

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Somerset Academy Silver Palms



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Somerset Academy Silver Palms

23255 SW 115TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33032

<http://somersetsilverpalms.dadeschools.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Kerri Ann O'sullivan**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/6/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: B (61%) 2014-15: A (70%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## Somerset Academy Silver Palms

23255 SW 115TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33032

<http://somersetsilverpalms.dadeschools.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)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	79%
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

Resources and responsible life-long learners

Students who achieve proficiency and beyond

Evaluate continuously and use data to drive curriculum

Teachers who are highly qualified

### School Leadership Team

#### **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	Oversee all school operations
Mongeotti, Maria	Assistant Principal	Academics and Curriculum Student Data. SPED Program Testing Accounting Activities Elementary Athletics Cafeteria Before/Aftercare Program Summer Camp Emergency Procedures Registrar/Attendance Parent Club Maintenance/Facilities Discipline
Penas, D'Andrea	Assistant Principal	Academics and Curriculum Student Data Dual Enrollment Teacher Observations SPED Program Master Schedule Activities Middle School Athletics Cafeteria Emergency Procedures Registrar/Attendance Maintenance/Facilities Discipline
Triana, Marianne	Instructional Coach	Curriculum Support Grades 5-8 Data Interventions Textbooks Technology Programs Computer Lab Schedule
Santana, Martha	Instructional Coach	Testing Saturday School Tutoring Program Curriculum Binders ESOL Technology Programs Computer Lab Schedule



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Petisco, Gabriela	School Counselor	Academic Counseling Guidance Counseling Career Planning Dual Enrollment Attendance
Reyes, Jennifer	School Counselor	Academic Counseling Guidance Counseling Attendance
Laguna, Nilda	Teacher, ESE	
Prieto, Joey	Dean	Discipline Facilities Building Projects Security Custodial Parent Communication Social Studies Department

## 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	202	200	184	192	192	187	292	233	232	0	0	0	0	1914
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	5	8	11	11	16	0	0	0	0	52

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	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	

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

86

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 9/6/2019

### 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	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	4	4	18	18	33	13	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	5	1	2	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	8	10	7	11	8	0	0	0	0	51

**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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

## 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	78%	63%	61%	71%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	61%	59%	67%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	57%	54%	60%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	84%	67%	62%	83%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	67%	63%	59%	73%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	56%	52%	74%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	71%	56%	56%	61%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	88%	80%	78%	84%	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	202 (0)	200 (0)	184 (0)	192 (0)	192 (0)	187 (0)	292 (0)	233 (0)	232 (0)	1914 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	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)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	8 (0)	11 (0)	11 (0)	16 (0)	52 (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
03	2019	75%	60%	15%	58%	17%
	2018	79%	61%	18%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	64%	16%	58%	22%
	2018	72%	60%	12%	56%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	80%	60%	20%	56%	24%
	2018	65%	59%	6%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
06	2019	74%	58%	16%	54%	20%
	2018	67%	53%	14%	52%	15%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
07	2019	76%	56%	20%	52%	24%
	2018	74%	54%	20%	51%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	88%	60%	28%	56%	32%
	2018	84%	59%	25%	58%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	84%	67%	17%	62%	22%
	2018	97%	67%	30%	62%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	69%	20%	64%	25%
	2018	90%	68%	22%	62%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	91%	65%	26%	60%	31%
	2018	86%	66%	20%	61%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	80%	58%	22%	55%	25%
	2018	76%	56%	20%	52%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
07	2019	79%	53%	26%	54%	25%
	2018	69%	52%	17%	54%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	70%	40%	30%	46%	24%
	2018	88%	38%	50%	45%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	78%	53%	25%	53%	25%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	52%	43%	9%	48%	4%
	2018	66%	44%	22%	50%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	68%	32%	67%	33%
2018	100%	65%	35%	65%	35%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	73%	14%	71%	16%
2018	89%	72%	17%	71%	18%
Compare		-2%			
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	94%	63%	31%	61%	33%
2018	98%	59%	39%	62%	36%
Compare		-4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	54%	42%	57%	39%
2018	97%	54%	43%	56%	41%
Compare		-1%			

### 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	41	38	37	43	52	50					
ELL	75	64	48	80	63	56	69	85	53		
ASN	94	67		94	67						
BLK	72	59	50	73	57	50	58	69	38		
HSP	79	69	60	86	69	65	72	88	65		
WHT	78	64		78	57	45	79	100			
FRL	77	68	59	83	66	61	70	88	63		
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
SWD	29	40	30	53	47	50					
ELL	51	54	57	75	58	59	44	89			
BLK	67	69	63	75	62	45	52	80	53		
HSP	74	65	57	86	60	63	71	91	69		
MUL	73	64		73	50						
WHT	88	80		91	57		79		60		
FRL	74	65	58	84	60	61	70	89	66		
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	37	63		53	69	73					
ELL	55	68	65	74	70	64	25	67			
BLK	55	58	52	74	67	77	31	74			
HSP	72	68	61	83	73	73	62	85	64		
MUL	87	79		73	64						
WHT	81	72		91	83		83	100			
FRL	70	67	59	82	73	74	58	83	67		

### 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	71
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	711
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	66
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	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
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	
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	72
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	70
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.**

ELA learning gains among the lowest 25% was the lowest data component in 2019 at 59%. Factors that contributed to this low performance include

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

Social Studies achievement showed the greatest decline from 90% to 88%. Social Studies and Math were the only components that showed a decline from 2018 to 2019. Factors contributing to this decline include an increase of student enrollment in grade 7 and a lack of prior knowledge in the subject area.

**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.**

We surpassed the state averages in all data components. The greatest gap was demonstrated by the Math achievement. State proficiency was 62%, while ours was at 84%. Although there is a large gap between the state and our data, this component was also one of the only 2 that showed a decline. However, factors that contribute to the success within our math program include the use and implementation of the iReady Standards Mastery Assessments. Students monitor their own progress using standards based student data trackers. Teachers reinforce weak benchmarks and standards through differentiated instruction.

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



Math learning gains in 2019 were 7 points above 2018's achievement (67% compared to 60%). The use of online tools such as Reflex Math in grades 3-5, iReady, Standards Mastery Assessments, Khan Academy, and small group instruction using differentiated materials according to the student's weaknesses all contributed to the rise and improvement in learning gains.

**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 on the ELA FSA. We had 52 students with a level 1, which is roughly 4% of the tested student population. While this is relatively low, it still provides an opportunity to improve services for our lowest performing students. Analyzing the data with students who earned a level 1 and 2 would raise this percentage, therefore demonstrating that the services provided should be improved.

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

1. Increase ELA Lowest 25% Achievement
2. Increase Social Studies Achievement to reflect that of 2018
3. Increase Math Achievement to reflect that of 2018
4. Increase Grade 8 Science Proficiency

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Increase Math Achievement in Grades 3, 4, 8, Algebra 1, and Geometry
<b>Rationale</b>	The Math Achievement decreased 1 percent from 2018 to 2019. Most grade levels demonstrated a decline in proficiency levels in grades 3, 4, and 8, as well as in Algebra 1 and Geometry.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The school data will show an increase in overall Math achievement, from 84% to 86%. Therefore, the measurable goal would be to attain 86% percent proficiency on the 2020 assessment.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Marianne Triana (mtriana@somersetsilverpalms.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Our strategies are to implement i-Ready Standards Mastery Assessments in September for grades 3-5. This will allowing teachers time to assess, reteach through small groups and differentiated instruction models, and reassess each standard prior to May. These students will utilize personal data trackers to monitor their growth by standard. Teacher schedules were also adjusted in order to incorporate common planning and collaboration. In grades 6-8, Carnegie will be utilized instead of iReady. A new curriculum was purchased for the Intensive Math course. An after-school math tutoring program will be available twice weekly for students to attend. Students are encouraged to obtain help with their math assignments, as well as with their Carnegie assignments during these sessions.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Utilizing the Standards Mastery Assessments early in the school year for grades 3-5 and teaching students and parents how to track and monitor their standards based data will give all parties involved a clear understand of that child's abilities and performance per standard. Utilizing common planning time among the teachers enables them to plan effective lessons collaboratively. Teachers also have the ability to plan for small group instruction that will target the lowest benchmarks. Carnegie learning proved to be a beneficial program with the high school students, therefore it will be implemented in the middle school. Carnegie Learning forces students to follow specific steps within their learning, filling any gaps the students may have. Two teachers are available every Tuesday and Thursday to help students with their math or Carnegie assignments. The teacher toolbox was used last year for Intensive Math, purchasing textbooks will help both the teacher and students.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Weekly collaborative planning meetings</li> <li>2. Implementation of Topic Assessments (grades 3-8) and Standards Mastery Assessments (grades 3-5)</li> <li>3. Implementation of Carnegie Learning (grades 6-8)</li> <li>4. New curriculum for Intensive Math students</li> <li>5. After School Math Tutoring/Carnegie Lab</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Marianne Triana (mtriana@somersetsilverpalms.net)

#2	
<b>Title</b>	Increase the ELA Achievement for the Lowest 25%
<b>Rationale</b>	ELA's lowest quartile was the lowest data component in 2019 at 59%. Although, the school showed a 1% increase from 2018 to 2019, this component is still the lowest among all school achievement.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	60% percent of the students within the lowest 25% will demonstrate proficiency on the 2020 Florida Standards Assessment. This will rise the proficiency from 59% to 60%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Martha Santana (msantana@somersetsilverpalms.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The strategy is to implement programs and resources such as iReady Toolbox, iReady lessons, iReady Standards Mastery Assessments, NWEA, Performance Coach, and Wordly Wise. Students within the lowest quartile receive daily reading intervention from an interventionist using the Wonder Works program. Standard based progress monitoring through the use of Standards Mastery Assessments and student data trackers are implemented.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Implementing the above mentioned resources allows students, teachers, and parents to monitor student progress. Students will complete a baseline assessment on various benchmarks. This data will be analyzed and recorded in student data folders. The data will be used to group students in order to properly implement differentiated instruction and target specific student needs. Students will participate in small group instruction to remediate the lowest tested standards and ensure student proficiency through reassessment of the lowest standards. As students demonstrate proficiency on tested benchmarks, small group assignments will be reevaluated and reassigned. Data folders will allow students to be held accountable for their learning, providing them with insight as to their progress.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1. Implementing Resources such as iReady, NWEA, Wordly Wise, and Performance Coach 2. Daily Intervention program using Wonder Words 3. Standards based student data trackers
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Martha Santana (msantana@somersetsilverpalms.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).

### 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: Increase Math Achievement in Grades 3, 4, 8, Algebra 1, and Geometry				\$39,305.11
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	General Fund		\$7,752.36
			<i>Notes: Performance Coach - Math Grades 3-5</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	General Fund		\$17,292.75
			<i>Notes: iReady Technology Program with Standards Mastery and Toolbox - ELA and Math</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	General Fund		\$8,500.00
			<i>Notes: NWEA - ELA and Math</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms			\$1,800.00
			<i>Notes: Math Nation Textbooks - Grades 6-8 Intensive</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms			\$3,960.00

			<i>Notes: Algebra 1 and Geometry Textbooks (New Materials)</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Increase the ELA Achievement for the Lowest 25%</b>				<b>\$75,714.70</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	General Fund		\$17,292.75
			<i>Notes: iReady Technology Program with Standards Mastery and Toolbox - ELA and Math</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	General Fund		\$8,500.00
			<i>Notes: NWEA Grades 3-8 ELA and Math</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	General Fund		\$27,374.53
			<i>Notes: Wordly Wise Books Grades K-8 Performance Coach Books Grades 3-5</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	General Fund		\$12,500.00
			<i>Notes: iLit Grades 6-8</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	General Fund		\$509.40
			<i>Notes: Junior Scholastic Magazine - Intensive Reading</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	General Fund		\$9,538.02
			<i>Notes: LAFS Textbooks Grades 6-8</i>			
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$115,019.81</b>