Somerset Oaks Academy

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Somerset Oaks Academy

1000 OLD DIXIE HWY, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetoaks.com

Demographics

Principal: Idalia Suarez M

Start Date for this Principal: 9/9/2019

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
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: C (49%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (46%) 2014-15: D (39%)
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 Oaks Academy

1000 OLD DIXIE HWY, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetoaks.com

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	88%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	94%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	B	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 Oaks Academy is to foster the development of responsible, self-directed, life-long learners by maximizing student achievement. Somerset Oaks is committed to providing a safe environment where future leaders are inspired to learn, explore and create through student centered learning, all while developing the whole child.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Somerset Oaks Academy will provide a rigorous academic curriculum in a nurturing environment by setting high expectations for both students and teachers. The school will meet and exceed high standards of student achievement by delivering a rigorous school curriculum, where emphasis is given to personalization in student mastery of the State Standards. As well, it will supplement and enhance instructions through high-quality curricular and extra-curricular programs. The school will provide ample opportunities for students, families, and the community to be active educational partners in education. The school will continuously monitor, evaluate, and improve curriculum to achieve continuous student improvement each year.

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
Suarez, Idalia	Principal	The principal oversees the overall functioning of the school concerning personnel, facilities, academics, activities, and budget. The principal will evaluate the effectiveness of the leadership team and staff by conducting walkthroughs, observations, and data chats. The principal will conduct weekly leadership team meetings to discuss data, curriculum, and concerns across all grade levels and content areas.
Gomez, Marcelo	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal will support the principal in areas concerning personnel, facilities, academics, activities, and budget. Together, with the principal, the AP will evaluate the effectiveness of the schools academic program through walkthroughs, weekly monitoring of lesson plans, teacher professionalism, communication, and teacher observations.
Garcia, Annette	Teacher, ESE	Will oversee the special education program at the school and help monitor all ESE students and that they receive the services required by their IEP.
Cruz, Ximena	Instructional Coach	The lead teacher will support the principal and assistant principal in areas concerning curriculum and its implementation school wide. She will provide professional development and PLC opportunities to the staff as deemed necessary. She will support core instruction, implementation of intervention and modeling best practices to ensure students meet Florida State Standards. The lead teacher, together with the principal and assistant principal, will analyze school data and conduct data chats with teachers to help develop instructional strategies to implement throughout the year.
Keime, Natalie	Instructional Coach	She will provide immediate support across grade levels in reading and writing. She will help support the implementation of school wide reading and literacy academic programs as well as model and provide feedback and resources to assist teachers.
Ochoa, Yadira	Instructional Coach	She will provide immediate support across grade levels in mathematics and science. She will help support the implementation of school wide math, science and STEM academic programs as well as model and provide feedback and resources to assist teachers.
Kirk, Jason	Dean	He will oversee the overall implementation of the school code of conduct across all grade levels. He helped develop a school wide positive behavior management system which he will support and monitor the effectiveness. He will also assist teachers in the implementation of the program along with provide guidance for individual classroom systems.
Detres, Vashti	School Counselor	She will oversee the school wide leadership program. She works directly with our ESE Department to provide support and services for our students.

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	69	49	49	81	99	72	71	77	50	0	0	0	0	617
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	4	1	3	4	2	9	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	1	12	23	12	20	7	1	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	45	28	38	17	27	13	0	0	0	0	168

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	6	0	7	40	33	31	29	17	0	0	0	0	163

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	1	4	0	7	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	18
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)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/9/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	5	8	13	10	18	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	24	25	31	26	11	0	0	0	0	128

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	2	4	12	7	24	27	25	25	14	0	0	0	0	140

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	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	5	8	13	10	18	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	24	25	31	26	11	0	0	0	0	128

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	2	4	12	7	24	27	25	25	14	0	0	0	0	140

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	51%	63%	61%	49%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	61%	59%	53%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	57%	54%	55%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	49%	67%	62%	59%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	49%	63%	59%	61%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	56%	52%	56%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	39%	56%	56%	39%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	45%	80%	78%	75%	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	69 (0)	49 (0)	49 (0)	81 (0)	99 (0)	72 (0)	71 (0)	77 (0)	50 (0)	617 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	1 (1)	3 (2)	4 (0)	2 (1)	9 (2)	26 (6)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (3)	8 (5)	1 (8)	12 (13)	23 (10)	12 (18)	20 (4)	7 (1)	1 (3)	84 (65)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	45 (11)	28 (24)	38 (25)	17 (31)	27 (26)	13 (11)	168 (128)

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	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
	2018	44%	61%	-17%	57%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison	12%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	64%	-23%	58%	-17%
	2018	52%	60%	-8%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	-11%					
Cohort Comparison	-3%					
05	2019	52%	60%	-8%	56%	-4%
	2018	45%	59%	-14%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison	7%					
Cohort Comparison	0%					
06	2019	54%	58%	-4%	54%	0%
	2018	42%	53%	-11%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison	12%					
Cohort Comparison	9%					
07	2019	42%	56%	-14%	52%	-10%
	2018	36%	54%	-18%	51%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison	6%					
Cohort Comparison	0%					
08	2019	46%	60%	-14%	56%	-10%
	2018	50%	59%	-9%	58%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison	10%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	67%	-20%	62%	-15%
	2018	56%	67%	-11%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	69%	-28%	64%	-23%
	2018	52%	68%	-16%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison	-11%					
Cohort Comparison	-15%					
05	2019	33%	65%	-32%	60%	-27%
	2018	64%	66%	-2%	61%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-31%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
06	2019	66%	58%	8%	55%	11%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
07	2019	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
	2018	46%	52%	-6%	54%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	23%	40%	-17%	46%	-23%
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	47%	53%	-6%	53%	-6%
	2018	40%	56%	-16%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	19%	43%	-24%	48%	-29%
	2018	38%	44%	-6%	50%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

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	46%	73%	-27%	71%	-25%
2018	46%	72%	-26%	71%	-25%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	63%	-1%	61%	1%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%
Compare		62%			
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
SWD	21	38	37	17	29	31		20			
ELL	47	56	59	51	54	51	37	21			
BLK	59	63		38	47						
HSP	50	57	51	48	49	43	38	44	58		
WHT	57	53		62	60						
FRL	50	56	52	48	50	42	40	44	67		
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	24	47	50	29	61	64	55				
ELL	29	48	53	45	53	60	21	47			
BLK	58	44		58	40						
HSP	43	52	51	56	50	47	39	45			
WHT	55	62		60	46						
FRL	43	51	52	54	48	52	36	46			
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	24	36	25	19	37	33	22				
ELL	34	53	57	46	56	54	18				
BLK	57	29		61	41						
HSP	48	54	55	58	63	56	38	75			
WHT	56	69		75	62						
FRL	47	51	55	57	60	54	38	80			

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	50
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	497
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	48
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	52
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	49
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	58
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	50
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.

Our data reveals a significant drop in Math Proficiency. After analyzing our school wide data, we determined that we need to increase the rigor on our math assessments, as this was one of the contributing factors to last year's performance. We will now add i-Ready standard mastery assessments to assess students after they have mastered each math standard. In addition, teachers will be using the item specs to enrich classroom assessments to increase rigor. The school also had a math coach and an intervention specialist to support students as well as teachers in classrooms.

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

Our data indicates that our math achievement, learning gains, and lowest percentile showed the greatest decline from the prior year. After desegregating the data with members of the schools' leadership team as well as teachers, we determined several factors that contributed to this decline with one being the rigor of the assessments. We created a plan of action during the summer to make sure we up the rigor in math instruction and assessment. The school will have students complete the i-Ready standard mastery each time students have mastered standards to make sure they have mastery and are exposed to FSA style questions. In addition, our math instructional coach will assist teachers in using the item specs to plan and enrich math assessments.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math Achievement. The state had a percentage of a 62% while the school has a percentage of a 49%. As previously mentioned, the school determined that one of the major factors that contributed to this gap is the amount of rigor of the math assessments. We created a plan of action during the summer to make sure we up the rigor in math instruction and assessment. The school will have students complete the i-Ready standard mastery each time students have mastered standards to make sure they have mastery and are exposed to FSA style questions. In addition, our math instructional coach will assist teachers in using the item specs to plan and enrich math assessments.

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

The data component which showed the most improvement was ELA achievements as well as ELA learning gains which a five point increase from 2018-2019. New actions that were taken in this area were purchasing a new vocabulary curriculum, revamping our intervention curriculum, as well as hiring two interventionist to assist in providing students with reading interventions.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data from Part 1, we determined that truancy, students with 15 or more absences is one of the areas for potential concern. Another potential area of concern would be course failure, specifically in ELA.

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

1. Increasing Math Proficiency, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25%
2 Increasing Civics EOC Proficiency
3. Science Proficiency across all grade levels.
4. Effectively Targeting SWD

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Math Proficiency, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25%
Rationale	After analyzing our 2019 school wide data, we noticed a decrease in our Math proficiency, learning gains, and our lowest 25%. We calculated a seven point decrease in math achievement from 2018-2019, and a six point decrease in the component of lowest 25% making adequate learning gains.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to increase our Math Achievement and Learning gains from a 49% to a 54% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Marcelo Gomez (mgomez@somersetoaks.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence based strategy that will be implemented for effectively increasing Math achievement and learning gains will be math Interventions. Students in grades 3-5 who scored a Level 1 or a Level 2 on the 2019 FSA, will be participating in weekly math interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research indicates that students struggling with mathematics may benefit from early interventions aimed at improving their mathematics ability and ultimately preventing subsequent failure. There is a high level of evidence that implementing these math interventions will result in increased numbers of proficiency.

Action Step	
Description	1. School Leadership Team will analyze school wide data to determine which students in grades 3-5 scored a level 1 or level 2 on the 2019 Math FSA. 2. The Leadership Team will choose a teacher to provide those students with 30 minutes math interventions twice a week. 3. The leadership Team will choose activities that will be implemented during those intervention in order to build math fluency as well as target areas in which they could benefit from further instruction in. 4. The leadership team will monitor for the fidelity of implementation of these interventions by conducting walk throughs during the scheduled interventions. 5. The leadership team will schedule growth monitoring assessments every 21 instructional days to see progress students have made.
Person Responsible	Yadira Ochoa (yochoa@somersetoaks.com)

#2	
Title	Effectively targeting students with disabilities
Rationale	According to our 2019 school wide data, there was a 3 point decrease from the 2018-2019 FSA in ELA achievement for students with disabilities. There was also a 9 point decrease from 2018-2019 in ELA learning gains. In math, there was a 12 point decrease from 2018-2019 in math achievement.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to be at or above the Federal Index of 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Annette Garcia (agarcia@somersetoaks.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) is a supplemental peer-tutoring program in which student pairs perform a structured set of activities in reading or math (PALS Reading and PALS Math, respectively). During the 30-35 minute peer-tutoring sessions, students take turns acting as the tutor, coaching and correcting one another as they work through problems. Pairs work together three or four times per week for reading sessions and two times per week for math sessions. The designation of tutoring pairs and skill assignment is based on teacher judgment of student needs and abilities, and teachers reassign tutoring pairs regularly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	There is a high level of evidence that implementing these peer assisted strategies will result in increased number of proficiency.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will identify general ed students with leadership qualities. 2. Teachers will pair a student with disabilities with a general ed student. 3. Students will conduct partner reading and retelling. 4. Teacher will use teacher observation as a form of assessment to ensure student understanding. 5. Leadership team will monitor for fidelity through classroom walk throughs.
Person Responsible	Ximena Cruz (xcruz@somersetoaks.com)

#3	
Title	Increasing Civics EOC proficiency
Rationale	According to the 2019 school grade component, the school scored a 45% proficiency in Civics, which was 35% lower than the District average of 80%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is the increase proficiency from 45% to at least the district average of 80%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jason Kirk (jkirk@somersetoaks.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Active learning techniques such as cooperative learning, project-based learning, role playing, and peer-guided discussion, in conjunction with differentiated instructional strategies have shown to have a positive impact on on student achievement in Civics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Studies have shown that differentiated classrooms focusing on student-centered learning through active learning techniques for Civics, have positive results in increasing citizenship building and political knowledge for students.
Action Step	
Description	1. Students will be taking a baseline assessment to determine what standards have been mastered and what standards they need further instruction in. 2. Teachers will analyze standards and create differentiated groups and tailor instruction based on student needs. 3. Teachers will create mini benchmark assessments to administer to students and debrief each assessment to ensure understanding. 4. Teachers will analyze data from these mini benchmark assessments and provide instruction and additional support in a small group setting. 5. Teachers will reteach concepts and reassess to ensure understanding.
Person Responsible	Jason Kirk (jkirk@somersetoaks.com)

#4	
Title	Increase Science Proficiency
Rationale	After analyzing our 2019 school wide data, science proficiency was 39%. We calculated a 2% dropped from the previous school year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to increase our Science Achievement from 39% to at least the district and state average of 56%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Marcelo Gomez (mgomez@somersetoaks.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategy we will use is a focus on inquiry based instruction where students will be able to experience learning through hands on activities in a fun and engaging way.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research indicates that inquiry based learning has many benefits. It helps provide students a deeper understanding of the topics taught as well as making better connections between concepts. As well, research demonstrates that inquiry based instruction empowers students voice and increases their motivation to complete their work.

Action Step	
Description	1. Students will be taking a baseline assessment to determine what standards have been mastered and what standards they need further instruction in. 2. Teachers will analyze standards and create differentiated groups and tailor instruction based on student needs. 3. Teachers will create mini benchmark assessments to administer to students and debrief each assessment to ensure understanding. 4. Teachers will analyze data from these mini benchmark assessments and provide instruction and additional support in a small group setting. 5. Teachers will reteach concepts and reassess to ensure understanding.
Person Responsible	Marcelo Gomez (mgomez@somersetoaks.com)

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).

In order to improve student literacy ,we plan on implementing literacy skill development across all curriculum and grade levels. There will be a concentrated emphasis on student centered learning through research- based instructional strategies such as project based learning. The school will also be implementing a character development program, Leader In Me, to address social and emotional learning.

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.

The school holds Quarterly EESAC meetings, where parents will learn important information regarding the school's academic and extracurricular initiatives. The school also sends home a Year At A Glance Calendar, informing parents of our yearly events so that they can plan accordingly to attend and/or volunteer as well as a more detailed monthly calendar. We promote parent participation by requiring a minimum of 30 volunteer hours per family per school year. In addition, we are in constant communication with our parents through our school wide web page, and social media accounts (instagram and Facebook).

Most importantly, the school will promote parent involvement in the academic program by conducting parent nights through out the school year to inform and prepare parents for the implementation of the Florida Standards and the Florida Standards Assessment in the spring.

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.

The school ensures that social-emotional needs of all students are being met, through the use of character development education. Teachers provide support and mentoring in the classroom as well as identifying behaviors that may need to be addressed at a deeper level. The school also keeps constant communication among the key stakeholders which include the student, teacher, parents and administration. When needed, intervention is implemented and data collection is monitored.

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

The school invites all families to an orientation so that families may familiarize themselves with the school. Also, weekly tours are available for families who are interested in attending the school. For our outgoing students to our neighboring sisters schools, such as Somerset Academy South Homestead Middle and High, the school will be invited to an assembly to describe their academic programs and answer questions. Parents and student will also be invited to a Curriculum Fair to promote and recruit students to their program.

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 school leadership team consists of key teachers from various grades and subjects. The team meets monthly to discuss most recent data generated by iReady, Interim assessments, progress monitoring tools, and computer based program reports. During these leadership meetings based on the most recent data, resources are discussed and decisions are made as to which resources should be purchased and

how they will be used. A property inventory log is used to determine what resources are available and what resources need to be purchased. The team determines the most effective use of the resources.

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Math Proficiency, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25%				$17,170.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1382	690-Computer Software	3033 - Somerset Oaks Academy	General Fund		$17,170.00
			Notes: iReady Diagnostic and Instruction			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Effectively targeting students with disabilities				$7,675.30
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1382	690-Computer Software	3033 - Somerset Oaks Academy	General Fund		$7,675.30
			Notes: iReady Teacher Tool Box			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing Civics EOC proficiency				$400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		690-Computer Software	3033 - Somerset Oaks Academy	General Fund		$400.00
			Notes: US Test Prep			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Science Proficiency				$637.60
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		530-Periodicals	3033 - Somerset Oaks Academy	General Fund		$637.60
			Notes: Scholastic News			
					Total:	$25,882.90