

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Somerset Academy Silver Palms



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Somerset Academy Silver Palms

23255 SW 115TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33032

<http://somersetsilverpalms.dadeschools.net>

Demographics

Principal: Kerri Ann O'sullivan

Start Date for this Principal: 11/15/2010

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)	76%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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	N/A

* 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	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Somerset Academy Silver Palms

23255 SW 115TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33032

<http://somersetsilverpalms.dadeschools.net>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	96%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Somerset Academy Inc. promotes a culture that maximizes student achievement and fosters the development of responsible, self-directed life-long learners in a safe and enriching environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Set high expectations

Objective

Meaningful curriculum

Effective

Resources and responsible life-long learners

Students who achieve proficiency and beyond

Evaluate continuously and use data to drive curriculum

Teachers who are highly qualified

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
O'Sullivan, Kerri	Principal	Oversee all school operations
Mongeotti, Maria	Assistant Principal	Academics and Curriculum Student Data. SPED Program Testing Accounting Activities Elementary Athletics Cafeteria Before/Aftercare Program Summer Camp Emergency Procedures Registrar/Attendance Parent Club Maintenance/Facilities Discipline
Penas, D'Andrea	Assistant Principal	Academics and Curriculum Student Data Dual Enrollment Teacher Observations SPED Program Master Schedule Activities Middle School Athletics Cafeteria Emergency Procedures Registrar/Attendance Maintenance/Facilities Discipline
Santana, Martha	Instructional Coach	Testing Saturday School Tutoring Program Curriculum Binders ESOL Technology Programs Computer Lab Schedule
Petisco, Gabriela	School Counselor	Academic Counseling Guidance Counseling Career Planning Dual Enrollment Attendance

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 11/15/2010, Kerri Ann O'sullivan

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.*

0

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

83

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)	76%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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	N/A
* 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	179	195	198	186	189	191	290	294	235	0	0	0	0	1957
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	7	8	11	9	11	3	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	6	4	9	6	9	0	0	0	0	39

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	3	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/3/2020

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	202	200	184	192	192	187	292	233	232	0	0	0	0	1914
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	5	8	11	11	16	0	0	0	0	52

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	202	200	184	192	192	187	292	233	232	0	0	0	0	1914
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	5	8	11	11	16	0	0	0	0	52

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

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

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	
Students retained two or more times		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	78%	63%	61%	71%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	61%	59%	67%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	57%	54%	60%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	84%	67%	62%	83%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	67%	63%	59%	73%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	56%	52%	74%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	71%	56%	56%	61%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	88%	80%	78%	84%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(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	75%	60%	15%	58%	17%
	2018	79%	61%	18%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	64%	16%	58%	22%
	2018	72%	60%	12%	56%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	80%	60%	20%	56%	24%
	2018	65%	59%	6%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
06	2019	74%	58%	16%	54%	20%
	2018	67%	53%	14%	52%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
07	2019	76%	56%	20%	52%	24%
	2018	74%	54%	20%	51%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	88%	60%	28%	56%	32%
	2018	84%	59%	25%	58%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	84%	67%	17%	62%	22%
	2018	97%	67%	30%	62%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	69%	20%	64%	25%
	2018	90%	68%	22%	62%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	91%	65%	26%	60%	31%
	2018	86%	66%	20%	61%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	80%	58%	22%	55%	25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	76%	56%	20%	52%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
07	2019	79%	53%	26%	54%	25%
	2018	69%	52%	17%	54%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	70%	40%	30%	46%	24%
	2018	88%	38%	50%	45%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	78%	53%	25%	53%	25%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	52%	43%	9%	48%	4%
	2018	66%	44%	22%	50%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	68%	32%	67%	33%
2018	100%	65%	35%	65%	35%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	73%	14%	71%	16%
2018	89%	72%	17%	71%	18%
Compare		-2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	63%	31%	61%	33%
2018	98%	59%	39%	62%	36%
Compare		-4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	54%	42%	57%	39%
2018	97%	54%	43%	56%	41%
Compare		-1%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	41	38	37	43	52	50					
ELL	75	64	48	80	63	56	69	85	53		
ASN	94	67		94	67						
BLK	72	59	50	73	57	50	58	69	38		
HSP	79	69	60	86	69	65	72	88	65		
WHT	78	64		78	57	45	79	100			
FRL	77	68	59	83	66	61	70	88	63		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	40	30	53	47	50					
ELL	51	54	57	75	58	59	44	89			
BLK	67	69	63	75	62	45	52	80	53		
HSP	74	65	57	86	60	63	71	91	69		
MUL	73	64		73	50						
WHT	88	80		91	57		79		60		
FRL	74	65	58	84	60	61	70	89	66		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	37	63		53	69	73					
ELL	55	68	65	74	70	64	25	67			
BLK	55	58	52	74	67	77	31	74			
HSP	72	68	61	83	73	73	62	85	64		
MUL	87	79		73	64						
WHT	81	72		91	83		83	100			
FRL	70	67	59	82	73	74	58	83	67		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	711
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	66
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	81
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	58
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	72
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	72
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	70
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.

Due to Covid-19 no Florida State Assessments were administered. Data analysis will reflect 2019 performance. ELA learning gains among the lowest 25% was the lowest data component in 2019 at 59%. Factors that contributed to this low performance include lack of prior knowledge and vocabulary.

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

Due to Covid-19 no Florida State Assessments were administered. Data analysis will reflect 2019 performance.

Social Studies achievement showed the greatest decline from 90% to 88%. Social Studies and Math

were the only components that showed a decline from 2018 to 2019. Factors contributing to this decline include an increase of student enrollment in grade 7 and a lack of prior knowledge in the subject area.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Due to Covid-19 no Florida State Assessments were administered. Data analysis will reflect 2019 performance.

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

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

Due to Covid-19 no Florida State Assessments were administered. Data analysis will reflect 2019 performance. Math learning gains in 2019 were 7 points above 2018's achievement (67% compared to 60%). The use of online tools such as Reflex Math in grades 3-5, iReady, Standards Mastery Assessments, Khan Academy, and small group instruction using differentiated materials according to the student's weaknesses all contributed to the rise and improvement in learning gains.

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

Due to Covid-19 no Florida State Assessments were administered. Data analysis will reflect 2019 performance. One area for concern is the number of students with level 1 on the ELA FSA. We had roughly 4% of the tested student population with a level 1. While this is relatively low, it still provides an opportunity to improve services for our lowest performing students. Analyzing the data with students who earned a level 1 and 2 would raise this percentage, therefore demonstrating that the services provided should be improved.

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

Due to Covid -19 and learning gaps remediation for all students is the main priority, while incorporating the list below.

1. Increase ELA Lowest 25% Achievement
3. Increase Social Studies Achievement Achievement
4. Increase Math Achievement Achievement
5. Increase Grade 8 Science Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	Increase Math Achievement in Grades 3, 4, 8, Algebra 1, and Geometry
Description and Rationale:	The Math Achievement decreased 1 percent from 2018 to 2019. Most grade levels demonstrated a decline in proficiency levels in grades 3, 4, and 8, as well as in Algebra 1 and Geometry.
Measurable Outcome:	The school data will show an increase in overall Math achievement, from 84% to 86%. Therefore, the measurable goal would be to attain 86% percent proficiency on the 2021 assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Martha Santana (msantana@somersetsilverpalms.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our strategies are to implement i-Ready Standards Mastery Assessments in September for grades 3-5. This will allowing teachers time to assess, reteach through small groups and differentiated instruction models, and reassess each standard prior to May. These students will utilize personal data trackers to monitor their growth by standard. Teacher schedules were also adjusted in order to incorporate common planning and collaboration. In grades 6-8, Carnegie will be utilized instead of iReady. A new curriculum was purchased for the Intensive Math course. An after-school math tutoring program will be available twice weekly for students to attend. Students are encouraged to obtain help with their math assignments, as well as with their Carnegie assignments during these sessions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing the Standards Mastery Assessments early in the school year for grades 3-5 and teaching students and parents how to track and monitor their standards based data will give all parties involved a clear understand of that child's abilities and performance per standard. Utilizing common planning time among the teachers enables them to plan effective lessons collaboratively. Teachers also have the ability to plan for small group instruction that will target the lowest benchmarks. Carnegie learning proved to be a beneficial program with the high school students, therefore it will be implemented in the middle school. Carnegie Learning forces students to follow specific steps within their learning, filling any gaps the students may have. Two teachers are available every Tuesday and Thursday to help students with their math or Carnegie assignments. The teacher toolbox was used last year for Intensive Math, purchasing textbooks will help both the teacher and students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly collaborative planning meetings
2. Implementation of Topic Assessments (grades 3-8) and Standards Mastery Assessments (grades 3-5)
3. Implementation of Carnegie Learning (grades 6-8)
4. New curriculum for Intensive Math students
5. After School Math Tutoring/Carnegie Lab

Person Responsible Martha Santana (msantana@somersetsilverpalms.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementing Resources such as iReady, NWEA, Wordly Wise, and Performance Coach
2. Daily Intervention program using Wonder Words
3. Standards based student data trackers

Person Responsible Martha Santana (msantana@somersetsilverpalms.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Due to Covid-19 remediation for all students is our priority to bridge the learning gaps in all content areas.

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.

All stakeholders collaborate and share responsibility in improving the school through our ESSAC meetings, faculty meetings and department meetings. The ESSAC meetings give parents and community members the opportunity to share their input and recommendations for continued improvement. The faculty and department meetings give teachers and staff the opportunities to share their ideas on how the school can continuously improve. All stakeholders enjoy their experience at school and feel a part of the shared vision of success by including students on incentive field trips and through staff building activities throughout the year. Students are able to access resources for their social and emotional needs through our counselors and teachers. These practices will be sustained in years to come by having an open line of communication between our stakeholders.

The leadership team works collaboratively with teacher leaders to provide support to faculty in implementing effective instructional strategies aligned to the school goals. The administration consistently monitors classroom instruction and provides timely and constructive feedback to ensure academic success. Faculty meetings are a productive use of time and are designed to support teaching and learning. All staff members have equitable opportunities to assume leadership roles at the school.

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				\$89,107.73
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	Other Federal		\$16,135.00
			Notes: iReady Technology Program with Standards Mastery and Toolbox - ELA and Math			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	Other Federal		\$19,682.05
			Notes: Carnegie - Grades 6-8 Math, Algebra 1, and Geometry			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms			\$8,656.25
			Notes: NWEA - ELA and Math			

			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	Other Federal		\$1,530.00
			<i>Notes: USA Test Prep - Grades 6-8 Science and Biology</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	Other Federal		\$3,056.63
			<i>Notes: Seesaw - Grades K-5 - ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	Other Federal		\$28,967.40
			<i>Notes: Science Textbooks and Digital Licences Grades 4-8</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	Other Federal		\$3,550.00
			<i>Notes: Physical Science - New Material - Discovery Education</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	Other Federal		\$7,530.40
			<i>Notes: Biology Textbooks and Digital Licenses (New Material)</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$58,087.92
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	Other Federal		\$16,135.00
			<i>Notes: iReady Technology Program with Standards Mastery and Toolbox - ELA and Math</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	Other Federal		\$8,656.25
			<i>Notes: NWEA Grades 3-8 ELA and Math</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	Other Federal		\$14,635.16
			<i>Notes: Wordly Wise Books Grades K-8</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	Other Federal		\$12,286.51
			<i>Notes: LAFS Textbooks Grades 3 and 6-8</i>			
			0332 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms	Other Federal		\$6,375.00
			<i>Notes: Edgenuity Grades 6-8</i>			
					Total:	\$147,195.65