
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Somerset Academy Charter High School

12425 SW 248 ST, Homestead, FL 33032

www.middlehigh.somersetsilverpalms.net

Demographics

Principal: Kerri O'sullivan A

Start Date for this Principal: 11/10/2010

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Somerset Academy Charter High School

12425 SW 248 ST, Homestead, FL 33032

www.middlehigh.somersetsilverpalms.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	95%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part 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

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
O'Sullivan, Kerri	Principal	will provide support and ensure all resources will be allocated appropriately, ensure proper implementation of interventions, provide professional development, observe and assess school staff and communicate with stakeholders plans and activities regarding RTI
Salazar, Ryan	Assistant Principal	will provide support and ensure all resources will be allocated appropriately, ensure proper implementation of interventions, provide professional development, observe and assess school staff and communicate with stakeholders plans and activities regarding RTI
Fernandez, Cristina	Administrative Support	monitors and communicates data gathered from district assessments, FAIR, NWEA, and school based assessments. Oversee and coordinate all the intervention programs. Provides support in guiding classroom instruction, assists with analyzing data, and identifies appropriate evidence-based intervention strategies
Valdes, Jacky	Teacher, ESE	Participate in student data collection and collaborates with regular education teachers while providing additional support through regular consultations.
Castro, Maura	School Counselor	
Aleman, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Mathematic department chair
Cuervo, Marcus	Teacher, K-12	Language Arts department chair

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184	167	143	114	608
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6	12	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	0	42	18	94

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	1	18	9	48

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

24

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/13/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	5	13	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	19	22	58	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	14	7	27

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%	59%	56%	72%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	54%	51%	58%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	48%	42%	51%	45%	41%
Math Achievement	77%	54%	51%	57%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	62%	52%	48%	53%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	51%	45%	49%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	88%	68%	68%	80%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	85%	76%	73%	83%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	184 (0)	167 (0)	143 (0)	114 (0)	608 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 ()	0 ()	2 ()	7 ()	10 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	6 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	12 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	34 (0)	0 (0)	42 (0)	18 (0)	94 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
09	2019	77%	55%	22%	55%	22%
	2018	69%	54%	15%	53%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	73%	53%	20%	53%	20%
	2018	77%	54%	23%	53%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	88%	68%	20%	67%	21%
2018	69%	65%	4%	65%	4%
Compare		19%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	71%	15%	70%	16%
2018	85%	67%	18%	68%	17%
Compare		1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	63%	16%	61%	18%
2018	72%	59%	13%	62%	10%
Compare		7%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	54%	20%	57%	17%
2018	79%	54%	25%	56%	23%
Compare		-5%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	30			10							
ELL	51	55	48	70	65	57	71				
BLK	81	70		73	71			92			
HSP	74	59	55	76	60	54	87	85		97	68
WHT	100	80									
FRL	74	63	60	77	60	58	86	84		99	69
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
BLK	67	60		91	82						
HSP	75	57	57	78	67	68	70	84		96	56
FRL	73	54	57	74	65	62	67	86		97	54
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD				31	38						
ELL	33	27		56	67					80	
BLK	60	64		57	55					91	50
HSP	71	59	46	57	54	49	77	83		94	56
WHT	92	42		50	44						
FRL	71	56	54	56	54	54	77	82		98	51

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	723
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	77
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	72
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	90
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	73
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Math learning gains among the lowest 25% was the lowest data component in 2019 at 54%. Factors that contributed to this low performance include an influx of new students, students who previously attended private school, and the general challenge of raising achievement among students in the lowest quartile. Given the historically high performance of students in our feeder middle school, our lowest 25% includes students who are already at a level 3. Therefore, matching and surpassing that level of proficiency is difficult for some of our lowest performing students.

In terms of trends, 54% was slightly below the 2018 gains, but above the 2016 and 2017 gains. Thus, our school shows a general upward trend in learning gains among the lowest quartile over the past few school years.

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

Math gains among the lowest quartile showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019 (64% to 54%). As briefly describe in section "a", this is the result of a few variables. Our denominator of students increased from 2018 to 2019 by roughly 20%. Thus, we had a larger cohort of students and consequentially a larger bottom quartile. The needs of our students changed, as we moved into a new high school building, and thus attracted a slightly different population of students. Especially given an influx of students from neighboring schools (private schools, home school, other public schools), our teachers had to adapt to a new variety of student needs including remediation that was previously not common in our K-12 model. Additionally, our incoming 9th graders in 2019 achieved very highly in 8th grade, which was likely due to the exceptional instruction that they received in our feeder middle school (led by the same principal). Thus, meeting and exceeding achievement from the 8th grade FSA math was challenging for many of our Algebra 1 students. Nonetheless, more than half of our lowest quartile made gains from 2018 to 2019, which can be considered a moderate success.

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.

Math achievement in 2019 was 26 points above the state average (77% compared to 51%). This was the greatest gap among all of the data components. This is likely the result of the historically strong achievement among our students at Somerset Academy Charter High. As described in section "a", our cohort of students includes many students who have previously achieved proficiency in math. Therefore, many students who achieve proficiency are still in the lowest quartile. The teachers in our math department are very experienced with the Florida Standards, local assessments, and curriculum. Furthermore, the coherence among our staff and their familiarity with the curriculum improves students' ability to pass the math EOCs.

The high achievement can also be attributed to our math department chair who provided a variety of extra support for our students, including after school tutoring, Saturday tutoring, and push-in support during class.

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

The area of greatest improvement was science achievement, which improved from 70% to 88%. This is a huge increase, and even higher than the 2018 level of 80% proficiency.

In order to achieve this improvement, we hired a new department chair who was able to support the biology teacher. She provided push-in support, planning assistance, and curriculum support. Additionally, our data coordinator helped to streamline the assessment and tracking systems in the science department, which allowed teachers to strategically target support for students who were at-risk.

For students who needed extra support, our science department provided tutoring sessions after school in preparation for the EOC. This provided remediation and support for students who had a weak science foundation.

In addition to all of these factors, it is important to note that this was the first year of our transition to the new high school building. In the new building, we have purpose-built science labs which far exceed the facilities previously offered to our students. Our science labs provided hands-on opportunities for students to learn biology in a manner that supported their mastery of the science standards and led to higher achievement on the EOC.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

One area for concern is the number of students with level 1 or 2 on the ELA FSA. We had 98 students with a level 1 or 2, which is roughly 18% of the student population. While this is relatively low, it still provides an opportunity to improve services for our lowest performing students.

An additional area of potential concern is the number of students with multiple early warning indicators. 50 students (roughly 10%) of the student population demonstrated more than 1 risk factor. For these 50 students, it is imperative that they receive additional support to master academic subjects and prepare for graduation and beyond. While we provide many support systems to help these students, it is always a concern when these students struggle with challenges such as low achievement or attendance.

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

1. Improving Math learning gains for the lowest 25%
2. Increasing rate of College and Career acceleration

3. Maintaining ELA achievement school-wide
4. Improving math learning gains overall
5. Supporting students with early warning indicators to achieve academic success

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	If the rigor in core instruction is increased in all content areas then student achievement will improve
Rationale	The students who scored in the lowest 25th percentile are missing foundational skills to adequately prepare them for the FSA/EOC exams
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our strategy is to utilize 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
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kerri O'Sullivan (kosullivan@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>This 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.</p> <p>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 monthly 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</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify lowest 25 percentile 2. Monitor learning gain through the usage of benchmark assessments during the year 3. Analyze data to group students according to weaknesses and strengths 4. Incorporate small group and differentiated instruction

5. Collaborate with stakeholders (teachers, counselors, parents, student, administrators)

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2

Title

Rationale

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Person responsible for monitoring outcome [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Action Step

Description

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Title 1 School, Please refer to PIP. Parental involvement throughout the school will help build positive relationships.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Somerset Academy at Silver Palms Princeton offers many service-based, social and academic clubs, including a full athletic program, to help meet the needs of our diverse student population. Our teachers/ club sponsors meet on a monthly basis in order to provide mentorship and social development opportunities. The school also offers two full-time counselors who offer guidance counseling, college

advisement, and peer mediation to all secondary students. The administrative team also mentors the lowest quartile in Reading and Math for the entire duration of the academic school year.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Prior to the opening of school, Orientation is held for all incoming Kindergarten students. Before the school year begins incoming Kindergarten students are screened in both reading and math using a school developed assessment in order to provide teachers with a baseline assessment of prior knowledge. Kindergarten students are assessed using FLKRS/ECHOS, and iReady Diagnostic Assessment which is given three times a year. The data received from these assessments is used to assist teachers in planning instruction. Students in grades 6-8 also participate an orientation the first week of school. All grade levels are invited to attend the Meet and Greet Bar-B-Que prior to the commencement of the school year. Students visit their decorated classrooms, parents and students meet their teachers, and they are invited to enjoy a meal.

Somerset Academy Silver Palms has implemented a sixth grade survival camp. During this camp, students are able to visit their classrooms and meet their teachers. Students are also given their schedules. In October, eighth grade students will visit the high school building, meet the high school teachers, and tour the academies available for them to enroll in.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The teachers selected for the MTSS/RTI team gathered and analyzed a variety of data by grade level in order to determine effectiveness of the strategies being implemented in the classrooms. Then the complete MTSS/RTI team collaborated in order to modify the strategies/resources necessary as identified in the End of Year School Improvement Plan Reviews from all departments. The new goals and action plans were then added to the 2019-2020 School Improvement Plan.

Title I, Part A

Somerset Academy Silver Palms provides services to ensure students, both elementary and secondary, requiring additional remediation are assisted through before school and after school tutoring, pull out tutoring using Wonder Works and after school FSA Tutoring. The instructional coaches will develop, lead and evaluate the reading program; model instructional lessons, and conduct data chats with teachers. Other components that are integrated into the school wide program include an extensive Parental Program where parents are required to volunteer 30 hours per year at the school,

Title III

Somerset Academy Silver Palms will provide for its ELL population through services available through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners through the use of iLit, and Wonder Works through intervention and push in tutoring.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Somerset Academy Silver Palms provides FSA after school tutoring and Saturday Tutoring where selected students participating in the FSA receive instruction in math and reading. The school funds tutoring programs for all students in the school who wish to attend. Pull out intervention will be offered to students who scored in the lowest 25% in reading and math.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Somerset Academy Silver Palms has partnered with Doral College to enable students to earn college credits throughout their middle and high school career.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: If the rigor in core instruction is increased in all content areas then student achievement will improve				\$59,371.44
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			\$4,425.00
<i>Notes: PrepWorks SAT/ACT computer software</i>						
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			\$6,210.44
<i>Notes: Springboard ELA grades 9-12</i>						
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			\$12,421.91
<i>Notes: Collections textbooks & digital components</i>						
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			\$4,703.40
<i>Notes: Wordly Wise</i>						
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			\$4,566.41
<i>Notes: HMH Practice workbooks (Alg.I, Alg.II, and Geo.)</i>						
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			\$8,143.80
<i>Notes: MATHia (Alg.I/Alg.II/Geo.)</i>						
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			\$6,088.20
<i>Notes: Biology series</i>						
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			\$4,375.00
<i>Notes: NWEA computer software</i>						
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			\$768.08
<i>Notes: Gateway workbook (US History)</i>						
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			\$3,653.71
<i>Notes: Realidades/Spanish seires</i>						

			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			\$748.83
			<i>Notes: AP World History workbooks</i>			
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			\$3,266.66
			<i>Notes: USA Test Prep computer software</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus:				\$0.00
					Total:	\$59,371.44