

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Somerset Palms Academy



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	15

Somerset Palms Academy

12001 SW 72ND ST, Miami, FL 33183

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Adriana Diaz Garcia

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2018

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
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 Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
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	N/A
* 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	15

Somerset Palms Academy

12001 SW 72ND ST, Miami, FL 33183

[no web address on file]

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)
Combination School KG-8	No	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	96%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19
Grade	C

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.

The mission of Somerset Academy Palms is to promote a transformational culture that maximizes student achievement and the development of accountable, global learners in a safe and enriching environment that fosters high-quality education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering students to explore global learning opportunities to promote and enrich their communities and the communities we serve.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ruiz, Suzette	Principal	Principal: Fosters a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. Select General Education Teachers, the Curriculum Director and the Assistant Principal work together to provide information about core instruction to corresponding grade level teachers and participates in student data collection for the school. The team members are selected based on their knowledge and commitment to the core subject areas. In addition, they have attended professional development workshops and shared the fundamental instructional material learned amongst instructional staff members.

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	33	15	19	16	15	24	28	13	0	0	0	0	0	163
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	3	2	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	18	8	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	2	1	1	7	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/24/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	3	0	5	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	2	0	3	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	3	0	5	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	2	0	3	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	64%	63%	61%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	61%	59%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	57%	54%	0%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	55%	67%	62%	0%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	48%	63%	59%	0%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	56%	52%	0%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	21%	56%	56%	0%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	33 (0)	15 (0)	19 (0)	16 (0)	15 (0)	24 (0)	28 (0)	13 (0)	0 (0)	163 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (2)	2 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (4)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (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)	3 (2)	2 (1)	0 (0)	2 (2)	4 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (6)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (3)	0 (0)	2 (5)	9 (13)	18 (12)	8 (0)	0 (0)	37 (33)

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
03	2019	82%	60%	22%	58%	24%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	64%	-8%	58%	-2%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		56%				
05	2019	38%	60%	-22%	56%	-18%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		38%				
06	2019	80%	58%	22%	54%	26%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		80%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	94%	67%	27%	62%	32%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	69%	-2%	64%	3%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		67%				
05	2019	24%	65%	-41%	60%	-36%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		24%				
06	2019	45%	58%	-13%	55%	-10%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		45%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	24%	53%	-29%	53%	-29%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
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					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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
ELL	55	67		55	61						
HSP	62	59	55	52	48	45	22				
FRL	58	56		44	47	45	25				

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
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

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	63
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
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.

The data component which showed the lowest performance was 5th grade Science (24% proficiency). The contributing factor was lack of professional development and resources in this area.

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

Math proficiency in 5th and 6th grade showed a decline (24% and 45% proficiency respectively). The contributing factor to this decline was a lack of professional development and resources for the self-contained teachers in these grade levels.

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 component with the largest gap when compared to the state average was 5th grade Science achievement. The contributing factor to this gap was, again, lack of professional development and appropriate resources for the self-contained 5th grade teacher.

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

The data component with the most improvement was the learning gains in math of the lowest 25% in ela (100% learning gains) and math in 6th grade (75% learning gains). Data chats and progress monitoring of the lowest 25% in this area led to these gains.

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

Two potential areas of concern are Science achievement for incoming 5th graders as well as Math proficiency and math learning gains our rising 6th and 7th graders.

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

1. Coaching - a curriculum coach with extensive experience in math and science has been assigned to work with 4th-7th grade teachers.
2. Professional development in the area of STEM to improve math and science scores.
3. Data Chats - Teacher/Admin Data Chats took place during 2018-2019. However, the focus will now shift to Teacher/Student Data Chats to empower students to set goals and track their own progress.
4. Continued progress monitoring using I-Ready Growth Monitoring and now the addition of Standards Mastery since we are entering our second year as a school.
5. Using a systematic walkthrough tool to aid admin in providing teachers with explicit and constructive feedback on an ongoing basis.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	The area of focus will be Math Learning Gains
Rationale	On the 2018-2019 FSA Math, the learning gain of 4th-6th grade students was 48% and the learning gains of the lowest 25% was 45%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The learning gains of 4-6th grade students and of the lowest 25% will demonstrate an increase in performance by a minimum of 3% on the Spring 2020 Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Suzette Ruiz (sruiz0520@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>The 4th-6th grade math teachers will meet quarterly with the Curriculum Director to plan for specific skills which will be covered during instruction using a focus calendar.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -share best strategies -provide professional development (I-Ready) -progress monitoring using Performance Matters and I-Ready -data chats (quarterly) -MDCPS baselines/interims (administer/monitor data using Performance Matters)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>School leadership team will monitor progress: review data (baseline, interims, informal and formal classroom assessments).</p> <p>Summative: FSA 2020, Interim Assessments, District Benchmark Assessments, Data Chats</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formal and informal assessments using Performance Matters (baseline, interims, etc.) 2. Professional development focusing on I-Ready Growth Monitoring and Standards Mastery 3. Implementation of research-based curriculum 4. Use of walkthroughs and Teacher/Admin Data Chats to monitor fidelity of instructional program 5. Use of I-Ready and ALEKS (in 6th and 7th grade) to provide adaptive instruction and monitor progress
Person Responsible	Suzette Ruiz (sruiz0520@dadeschools.net)

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).

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: The area of focus will be Math Learning Gains				\$2,250.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

	3376	120-Classroom Teachers	5015 - Somerset Palms Academy	General Fund		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: I-Ready 6 hour workshop</i>			
	3376	120-Classroom Teachers	5015 - Somerset Palms Academy	General Fund		\$750.00
			<i>Notes: I-Ready Webinar for new teachers (1.5 hours)</i>			
Total:						\$2,250.00