Somerset Preparatory Academy High School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Somerset Preparatory Academy High School Homestead

3000 SE 9TH ST, Homestead, FL 33035

[no web address on file]

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.

Somerset Academy, Inc. promotes a transformational culture that maximizes student achievement and the development of accountable, global learners in a safe and enriching environment that fosters high-quality education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering students to explore global learning opportunities to promote and enrich their communities and the communities we serve.

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
Mesa, Jessica	Principal	
Killins, Jason	Assistant Principal	
Quiroga, Mary	Instructional Coach	
Stay, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Andrade, Carolyn	Assistant Principal	

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.

Initially school admin meets monthly to review school needs, followed by monthly leadership team meetings, and department meetings. We review school wide data and ensure baseline assessments are implemented with fidelity in order to identify our students' areas of growth. Throughout the year, we we hold EESAC meetings where additional stakeholder input is welcomed. Staff, parents, students, families and community members all attend and contribute to assist in brainstorming possible plans of action to improve student academic performance.

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))

Our SIP will be monitored on a quarterly basis as students complete progress monitoring assessments. Teachers will ensure to administer mini benchmark assessments and review data on Performance Matters. They will also use PM1 coupled with standards mastery assessments in iXL and Study Island to monitor progress and tailor instruction as needed. Students with the greatest achievement gap will participate in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. These students will be closely monitored by their teachers as well as work closely with our interventionist. Furthermore, they will be encouraged to attend afterschool tutoring to help bridge their academic gap.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	96%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	80%
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
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	97	97
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level 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	55	55

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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
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	97

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	42

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) 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 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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*	53	55	50	59	54	51	47		
ELA Learning Gains				58			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			41		
Math Achievement*	27	43	38	40	42	38	27		
Math Learning Gains				49			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			31		
Science Achievement*	59	62	64	49	41	40	50		
Social Studies Achievement*	43	69	66	41	56	48	68		
Middle School Acceleration					56	44			
Graduation Rate	86	89	89	96	56	61			
College and Career Acceleration	58	70	65	70	67	67			
ELP Progress	63	49	45	59			86		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	86

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	602
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	96

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	15	Yes	2	2
ELL	33	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	2	1
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	48			

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	10	Yes	1	1
ELL	30	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	57			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	46			

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	53			27			59	43		86	58	63
SWD	24			6							2	
ELL	29			16			30	27			5	63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			13							2	
HSP	55			28			56	45		62	7	63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	50			24			59	43			5	65

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	59	58	36	40	49	45	49	41		96	70	59
SWD	10											
ELL	10	35	31	5	42	50	10					59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	50		13	36							
HSP	61	61	41	46	54	44	51	38		96	73	63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	55	53	29	39	50	47	48	37				59

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	47	54	41	27	32	31	50	68				86
SWD	9			0								
ELL	29	46		38	45							86
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	48	55	43	29	33	29	50	67				85
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	43	52	40	21	29	33	45	68				92

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
10	2023 - Spring	58%	54%	4%	50%	8%
09	2023 - Spring	45%	51%	-6%	48%	-3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	20%	56%	-36%	50%	-30%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	39%	52%	-13%	48%	-9%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	65%	-8%	63%	-6%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	45%	66%	-21%	63%	-18%

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.

According to the comprehensive school data analysis, the proficiency rate for High School Algebra 1 FAST scores stood at 22%. Several potential factors that might have influenced student achievement include deficient foundational understanding, ineffective instructional techniques, and variations in teacher expertise.

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

The most significant decrease in data compared to the previous year was observed in Algebra 1, with the proficiency rate falling from 43% to 20%. Several factors played a role in this decline, including ineffective teaching methods, alterations in the assessment approach, and a lack of solid foundational knowledge.

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.

Compared to the state average, the most significant disparity was evident in Algebra 1, with a notable 32% difference in proficiency rates. Several contributing factors have contributed to this gap, such as ineffective teaching methods, changes in assessment strategies, and a deficiency in strong foundational knowledge.

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

Based on the extensive school data analysis, the most notable progress was evident in U.S. History, where proficiency surged from 40% to 45%. The school implemented new measures to boost performance, including providing additional support through after-school tutoring, mentoring, and student study groups.

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

Level 1 ELA
Level 1 Math

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

1. Elevating student performance in core subjects, including math, science, and literacy.
2. Using data to inform instructional decisions and identify areas in need of improvement.
3. Preparing students for post-secondary education and future careers.
4. Establish Professional Learning Communitites that create opportunities for teachers to collaborate and share best practices.
5. Fostering a positive and inclusive school climate where students feel safe and motivated to learn

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

Based on the attendance data for the district and the rates of out-of-school suspensions, our primary goal is to reduce these occurrences. While our students have shown commendable performance, there is always room for improvement. We recognize that exclusionary discipline methods, such as suspensions and expulsions, can negatively affect students by denying them valuable learning opportunities. Moreover, these punitive measures tend to impact students of color and those with disabilities disproportionately.

To address these issues, we aim to establish strong relationships among students, teachers, and families. Together, we can ensure that we meet each student's holistic needs, considering their academic development and overall well-being. It is equally important to focus on the well-being of our educators, who play a crucial role in facilitating our students' learning experiences. They should feel valued and supported in their roles.

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

Our objective is to reduce outdoor student suspensions by 25% by implementing proactive intervention programs and peer mediation systems. To gauge the impact and effectiveness of these measures, we will conduct quarterly assessments of disciplinary actions. Additionally, we plan to evaluate the effectiveness of intervention program sessions through post-session surveys.

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

We aim to decrease student outdoor suspensions by 25% by implementing proactive intervention programs and peer mediation systems. We will regularly monitor disciplinary actions every quarter to assess the impact and effectiveness of these measures. Surveys will be conducted after intervention program sessions to analyze effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Killins (jkillins@somersetprephomestead.com)

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.)

The administration will monitor the effectiveness of the proactive and peer-involved support system and data will be collected quarterly to assess the impact of these measures.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Proactive measures aim to prevent disciplinary issues before they occur. By addressing potential problems early, schools can reduce the incidence of disruptive or harmful behavior, creating a more conducive learning environment.

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.

1. Identify the target group of students based on discipline data and EWS
2. Create programs to assist with preventative interventions
3. Implement programs and monitor with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Jason Killins (jkillins@somersetprephomestead.com)

By When: We will regularly monitor disciplinary actions every quarter to assess the impact and effectiveness of these measures.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

Based on the data analysis, our ESSA Subgroup, English Language Learners, is currently not meeting the expected proficiency. As a school, this group of students had an overall proficiency of 30%, as measured in 2022-2023. Our school expects this area to increase overall proficiency for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 English language proficiency assessment, the goal of our school will be to increase the overall percentage points for our English Language Learner subgroup by 5%. Moving from 30% to 35% respectively.

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

The area of focus will be progress monitored regularly and adjustments will be made to achieve desired outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

We now have two support facilitators that are pushing in and pulling out as needed. In addition, we have hired a full-time certified ESOL instructor. The district-mandated curriculum will be integrated to close learning gaps. Our ELL learners are proactive in ensuring they properly communicate with all stakeholders to secure implementation fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To meet their needs, these students require specific language instruction and the regular curriculum being delivered as part of the grade-level content.

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

Our middle school's SWD subgroup scored 10%, and the Black/African American subgroup scored 36% under the Federal Percent of Points Index. This indicates that our students with disabilities need additional support to reach proficiency. Last year, we only had one support facilitator. Luckily, we have been able to augment our support in this area for the 23-24 school year. We now have two support facilitators that are pushing in and pulling out as needed. Our SWDs proactively ensure they properly communicate with all stakeholders to secure implementation fidelity. This additional support, coupled with prescribed and tailored Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention, will ensure that our SWD population gets the support needed to bridge the gap and increase their proficiency percentage.

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

The school will use data disaggregation strategies to predict proficiencies and deficiencies. Differentiated instruction needs to be implemented to focus on individualized student needs. Differentiated instruction will be utilized to address the needs of all subgroups, including implementing interventions (tutoring, push-ins, pull-outs, etc.).

The goal of our school will be to increase the overall percentage points for our SWD subgroup by 5% and the Black/African American subgroup by 5%. Moving from 10% to 15% and 36% to 41% respectively.

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

-Informed Data Chats (based on the Department of Education)
-Common Planning (based on the Department of Education)
-Data disaggregation strategies to predict proficiencies

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Quiroga (mquiroga@somersetprephomestead.com)

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.)

We now have two support facilitators that are pushing in and pulling out as needed. Our SWDs proactively ensure they properly communicate with all stakeholders to secure implementation fidelity. This additional support, coupled with prescribed and tailored Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention, will ensure that our SWD and Black/African-American population gets the support needed to bridge the gap and increase their proficiency percentage.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale of these evidence-based interventions is to ensure that resources, time, and effort are directed toward strategies that are more likely to produce positive results. Tailored Tier 2 and Tier 3, intervention will ensure that our SWD and Black/African-American population gets the support needed to bridge the gap and increase their proficiency percentage.

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

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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).

Our High school's sub-groups scored 36% for our Black population, 30% for our ELL population, and 10% for our SWDs. All of the previously mentioned sub-groups need additional support to reach proficiency. Last year, we only had one support facilitator. Luckily, we have been able to augment our support in this area for the 23-24 school year. We now have two support facilitators that are pushing in and pulling out as needed. Our SWDs will be proactive in ensuring they properly communicate with all stakeholders to secure implementation fidelity. This additional support, coupled with prescribed tailored Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention, will ensure that our SWD population gets the support needed to bridge the gap and increase their proficiency percentage. Our ELL population will follow the life and impact program curriculum to address and close learning gaps. We will ensure that the program is monitored and utilized with fidelity. Differentiated instruction will address the needs of the diverse learners within the classroom. According to the research, differentiated instruction is efficient and effective for all students. The results of multiple studies show that when ELL learners are exposed to differentiated instruction, there is an improvement in their scores. The Black student population will benefit from increased positive adult relationships with the school. Furthermore, we will establish clear and consistent communication channels between the school and black parents. This will include regular newsletters, emails, phone calls, and a user-friendly school website.