Somerset Academy Silver Palms School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Somerset Academy Silver Palms

23255 SW 115TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33032

http://somersetsilverpalms.dadeschools.net

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 culture that maximizes student achievement and fosters the development of responsible, self-directed life-long learners in a safe and enriching environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Set high expectations
Objective
Meaningful curriculum
Effective
Resources and responsible life-long learners
Students who achieve proficiency and beyond
Evaluate continuously and use data to drive curriculum
Teachers who are highly qualified

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
O'Sullivan, Kerri	Principal	Responsible for all school operations, curriculum, budget and safety
Mongeotti, Maria	Assistant Principal	Academics and Curriculum Student Data SPED Program Testing Accounting Activities Elementary Athletics Cafeteria Before/Aftercare Program Summer Camp Emergency Procedures Registrar/ Attendance Parent Club Maintenance/Facilities Discipline
Santana, Martha	Administrative Support	Academics and Curriculum Dual Enrollment SPED Program Master Schedule Activities Middle School Athletics Cafeteria Emergency Procedures Registrar/ Attendance Maintenance/Facilities Discipline Academics and Curriculum Student Data Saturday School Tutoring Curriculum Binders ESOL Technology Programs Computer Lab Schedule
Paz, Raquel	Instructional Coach	Provide instructional support, planning, coach new teachers, model lessons, push into classes
Penas, D'Andrea	Assistant Principal	Academics and Curriculum Student Data SPED Program Testing Accounting Activities Elementary Athletics Cafeteria

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Before/Aftercare Program Summer Camp Emergency Procedures Registrar/ Attendance Parent Club Maintenance/Facilities Discipline
Andre, Martin	Administrative Support	Discipline Teacher Support
Barton, Alexandra	School Counselor	Monitors grades, attendance, behavior
Meade, Adriana	School Counselor	Monitors grades, attendance, behavior
Petisco, Gabriela	School Counselor	Monitors grades, attendance, behavior

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.

The process in developing the School Improvement Plan involved various stakeholders, from school administrators, teachers, staff and school professionals, parents and local community members. Various meetings were held to discuss the best procedures to implement in order to achieve our SIP goals. Through collaboration, commitment and a common goal, the SIP was developed. Furthermore, monthly ESSAC meeting contribute to key factors for the School Improvement Plan.

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))

School administrators and personnel will continuously gather data throughout the academic year. This data will be analyzed and serve as the pivotal influence in guiding and designing the SIP. Using student data, stakeholders will re-evaluate the implementations on the SIP and adjust according to student needs.

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)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	97%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	76%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	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	
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	

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
	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	3	7	12	5	35	36	14	112
Course failure in ELA	0	13	11	5	4	1	0	4	5	43
Course failure in Math	0	2	5	5	20	2	2	0	2	38
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	8	6	10	5	9	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	10	16	11	7	15	67
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	2	6	15	1	45	69	51	49	0	238

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	16
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	3	7	12	5	35	36	14	112
Course failure in ELA	0	13	11	5	4	1	0	4	5	43
Course failure in Math	0	2	5	5	20	2	2	0	2	38
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	8	6	10	5	9	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	10	16	11	7	15	67
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	2	6	15	1	45	69	51	49	0	238

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	16
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*	68	61	53	73	62	55	71		
ELA Learning Gains				61			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			46		
Math Achievement*	71	63	55	71	51	42	61		
Math Learning Gains				66			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			31		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	71	56	52	70	60	54	64		
Social Studies Achievement*	88	77	68	88	68	59	72		
Middle School Acceleration	54	75	70	63	61	51	59		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	53	62	55	68	75	70	43		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	672
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
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	48			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	66			
HSP	68			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	82			
FRL	66			

	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	42			
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	64			
HSP	67			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	67			

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	68			71			71	88	54			53
SWD	42			42			45	63			4	
ELL	55			62			56	71	32		7	53
AMI												
ASN	77			73							2	
BLK	59			63			69	88	54		6	
HSP	68			71			70	88	54		7	52
MUL	75			75							2	
PAC												
WHT	65			77			93	91			4	
FRL	65			69			70	86	54		7	53

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	73	61	49	71	66	63	70	88	63			68
SWD	34	46	36	32	51	46	21	69				
ELL	66	60	49	65	62	57	57	85	42			68
AMI												
ASN	75	61		83	72							
BLK	65	63	58	66	63	66	47	85	64			
HSP	73	61	48	70	66	64	72	88	62			69
MUL	86	60		50	50							
PAC												
WHT	79	67		81	72	58	69		73			
FRL	72	61	50	70	65	63	70	87	62			67

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	71	59	46	61	33	31	64	72	59			43
SWD	37	46	38	32	23	26	19	45				
ELL	71	63	48	58	32	38	55	68				43

						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
AMI												
ASN	76	59		81	35							
BLK	62	54	32	53	29	23	53	63	55			
HSP	72	60	49	62	34	33	66	72	61			43
MUL	67			75								
PAC												
WHT	72	53		57	29		71	80	50			
FRL	70	59	46	61	33	31	62	71	57			43

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	65%	56%	9%	54%	11%
07	2023 - Spring	71%	50%	21%	47%	24%
08	2023 - Spring	70%	51%	19%	47%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	58%	4%
06	2023 - Spring	70%	50%	20%	47%	23%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	52%	19%	50%	21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	76%	58%	18%	54%	22%
07	2023 - Spring	67%	48%	19%	48%	19%
03	2023 - Spring	86%	63%	23%	59%	27%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	64%	10%	61%	13%
08	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	55%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	61%	58%	3%	55%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	57%	40%	17%	44%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	77%	50%	27%	51%	26%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	56%	32%	50%	38%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	52%	37%	48%	41%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	65%	33%	63%	35%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	68%	19%	66%	21%

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.

ELA and Science data were the lowest performing components. The contributing factor is the lack of fundamental ELA skills and the lack of prior knowledge in science to prepare the students for the assessment,

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

ELA showed the greatest decline from the prior year. A contributing factor is the change in assessment style and learning gaps.

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.

The greatest gap observed when comparing to the state average was the ELL students, English Language Learners. The state average was 33% and Silver Palms was 66%. Factors may include the use of iReady, small group instruction, intervention and differentiated instruction based on the students needs.

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

The 2022 State Assessment showed that across all grade-levels Math made considerable gains of 76 points. ELA maintained steady gains of 10 points. The strategy that we used to support our learned was a intervention program based on individual student needs. Data trackers were used to communicate expectations with students as well as data folders and displays to show students expectations. . Small group instruction hosted by teachers to support students based on individual needs. We also used programs like iReady, Reflex Math, Carnegie to individualized the students intervention and additional support.

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

Based on the EWS data from part 1, the area that is concerning is the number of students who have failed an ELA class. More specifically students who are failing an ELA class during the primary foundational years.

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

The highest priorities for the current 2023-2023 school year is to continue the closing of learning gaps, lessening the attendance infractions, supporting professional development of all staff and support and continued collaboration between home, school and community.

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.

The performing subgroup are the teachers. With the deficient of available teachers, retention of current teachers and their mental well-being is of the highest priority. school administrators will provide teachers with support, strategies and outlets to promote working in a healthy environment and a positive work culture. School administrators will make an effort to recruit educators that certified and highly effective.

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

In the 2024-2025 school year Somerset Silver Palms will retain 85% of our high effective current staff/ teachers.

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

Throughout the year the school will offer professional developments to support the growth and development of our teachers, teachers will be asked to submit evaluations and based on these new Professional Developments will be designed. These Professional Developments will vary from classroom support to team building as a staff. We will use these evaluations to monitor the teachers well being and mental health.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kerri O'Sullivan (kosullivan@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.)

Professional Developments will be offered by licensed professionals who have expertise on specific topics catered to the teachers subject areas, team building/positive working environment and professional development focuses.

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

By focusing on these areas, the well-being of the teachers and their professional growth is the focus of all stakeholders ensuring the success of the staff and the students they teach.

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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 our 2022/2023 Data, we identified a need in ELA. There was not sufficient growth in grades 3rd-8th. When dissecting the data, we recognized that the lowest 25% only made 46% proficiency and our Students with Disabilities scored 42% acehievement

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

Our goal in ELA for the 2023-24 State Assessment is to increase by
10% proficiency.
Our goal in ELA for the Lowest 25% in the 2023-24 State Assessment
is to increase by 5% proficiency.
Our goal in ELA for the Student's with Disabilities in the 2023-24 State
Assessment if to increase by 5% proficiency.

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

We will be using state designated Progress Monitoring, as well as
IREADY and classroom data. We will conduct quarterly data chats
with teachers, as well as students to discuss areas of growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maria Mongeotti (mmongeotti@somersetsilverpalms.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.)

We will continue to use Evidence Based Wonder Series K-5th grade and My
Perspectives grades 6th-8th. IREADY will be used and monitored for
student progress. Additional intervention staff and a Curriculum
Coach.

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

Based on our 2023 State Assessment, we identified a need in ELA. There
was not sufficient growth in grades 3rd-8th. When dissecting the data,
we recognized that the lowest 25% only made 46% proficiency and
our Students with Disabilities scored 42% achievement.

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.

Identify individual needs based on data.
Discuss findings with teachers, interventionist and curriculum coach.
Assist teachers in designing an individualized plan for each student.
Strategically assign interventionist and curriculum coach to work with the lowest 25% and Students with Disabilities.
Reassess and evaluate biweekly to insure that needs are being met

Person Responsible: Maria Mongeotti (mmongeotti@somersetsilverpalms.net)

By When: June 2024

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).

Not Applicable.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The 3 areas of focus are decoding, reading comprehension and fluency.
The percentage of students not on track to score a level 3 or above on the state ELA Assessment is 15%.
Forms of Data we will be utilizing is the iReady baseline, midyear and end of year (AP #1-AP#3), IReady growth Monitoring, biweekly Wonders assessments, Weekly Formative Assessments of Sight Words and or Fluency.

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

The 3 areas of focus are fluency, vocabulary and comprehension.
The percentage of students not on track to score a level 3 or above on the state ELA Assessment is 30%.

Forms of Data we will be utilizing is the iReady baseline, midyear and end of year (AP #1-AP#3), IReady growth Monitoring, biweekly Wonders assessments, Weekly Formative Assessments of Sight Words and or Fluency.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

The percentage of students not on track to score a level 3 or above on the state ELA Assessment is 15%.Our goal is to decrease this percentage to 10%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our Measurable Outcome for this year in the statewide ELA Assessment is the following:
Grades 3 ELA to increase from 70% in 2023 to 75% in 2024.
Grades 4 ELA to increase from 62% in 2022 to 70% in 2024.
Grades 5 ELA to increase from 65% in 2022 to 70% in 2024.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

To Monitor Outcomes we will be utilizing the iReady baseline, midyear and end of year (AP #1-AP#3), IReady growth Monitoring, biweekly Wonders assessments, Weekly Formative Assessments of Vocabulary
and or Fluency.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Mongeotti, Maria, mmongeotti@somersetsilverpalms.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Our strategy is to utilize differentiation of intervention programs to lessen the learning gap and build the foundational skills. This year our students will use personal data trackers to track their growth data by benchmark.
Driven by insights from the i-Ready Diagnostic, the platform prescribes a path of online lessons that provide
instruction tailored to each student's needs and encourages students as they develop new skills. i-Ready Personalized Instruction's online lessons are rigorous, offering students explicit instruction and providing systematic practice and scaffolded feedback that promotes a growth mindset. Once students have completed their first Diagnostic assessment, i-Ready Personalized Instruction builds a unique lesson plan
consisting of online instructional lessons based on assessment performance, with a personalized starting point for each student.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Utilizing this strategy allows the parents, students, and teachers a clear understanding of how students are
performing in each content area/standard. Students will be assessed at the beginning of the year on all benchmarks, this data will then be analyzed and logged in their data folders. Teachers then will use the data folders to group students by strengths and weaknesses. During small groups, students will be provided
remediation and continuously reassessed to show growth. As needed, the students will be moved between
groups in order to ensure that their learning needs are continuously being met. The data folders will facilitate open communication and understanding by all parties involved in how to best support our students.
Once students have completed their first Diagnostic assessment, i-Ready Personalized Instruction builds a
unique lesson plan consisting of online instructional lessons based on assessment performance, with a personalized starting point for each student.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
As a collaborative effort we have developed an action plan that will monitor the learning gains of the students in order to ensure that even with our barriers our students are achieving at the necessary levels of rigor and understanding. Our plan includes progress monitoring and instructional support through professional development. In order to monitor the effectiveness of our action plan both administration and instructional leaders such as department heads will meet biweekly to discuss progress and data. These meetings will run throughout the calendar school year from August through June. Within these meetings the participants will discuss the evidence collected such as, lesson plans, assessments data, and personal data trackers.	Mongeotti, Maria, mmongeotti@somersetsilverpalms.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The EESAC Meetings and the Title 1 Annual Meeting will be the methods for dissemination of the is SIP. The EESAC Chair has the responsibility of monitoring, evaluating and revising the vision, mission and implementation plans of the school. Members obtain feedback from their constituents and express them at meetings and conferences. Within the EESAC are members of the Staff, School's Administration, Student Body and Dade Partners, all of whom work collaboratively to support the school with resources

that are available. Equipment, supplies and materials are purchased to support the schools strategic and action plans with expenditures focused on identified key performance areas.

https://elementary.somersetsilverpalms.net/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=240982&type=d

https://elementary.somersetsilverpalms.net/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=257899&type=d

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

All stakeholders collaborate and share responsibility in improving the school through our Title 1 Annual Meeting, ESSAC meetings, Activities, faculty meetings and department meetings. The ESSAC meetings give parents and community members the opportunity to share their input and recommendations for continued improvement. The faculty and department meetings give teachers and staff the opportunities to share their ideas on how the school can continuously improve. All stakeholders enjoy their experience at school and feel a part of the shared vision of success by including students on incentive field trips and through staff building activities throughout the year. Students are able to access resources for their social and emotional needs through our counselors and teachers. These practices will be sustained in years to come by having an open line of
communication between our stakeholders.

https://elementary.somersetsilverpalms.net/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=240982&type=d

https://elementary.somersetsilverpalms.net/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=257899&type=d

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

The school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum by having focused collaborative planning sessions that focus on how to maximize the instructional time and addresses the diverse needs of the learners. Additionally, intervention and tutorial programs will be developed and offered to students needing remediation or enrichment.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A