

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Somerset Academy Charter Elementary School (South



2020-21 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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# Somerset Academy Charter Elementary School (South Homestead)

300 SE 1ST DR, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetelem.dadeschools.net

## Demographics

Principal: Layda Morales

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
<b>2019-20 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (60%)
<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>	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](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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# Somerset Academy Charter Elementary School (South Homestead)

300 SE 1ST DR, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetelem.dadeschools.net

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	81%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	95%

## School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	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.

The mission of Somerset Academy Charter is to provide an individualized, academically rigorous, and engaging curriculum focusing on the ever-changing needs of our learners. Our educational process encompasses the partnership among the school, family, and community, in order to develop a life-long love of learning. We strive to develop students who are self-assured, well-rounded, and prepared for future success.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Somerset Academy Charter is to continue to be recognized and respected as a top ranked learning community that graduates productive and caring citizens who are prepared to succeed in a global society.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
morales, layda	Principal	Principal, oversees school wide instruction progress and fidelity to school wide plan
Romero, Crystina	Instructional Coach	Meets with staff regularly to discuss and monitor student progression across grade levels in the area of Mathematics. Reading coach, models and provides teachers with intervention strategies and delivers materials for small group instruction in the area of Reading and Language Arts. PD Liaison, provides teachers with professional learning opportunities.
Yoon, Lynn	Teacher, K-12	
Martinez, Yvette	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders, model and provide new teachers with materials, strategies and mentoring to ensure student success.
Villasuso, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders, model and provide new teachers with materials, strategies and mentoring to ensure student success.
Bernal, Yesenia	Teacher, K-12	Team Leaders, model and provide new teachers with materials, strategies and mentoring to ensure student success, STEM.

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 8/24/2015, Layda Morales

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

30

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

4

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

34

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
<b>2019-20 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (60%)
<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>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	84	96	99	92	96	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	568
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	9	0	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

Monday 8/24/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	95	87	104	103	101	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	583
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	5	6	5	1	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

**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	6	8	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	95	87	104	103	101	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	583
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	5	6	5	1	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

**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	6	8	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	73%	62%	57%	63%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	62%	58%	46%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	58%	53%	48%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	75%	69%	63%	71%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	66%	62%	61%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	55%	51%	50%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	55%	53%	57%	52%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

### Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	60%	19%	58%	21%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	57%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	64%	2%	58%	8%
	2018	64%	60%	4%	56%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	70%	60%	10%	56%	14%
	2018	62%	59%	3%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	67%	7%	62%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	75%	67%	8%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	69%	4%	64%	9%
	2018	82%	68%	14%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	77%	65%	12%	60%	17%
	2018	66%	66%	0%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	53%	11%	53%	11%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						

**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	40	43	20	28	44	35	12				
ELL	79	60		79	72	40	83				
BLK	75	60		88	80						
HSP	74	63	25	74	71	40	65				
WHT	59	53		77	80						
FRL	72	64	32	73	72	44	60				

  

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	44	45	43	38	45	38	20				
ELL	56	61	67	71	76	73	20				
BLK	60			87							
HSP	66	56	52	73	71	42	56				
WHT	60			87							
FRL	63	55	52	74	70	42	52				

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	27	33	36	38	67	58	17				
ELL	56	43	47	67	57	54					
BLK	53			73							
HSP	66	46	45	71	62	44	63				
WHT	50			71							
FRL	61	45	44	68	58	48	55				

### 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	63
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	87
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	506
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	71
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	76
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	63
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

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

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the lowest performance. This is not a trend for our school but contributing factors may have been a lack of student motivation and gaps in learning.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest decline from the prior year.

**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 Math and the ELA lowest 25th percentile were the only components that showed a gap compared to the state average.

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

ELA Achievement showed an improvement from 65% to 73%. Teachers implemented new teaching strategies in small group and interventions increased as well.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

The amount of students that scored a level 1 in both ELA and Math.

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

1. Student achievement for lowest 25th percentile
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** According to our data, only 33% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in ELA, and 40% in Math. The learning needs of these particular students differ from the general population and we need to ensure that the instruction provided is adequate. Making changes and adjustments can help close the gap between the performance of the lowest 25% and the rest of the student population.

**Measurable Outcome:** The school would like to see a year's worth of learning gains as evidenced by the i-Ready Diagnostics and/or FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** layda morales (lmorales@somersetsoho.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The school will focus on data gathered through different platforms to develop a fluid plan for the students that is subject to change at any time, according to the student's needs. We would also like to see more parent involvement in the learning process of their child.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Research shows that when teachers present multiple solution strategies for solving the same problem, students demonstrate significant increases in procedural flexibility, conceptual knowledge, and procedural knowledge.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Identify students who make up the lowest 25% based on i-Ready and FSA data.
2. Communicate these names to the teachers.
3. Teachers will create targeted small groups and meet with them on a daily basis.
4. Students must attend Extended Day Learning once we return to the schoolhouse.
5. Teachers will record and collect data.
6. Teachers will meet with leadership team to review progress monitoring.
7. Instruction of these students is observed and actionable feedback is provided regarding adjustments to instructional strategies and/or materials.
8. Parents will be notified on a weekly basis on how their child is progressing and re-assess as needed.

**Person Responsible** layda morales (lmorales@somersetsoho.com)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

n/a

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**



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

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

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

The staff at Somerset South Homestead works diligently to involve parents in a variety of activities at school. There are opportunities such as PAL's, Open House, family night events. The mission and vision of the school are shared with parents through the School Advisory Council meetings and at family events. There is ongoing communication regarding students' progress between parents and teachers using a variety of means such as phone calls, emails, written notes, conferences, and Class Dojo.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
			Total: \$0.00