Somerset Academy Silver Palms At Princeton School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Somerset Academy Silver Palms At Princeton

13390 SW 248 ST, Homestead, FL 33032

[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 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
Resourceful 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	Disciplining or advising students, approving teachers' curriculums and ensuring the school environment is safe for all students and staff members.
Fernandez, Cristina	Assistant Principal	School management, student activities and services, SPED, RTI, Intervention, personnel and curriculum instruction, community relations and collaborating with teachers and administrators to fulfill and implement school vision and mission.
Buergo, Marlene	Teacher, ESE	SPED coordinator, staffing, intervention and RTI, collaborating and facilitating with classroom teachers to meet the students individual accommodations.
Sherry, Colleen	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Design instructional materials and sample lessons consistent with program area of emphasis or grant requirements as appropriate. Conducts demonstration teaching units for replication purposes. Develops an implements staff development training courses and follow-up programs.
Redondo, Karina	Teacher, ESE	Deliver classroom instruction that helps students learn, teachers must prepare effective lessons, grade student work and offer feedback, manage classroom materials, productively navigate the curriculum, and collaborate with other staff.
Velasquez, Adriana	Teacher, K-12	Helping students read fluently, comprehend what they're reading, and train them in phonetics, spelling, grammar, and vocabulary memorization.
Reyes, Jennifer	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor or School Guidance Counselor, provides advice and helpful resources to students regarding certain personal and academic situations. Their main duties include offering counseling to students and/or teachers, conduct group counseling sessions to help students develop their personal and academic skills. School Counselor also advocates for the student and is a resource between home, school, and community.

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	86%
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)	English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 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	9	5	6	3	3	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	9	5	6	3	3	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	64	61	53	64	62	55	61		
ELA Learning Gains				68			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			40		
Math Achievement*	77	63	55	70	51	42	70		
Math Learning Gains				62			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			50		
Science Achievement*	74	56	52	43	60	54	49		
Social Studies Achievement*		77	68		68	59			
Middle School Acceleration		75	70		61	51			
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	62	62	55	55	75	70	49		

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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	337
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	470
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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				
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	73			
HSP	67			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	67			

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				
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP	59			

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	65			
FRL	59			

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	64			77			74					62
SWD												
ELL	60			78			65				5	62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	67			71			80				3	
HSP	63			77			74				5	62
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	70			80							2	
FRL	64			78			71				5	61

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	64	68	56	70	62	52	43					55
SWD												
ELL	65	68	64	75	67	55	41					55
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	48	75		61	44							
HSP	66	65	45	72	65	58	47					55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	70			60								
FRL	63	69	57	70	63	53	42					56

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	61	56	40	70	58	50	49					49
SWD												
ELL	57	53		67	73		27					49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	59			59								
HSP	62	57	33	69	63	55	45					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75			100								
FRL	55	50	40	66	57	58	37					47

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	74%	56%	18%	54%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	58%	15%	58%	15%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	57%	52%	5%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	82%	63%	19%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	64%	16%	61%	19%
05	2023 - Spring	81%	58%	23%	55%	26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	73%	50%	23%	51%	22%

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 data gathered from 2021-2022, showed a decline in Math and Science. FSA Math Assessment 5th grade Math and Science had a decline of 7% in each content area. Trends that may have affected it was students missing fundamental benchmarks due to the pandemic.

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

The greatest decline was seen in Math and Science with a decline of 7% in each content area. In 3rd grade Math FSA Assessment, a decrease of 1% and ELA of 3% was witnessed.

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 state average was the ELL students, English Language Learners. The state average was 33% and Silver Palms Princeton was 64%. Factors that may affect this trend are the resources provided to the individual student, the use of iReady, differentiated instruction, intervention and small group instruction

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

4th grade ELA and Math showed the most improvement in progress monitoring and the 2022 State Assessments. Our strategy was to utilize intervention programs to lessen the learning gap and build foundational skills. This year our students used personal data trackers to track their growth data by benchmark.

Utilizing this strategy allowed parents, students and teachers a clear understanding of how students are performing in each content area/standard. Students are assessed at the beginning of the year on all benchmarks, this data was than analyzed and logged in their data folders. Teachers then used this data folders to group students by strengths and weaknesses. During small group, students were provided remediation and continuously reassessed to show growth.

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

Upon the review of Early Warning Signs, an area of concern is the amount of students absent 10% or more days.

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

The highest priorities for the school improvement in the upcoming school year is to continue the closing of learning gaps, lessening the absences infractions of students, supporting professional growth of all staff, 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 teacher and their mental well-being is of highest priority. School administrators will provide teachers with strategies, support and outlets to work in a healthy environment. To promote a positive culture and environment, school administrators will recruit educators that are certified and highly effective.

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

For the 2024-2025 school year, Somerset Silver Palms Princeton will retain 85% of our highly 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.)

The evidence based intervention being implemented for this area of focus will be professional developments catered to the teachers subject areas, areas of focus, and team building/positive working environment.

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

By focusing on these areas, the well-being of 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 Math

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 review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiation. Our findings demonstrated learning gains for the lowest 25% decreased in Math. However, with differentiated instruction in place, each student's needs will be met. We will provide the necessary instruction for the lowest 25% subgroup to make learning gains and move towards proficiency.

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

If successfully implemented differentiation, then our lowest 25% subgroup will increase by a minimum of 10% percentage points as evidenced by the 2024 state assessments.

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

The leadership team will conduct monthly data chats and follow up with weekly walkthroughs. Teachers will adjust their groups based on current data on a monthly basis. Lead teachers will provide support and guidance to all classroom teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cristina Fernandez (cafernandez@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.)

Our strategy to utilize differentiation of intervention programs to lessen the learning gap and build foundational skills. This year students will continue use personal data trackers to track their growth data by benchmark.

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

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.

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).

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 focus areas are:
Decoding
Comprehension
Fluency
These 3 areas are dependent on each other. You can't comprehend the text if you can't decode it. If you can't decode it, you're not going to be very fluent. And then, the more fluent a reader is, the better they can comprehend the text. And the more a reader comprehends the text, the better their fluency will be (i.e. they can read with more expression, know what words to put emphasis on, etc.)
The percentage of students not on track to score a level 3 or above on the state ELA Assessment is 10%.
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 focus areas are:
Fluency
Vocabulary
Comprehension
These 3 areas are dependent of each other. Vocabulary instruction can be taught directly or indirectly. It is most effective when multiple strategies are used and the words are age appropriate.
*Fluency is necessary for comprehension and is best taught through guided instruction. Students who read fluently are able to read with speed, accuracy, and proper expression.
*Comprehension occurs when a reader is able to connect ideas or concepts in a text to their own prior knowledge or experiences.
The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, was 12%.
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 Vocabulary 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 10%.Our goal is to decrease this percentage to 7%.

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 62% in 2022 to 65% in 2023.
Grades 4 ELA to increase from 67% in 2022 to 69% in 2023.
Grades 5 ELA to increase from 63% in 2022 to 65% in 2023.

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.

Fernandez, Cristina, cafernandez@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.	Fernandez, Cristina, cafernandez@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.

One method used to disseminate the SIP to stakeholders is through our monthly ESSAC meetings. These meetings are open to all stakeholders, administrators, teachers, staff, parents, community members, and student body. Data is provided to all individuals in attendance and is analyzed to provide the resources most beneficial for the student's individual needs. The are advertise through the school website and parent newsletter. Aside from
the ESSAC meetings, the SIP is disseminated quarterly as data is analyzed from assessments such as iReady, PM1, PM2, FAST and many more. Teachers are involved in the process as well as students and parents. Based on the data, individualized plans are formed and SIP goals or areas of focus are visited to ensure an accurate measurement of growth.

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))

Somerset Silver Palms Princeton plans to build a positive relationship with parents, families and community stakeholders by involving them in the process of the student's growth, both academically and emotionally. Community stakeholders will collaborate with school administrators to provide services, workshops, and informational/educational meetings on issues or topics parents are faced with. Parents will be encourage to volunteer at school events such as fieldtrips, school events, or donating their time to help the classroom teacher. Parents will be an integral part of the process in their child's academic life and will be involved in making the best decision for their child's individual needs.

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))

Silver Palms Princeton plans to strengthen the academic program through the implementation of specific curriculum. Programs such as iReady will provide a diagnostic of each child focusing on the areas of strength and areas of concern. Since the area of focus pertains to Instructional Practices pertaining to Math, iReady and GoMath can provide teachers with an analytical view of each students strength and weakness in the subject area. Benchmarks will be identified and supplemental assistance will be provide so each student can master the content.

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))

In compliance with all federal, state and local services, students are provided the services needed to their individual success and growth. Each academic year, students and their families are provided with information from programs such as Head Start, nutrition programs, and many more.