environment among faculty and staff through team-building activities and opportunities to convene and share knowledge and experiences.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Somerset Academy Bay aims to increase participation in all school activities, including before school tutoring and staff team building activities, by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Positive culture and environment will be monitored throughout the school year using sign-in sheets, attendance records, parent meetings, parent-teacher conferences, and school-wide activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Magaly Menendez (maggiemenendez@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Peer-Mediated Instruction and Support, which will encourage peer relationships and engagement by promoting collaborative learning and assigning peer mentors to provide academic and social support to SWD. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS): Implement a school-wide PBIS framework to foster positive behavior and prevent challenging behaviors through clear expectations, reinforcement strategies, and data-driven decision-making. Differentiated Instruction: use D.I. strategies to tailor instruction to various ability levels, allowing SWD to receive individualized support while collaborating with peers. Data Analysis: establish student support teams that regularly review data and make informed decisions regarding interventions and support services for SWD. Family Engagement and Communication: maintain open communication with parents and guardians of SWD, involving them in the decision-making process and providing resources to support learning at home. Mentoring and Peer Support Programs: mentoring programs where older students or peers provide support and guidance to SWD, fostering a sense of belonging and community.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for using these strategies collectively is to create a well-rounded and inclusive educational experience for SWD. Each strategy targets different facets of their learning journey, ultimately contributing to their academic success, personal growth, and overall well-being. The synergistic effect of implementing these strategies together enhances the overall support network for SWD, fostering an environment where all students can reach their full potential.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Needs Assessment and Improvement Plan: conduct a thorough needs assessment to identify areas that require improvement. This assessment considers academic performance, student demographics, attendance, behavior data, and other relevant indicators.

Improvement Goals: based on the needs assessment, Somerset Academy Bay will set specific improvement goals aligned with our mission, student population, and instructional approach.

Resource Allocation Strategy: develop a strategy for allocating resources to address the identified improvement needs. This strategy might involve determining the percentage of the budget allocated to improvement initiatives.

Data-Informed Decisions: use data and evidence-based practices to inform decisions about which interventions and strategies to implement.

Implementation and Monitoring: implement the approved improvement initiatives. Monitoring systems are put in place to track progress toward improvement goals using data and performance metrics.

Reporting and Accountability: provide regular reports on the progress of improvement initiatives, including data on student outcomes and resource utilization.

Continuous Improvement: continuously assess the effectiveness of their improvement initiatives and make adjustments as needed to ensure they are achieving the desired outcomes.

Transparency and Communication: maintain communication with all stakeholders, including parents, teachers, students, and the charter school office, regarding resource allocation decisions and progress updates.

Collaboration and Learning Exchange: collaborating with other schools and sharing best practices.