

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Somerset Academy Charter Middle School (South



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Somerset Academy Charter Middle School (South Homestead)

305 NE 2ND RD, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetacademysh.com

Demographics

Principal: Walk IR la Soberon

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	82%
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: A (63%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Somerset Academy Charter Middle School (South Homestead)

305 NE 2ND RD, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetacademysh.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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	83%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	90%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Somerset Academy, Inc. promotes a transformational culture that maximizes student achievement and the development of accountable, global learners in a safe and enriching environment that fosters high-quality education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lopez, Alina	Principal	
Morfa, Caridad	Assistant Principal	
Steele, Laura	Assistant Principal	
Berry, Lakisha	Other	Testing Chair
Socas, Cristina	Dean	
Marques, Sonia	Instructional Coach	
Ball-Llovera, Kelly	Instructional Coach	
Daniel, Matthew	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2015, Walk IR la Soberon

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.*

18

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

26

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	82%
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: A (63%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	157	211	0	0	0	0	503
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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	9	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	19	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	16	28	0	0	0	0	55
	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	0	0	0	0	0	20	29	58	0	0	0	0	107

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

Wednesday 9/16/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	205	192	0	0	0	0	543
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	3	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	11	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	58	47	0	0	0	0	154
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	49	25	0	0	0	0	102

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	7	0	0	0	0	27

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	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	10
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	205	192	0	0	0	0	543
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	3	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	11	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	58	47	0	0	0	0	154
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	49	25	0	0	0	0	102

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	7	0	0	0	0	27

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	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	10
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	61%	58%	54%	59%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	58%	54%	61%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	47%	57%	48%	44%
Math Achievement	70%	58%	58%	54%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	65%	56%	57%	52%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	54%	51%	49%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	38%	52%	51%	48%	50%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	85%	74%	72%	78%	70%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	65%	58%	7%	54%	11%
	2018	61%	53%	8%	52%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	56%	-1%	52%	3%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	51%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2019	60%	60%	0%	56%	4%
	2018	61%	59%	2%	58%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	60%	58%	2%	55%	5%
	2018	46%	56%	-10%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
	2018	58%	52%	6%	54%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	80%	40%	40%	46%	34%
	2018	83%	38%	45%	45%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	13%	43%	-30%	48%	-35%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	37%	44%	-7%	50%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	68%	7%	67%	8%
2018	96%	65%	31%	65%	31%
Compare		-21%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	84%	73%	11%	71%	13%
2018	82%	72%	10%	71%	11%
Compare		2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	63%	33%	61%	35%
2018	93%	59%	34%	62%	31%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	54%	46%	57%	43%
2018	90%	54%	36%	56%	34%
Compare		10%			

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	26	46	36	41	42	36	27	55			

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL	42	53	48	54	55	62	24	67	77		
ASN	80	60		90	70						
BLK	54	50	46	63	64	73	20	82			
HSP	61	57	48	69	64	68	36	86	78		
WHT	63	48	29	76	75	63	55	83	81		
FRL	58	55	48	67	63	64	36	84	77		
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	26	41	38	38	58	55	27	75			
ELL	27	52	53	41	60	67	27	62			
BLK	50	58	54	53	64		36				
HSP	56	56	49	65	65	70	52	81	57		
WHT	73	61		65	57	57	77	86	71		
FRL	55	55	51	63	64	71	49	81	57		
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	58	56	42	55	33	43	50			
ELL	37	59	56	40	62	57	20	46	45		
BLK	44	58		52	42		45				
HSP	58	61	57	51	50	50	43	80	74		
WHT	68	59	64	65	61	50	63	85	80		
FRL	56	61	60	51	50	50	42	75	73		

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	62
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	619
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	54
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	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
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	62
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	64
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	61
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.

8th Grade Science. In addition to a lack of foundational knowledge in science, another factor potentially contributing to the low performance is a lack of rigor in the subject area and insufficient progress monitoring.

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

8th Grade Science. In addition to a lack of foundational knowledge in science, other factors that potentially contributed to the decline were a lack of rigor in the subject area, and insufficient progress monitoring.

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.

8th Grade Science. In addition to a lack of foundational knowledge in science, other factors that potentially contributed to the gap were a lack of rigor in the subject area, and insufficient progress monitoring.

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

6th Grade Math. The previous year was the first year our school implemented the i-Ready program, which is a possible contributing factor to the improved performance. Further, there was more alignment and collaboration between the teachers teaching the subject area.

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

Students earning a Level 1 on FSA

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

1. 8th Grade Science Achievement
2. ELA Achievement
3. ESSA SWD Math Achievement
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to 8th Grade Science Achievement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Science achievement was the lowest-performing component, the component with the greatest decline from the previous year, and the component with the greatest gap between school and state.

Measurable Outcome: Improve achievement in 8th-grade science by 12 percentage points to an overall proficiency of 25%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sonia Marques (smarques@somersetacademysh.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Frequent progress monitoring using consistent assessment tools across all teachers teaching the subject area to gauge; provide tutoring opportunities and online resources to assist in remote learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Frequently assessing student progress will ensure students are on-track to master standards. Tutoring will supplement their classroom instruction and help fill gaps in their science knowledge. Providing each student with online resources will help with the facilitation of learning and knowledge acquisition.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create topic assessments to be used to progress monitor, implement a schedule for administering the assessments.
2. Tutoring
3. Online purchase of textbooks to facilitate remote learning instruction

Person Responsible: Caridad Morfa (cmorfa@somersetacademysh.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA gains and performance of the lowest 25% were our second and third-lowest scoring component.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA learning gains of 57% and the lowest 25% performance of 48%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Ball-Llovera (kmaes@somersetacademysh.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tutoring, i-Ready program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Individualized targeted tutoring will support students in filling gaps in reading comprehension skills. The i-Ready program is a differentiated research-based online remediation program aimed at filling gaps. Purchase on-line resources to facilitate remote learning instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. i-Ready program usage with fidelity
2. Provide ELA tutoring opportunities
3. Additional online purchase of texts to facilitate remote learning instruction

Person Responsible Caridad Morfa (cmorfa@somersetacademysh.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math students with disabilities (SWD) declined in learning gains from 58% in the 2018 testing year to 42% in the 2019 testing year.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with disabilities (SWD) will increase their learning gains in math by 10% to 52%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matthew Daniel (mdaniel@somersetacademysh.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Target SWD with Math pull-out tutoring throughout the day and after school tutoring sessions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SWD requires a smaller group setting to maximize their learning. By placing them in a pull-out tutoring group will allow us to focus on their specific deficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Pull- Out Tutoring
After School Tutoring

Person Responsible Caridad Morfa (cmorfa@somersetacademysh.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School leadership appointed a mathematics and reading coach to address teacher deficiencies in differentiated instruction to assist students earning a Level 1 on the FSA.

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.

Last year we began a new initiative, the school created a Parent Academy, which aims to involve parents and the community in the school and develop the capacity of families to support their child's education. The Academy will meet virtually 6 times during the year and engage participants in topics such as parenting skills, navigating the path to college, how to best support children in school, etc.

The school also hosts a variety of events open to families and the community, for example, the Hispanic Heritage Expo, Black History Showcase, and SASH Bash (food truck night). Further extracurricular clubs, such as the National Junior Honor Society and Key Club, prepare students to be leaders for the public and engage in a variety of community service projects. These events will continue to take place per CDC guidelines.

To support student achievement, the school has also partnered with Miami-Dade College to provide tutoring, we will continue these efforts virtually. Further, the counseling team has partnered with community organizations to provide resources to families, such as counseling and information and services during the school's Wellness Fair. The school has also teamed with local restaurants and businesses (e.g., Texas Roadhouse to raise funds for the school's various organizations). These events will continue to take place per CDC guidelines.

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: Other: 8th Grade Science Achievement				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	3374		6013 - Somerset Academy Charter Middle S Homestead	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$27,220.90
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			6013 - Somerset Academy Charter Middle S Homestead	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Tutoring</i>			
	6500	690-Computer Software	6013 - Somerset Academy Charter Middle S Homestead	Title, I Part A		\$24,220.90
			<i>Notes: i-Ready online component and supplemental consumables</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$34,984.10
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3374	160-Other Support Personnel	6013 - Somerset Academy Charter Middle S Homestead	Title, I Part A		\$31,984.10
			<i>Notes: Para-professionals</i>			
	3374	160-Other Support Personnel	6013 - Somerset Academy Charter Middle S Homestead	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Tutoring</i>			
Total:						\$65,205.00