Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Somerset Academy Charter High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 11/15/2010

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2019-20 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%)
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

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	81%

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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 11/15/2010, Kerri O'sullivan A

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	282	204	183	154	823
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	10	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	6	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/3/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	
Number of students enrolled	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	1	0	2	7	10
One or more suspensions	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	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	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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	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	1	0	2	7	10
One or more suspensions	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	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	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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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 Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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.

Due to Covid-19, no Florida state assessments were administered. Data analysis will reflect 2019 performance. 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.

Due to Covid-19, no Florida state assessments were administered. Data analysis will reflect 2019 performance. 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.

Due to Covid-19, no Florida state assessments were administered. Data analysis will reflect 2019 performance. 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?

Due to Covid-19, no Florida state assessments were administered. Data analysis will reflect 2019 performance. 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?

Due to Covid-19, no Florida state assessments were administered. Data analysis will reflect 2019 performance. 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.

Due to Covid-19 and learning gaps, remediation for all students is the main priority while incorporating the list below:
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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to If the rigor in core instruction is increased in all content areas then student achievement will imporve	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The students who scored in the lowest 25th percentile are missing foundational skills to adequately prepare them for the FSA/EOC exams
Measurable Outcome:	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:	Cristina Fernandez (cafernandez@somersetsilverpalms.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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

Action Steps to Implement

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 Cristina Fernandez (cafernandez@somersetsilverpalms.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Due to the Covid-19 remidiation for all students is the area of our focus to bridge the learning gap in all content areas.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

All stakeholders collaborate and share responsibility in improving the school through our ESSAC meetings, 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.
The leadership team works collaboratively with teacher leaders to provide support to faculty in implementing effective instructional strategies aligned to the school goals. The administration consistently monitors classroom instruction and provides timely and constructive feedback to ensure academic success. Faculty meetings are a productive use of time and are designed to support teaching and learning. All staff members have equitable opportunities to assume leadership roles at the school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: If the rigor in core instruction is increased in all content areas then student achievement will imporve				$72,026.28
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School	Other Federal		$5,310.69
			Notes: SpringBoard ELA grades 9-12			
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School	Other Federal		$6,468.93
			Notes: Sadlier Vocabulary text/digital components			
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School	Other Federal		$9,015.14
			Notes: Collections textbooks & digital components			
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School	Other Federal		$9,853.20
			Notes: MATHia (Alge.1/Geo.) Carnagie			
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School	Other Federal		$1,900.00
			Notes: Math Nation (ALg.1) text/workbook			
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School	Other Federal		$3,500.00
			Notes: IXL site license (Alg.2/Pre-Cal./Int.Math)			
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School	Other Federal		$6,302.82
			Notes: HMH Practice work books & digital component (Alg1/Geo/Int.Math)			
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School	Other Federal		$3,648.50
			Notes: Turnitin site service			
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			$774.00
			Notes: Biology digital access license			
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			$3,137.50
			Notes: HMH Chemistry digital text access			
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School			$6,000.00
			Notes: Discovery Learning Physical Science digital site license			
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School	Other Federal		$8,240.50
			Notes: HMH World History digital resource pkg.			

			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School	Other Federal		$1,500.00
			Notes: Florida Transformative Education (US History)			
			7042 - Somerset Academy Charter High School	Other Federal		$6,375.00
			Notes: Edgenuity site license			
					Total:	**$72,026.28**