Somerset Oaks Academy

2020-21 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: 8/27/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	94%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	95%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	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 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/27/2020, Idalia Suarez M

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.*

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	69	48	49	74	98	65	65	69	0	0	0	0	603
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	3	1	6	19	17	13	13	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	2	1	1	3	6	15	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	18	6	10	12	4	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	25	19	7	5	2	0	0	0	0	87

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	5	2	7	45	29	28	24	0	0	0	0	140

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	0	2	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/27/2020

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	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	

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	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	

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**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	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%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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%
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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
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					
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		

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
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

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
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.

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?

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. Increase 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and 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.
Measurable Outcome:	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 a school wide math fluency program. Students in grades K-8 will participate in this program in which students will be provided with weekly drills to enhance their math fluency. Students who scored a Level 1 or a Level 2 on the 2019 FSA, will be closely monitored to determine progress and growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that students struggling with mathematics may benefit from early intervention in math fluency aimed at improving their mathematics ability and ultimately preventing subsequent failure. There is a high level of evidence that implementing these math fluency drills will result in increased numbers of proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School Leadership Team will analyze school wide data to determine which students in grades K-8 scored a level 1 or level 2 on the 2019 Math FSA.
2. The Leadership Team will develop a plan for the math fluency program.
3. The leadership Team will choose activities that will be implemented weekly 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 fluency 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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and 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.
Measurable Outcome:	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 (while taking social distancing into effect).
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 Steps to Implement

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and 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%.
Measurable Outcome:	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 (staff will plan strategies using social distancing guidelines).
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 Steps to Implement

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After analyzing our 2019 school wide data, science proficiency was 39%. We calculated a 2% dropped from the previous school year.
Measurable Outcome:	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 Steps to Implement

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

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

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 which, do to the Covid-19 world wide pandemic, many students will be returning with different social and emotional needs.

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 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. In addition, we are in constant communication with our parents through our
school wide web page, school wide communication tool, and social media accounts (instagram and Facebook).
Most importantly, the school will promote parent involvement in the academic program by conducting parent nights/workshops through out the school year to inform and prepare parents for digital curriculum learning, as well as the implementation of the Florida Standards and to prepare for state standardized testing.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$16,480.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1382	690-Computer Software	3033 - Somerset Oaks Academy	General Fund		$16,480.00
			Notes: i-Ready Diagnostic and Instruction			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$6,460.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1382	690-Computer Software	3033 - Somerset Oaks Academy	General Fund		$6,460.00
			Notes: i-Ready Teacher Tool Box			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies				$4,700.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1382	690-Computer Software	3033 - Somerset Oaks Academy	General Fund		$4,700.00

			Notes: Edgenuity			
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$4,446.90**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1382	530-Periodicals	3033 - Somerset Oaks Academy	General Fund		$4,446.90
			Notes: Science and Social Studies Weekly			
					Total:	**$32,086.90**