

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Somerset Preparatory Academy (Homestead)



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Somerset Preparatory Academy (Homestead)

3000 S.E. NINTH STREET, Homestead, FL 33033

[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	
Andrade, Carolyn	Assistant Principal	
Stay, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Quiroga, Mary	Instructional Coach	

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 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 AP1 coupled with standards mastery assessments in iReady 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)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	94%
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: C
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	2	2	2	0	0	0	9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	1	7	0	1	2	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	1	1	7	1	1	2	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	11	11	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	6	14	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	22	24	0	0	0	64

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	1	2	0	0	0	3

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	1	1	7	2	1	2	0	0	0	14
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	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	5	4	15	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	2	22	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	4	15	0	0	0	24

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	5	1	9	0	0	0	15

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in 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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	4	15	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	2	22	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	4	15	0	0	0	24

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	5	1	9	0	0	0	15

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	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	60	53	50	62	56	44		
ELA Learning Gains				58			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52					
Math Achievement*	63	66	59	43	58	50	34		
Math Learning Gains				37			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50					
Science Achievement*	53	58	54	29	64	59	21		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	63	63	59	63			60		

* 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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	294
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48

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	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
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	50			
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	66			
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	55			

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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	61			
HSP	46			

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				
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			63			53					63
SWD	45			55							2	
ELL	39			37			31				4	63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	62			67							3	
HSP	49			63			49				5	63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67			50							2	
FRL	49			59			49				5	62

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	50	58	52	43	37	50	29					63
SWD	36											
ELL	38	61	75	36	30		8					63
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	67			55								
HSP	46	59	55	39	33	50	27					62
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	47	59	52	40	34	50	23					63

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	44	39		34	24		21					60
SWD												
ELL	31			23								60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	39	40		29	21		16					63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	40	36		28	9		11					65

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	51%	56%	-5%	54%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	58%	-4%	58%	-4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	64%	52%	12%	50%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	63%	13%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	64%	8%	61%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	58%	-11%	55%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	50%	3%	51%	2%

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.

The Spring 23, Math data showed that numbers and sense scored lowest in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade. Number Sense is the ability to relate numbers to the quantities they represent. Operations are the computations (addition, subtraction, multiplication and division) that students perform with numbers. Number Sense and Operations should be taught together, as well as in conjunction with other mathematical strands. Given that, last year's scores are measuring our COVID Kinder, 1st, and 2nd graders. This indicates that our students are still lacking in foundational skills and could benefit from reinforcing basic number sense and operation.

In Reading, 3rd grade scored lowest on informational text, 4th grade in prose, and 5th grade across genres. Ensuring we properly tailor our instruction this year with our 4th, 5th, and 6th graders to address these topics will be critical in seeing gains. Differentiated instruction and small groups will need to be closely monitored and tailored.

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

When reviewing the Spring 2023 data, growth was shown in all grade levels for Reading, Math, and Science.

Third to fifth grade Reading proficiency increased from 49% to 56%.

Third to fifth grade Math proficiency increased from 42% to 65%.

Fifth grade Science proficiency increased from 29% to 53%.

We are excited to see that the initiatives and best practices implemented during the 22-23 school year yielded a 7% increase in reading, a 23% increase in math, and a 24% increase in science proficiency.

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.

When reviewing the Spring 2023, the greatest gap between SPA and the state were found in 4th grade Reading and 5th grade Math.

4th grade Reading data showed proficiency as follows: State 58%, District 58%, SPA 54%. SPA had a 4 point gap with the state.

5th grade Math data showed proficiency as follows: State 55%, District 58%, SPA 47%. SPA had an 8 point gap with the state.

We did have an increase in our ELL students last year and foresee their performance being directly related to the gap. However, we will continue to tailor our instruction and push small group intervention to better service our students and diminish academic gaps when compared to the state average.

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

Improvements in our school data for the 22-23 school year were seen across grade levels and subjects. In Reading, the greatest improvement was seen in 3rd grade where proficiency improved from 50% to 64%.

In Math the greatest gains were seen in the 4th grade class where proficiency improved from 27% to 73%. When tracking the 21-22 4th grade class, they grew from a proficiency of 27% to 46%. Science showed great improvements as well, growing from 29% proficiency to 53%.

This past year we focused on moving our students in each of their lowest domains. We ensured teachers implemented small group with fidelity and communicated constantly with our interventionist. We also made them attend tutoring twice a week per subject as needed.

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

When reflecting on Early Warning Signs, the two potential areas of concern are the seven retained second grade students as well as the fourteen fifth grade students that scored a 1 in Math. Those students are lacking the foundational skills required to succeed in 6th grade Math.

We will ensure that extra support is given to these subgroups and that tailored instruction is implemented with fidelity to ensure academic gains.

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

1. When reviewing the data, we would like to focus on maintaining a high proficiency rating in 3rd grade and ensure there is no decrease in 4th grade Reading.
2. We would like to prevent any decrease in 3rd grade proficiency because of novice teachers. We must ensure proper support is given through modeling and observations.
3. We want to maintain a high proficiency rating in 3rd and 4th grade math and prevent any decrease in

4th & 5th grade due to new teachers.

4. We will be focusing on 4th & 5th grade Writing since they will now be a stand alone score.

5. Based on iReady, we identified lack of growth in students placing 2+ school years behind at the time of AP1. Students only reached 62% to their typical growth for the year. We would like to increase this number.

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 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.

In order to maintain teacher retention and encourage recruitment, we will ensure our teachers feel supported. They will be equipped with all necessary materials and professional development to further their instructional craft. When teachers are given mentors they are able to build better relationships with their colleagues and feel like they are part of a team.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of our teachers will participate in professional development workshops hosted by our PD liaison throughout the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Our PD liaison will ensure our faculty signs up and completes required workshops to facilitate certificate renewal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Stay (jstay@somersetprehomestead.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.)

Our PD liaison will work diligently with our partner Doral College to create and offer workshops every quarter for our teachers to enroll and gain best practices in areas where they would like to grow professionally.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By ensuring that our faculty is enrolling in these courses and following up on their progress, they will feel that their professional growth is of paramount importance. Ensuring application of said skills through informal and formal walk throughs as well as modeling application from mentor teachers and grade level chairs, will facilitate newly acquired best practices in becoming imbedded in their daily practice.

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. 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.

Our students with disabilities performed at a 36% as identified in the Federal Percent of Points Index.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our SWD will increase their average percent proficiency by 10% by the next progress monitoring assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Our SWD will be provided with their accommodations and instructed on how to best advocate for their needs. Our support facilitator will ensure to regularly visit our SWD population and log hours of support facilitation. These students will also be expected to participate in small group intervention with our assigned interventionist. Moreover, they will be encouraged to attend after school tutoring to further support their academic progress and show gains in their areas of deficit.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Stay (jstay@somersetprehomestead.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.)

As mentioned before, our support facilitator, interventionist and curriculum coach will work hand in hand in logging in service hours, intervention sessions, and tutoring attendance to ensure students are maximizing of all school offered opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If our SWD are given "in class" support, small group intervention, and tutoring opportunities, coupled with accountability and follow through, we believe our students will thrive and bridge their academic gap. All stakeholders will work together in ensuring we all do our part in properly supporting our SWD subgroup.

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 elementary school's SWD sub group scored a 36% under the Federal Percent of Points Index. This is an indicator that our students with disabilities are in need of additional support in order 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 SWD are being proactive in ensuring that they are properly communicating with all stakeholders to secure fidelity of implementation. This additional support, coupled with prescribed and tailored Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention will ensure that our SWD population get the support needed to bridge the gap and increase in their percent of proficiency.