Somerset Academy Silver Palms At Princeton

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Somerset Academy Silver Palms At Princeton

13390 SW 248 ST, Homestead, FL 33032

[no web address on file]

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)	86%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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

Somerset Academy Silver Palms At Princeton

13390 SW 248 ST, Homestead, FL 33032

[no web address on file]

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	84%

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	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
Resourceful 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
Velasquez, Adriana	Teacher, K-12	
Febus, Talia	Teacher, K-12	
O'Sullivan, Kerri	Principal	
Palomares, Karina	Assistant Principal	
Buergo, Marlene	Teacher, K-12	
Valdes, Jacky	Teacher, ESE	
Sherry, Colleen	Teacher, K-12	

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
22

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)	86%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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	120	99	82	64	70	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	483
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	3	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	97	68	61	64	45	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	406
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	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	2	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	97	68	61	64	45	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	406
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	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	2	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	58%	63%	61%	73%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	61%	59%	66%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	57%	54%	57%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	89%	67%	62%	94%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	88%	63%	59%	79%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	100%	56%	52%	79%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	68%	56%	56%	60%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	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	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
	2018	81%	61%	20%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	64%	-12%	58%	-6%
	2018	77%	60%	17%	56%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-25%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2019	72%	60%	12%	56%	16%
	2018	80%	59%	21%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	67%	12%	62%	17%
	2018	88%	67%	21%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	69%	21%	64%	26%
	2018	93%	68%	25%	62%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	97%	65%	32%	60%	37%

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
	2018	85%	66%	19%	61%	24%	
Same Grade Comparison		12%					
Cohort Comparison		4%					
06	2019						
	2018						
Cohort Comparison		-85%					
07	2019						
	2018						
Cohort Comparison		0%					
08	2019						
	2018						
Cohort Comparison		0%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	69%	53%	16%	53%	16%	
	2018	83%	56%	27%	55%	28%	
Same Grade Comparison		-14%					
Cohort Comparison							
08	2019						
	2018						
Cohort Comparison		-83%					

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					
2018					
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					
2018					
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
ELL	62	64		95	94		73				
BLK	55			55							
HSP	59	59	54	94	88	100	71				
FRL	61	60		90	86	100	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
ELL	76	70	79	84	73	59	64				
BLK	60	64		67	64						
HSP	81	74	68	91	77	74	86				
WHT	70			80							
FRL	77	71	60	88	79	70	81				
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
ELL	72	69	65	90	67	67					
BLK	53	58		76	62						
HSP	74	67	58	95	79	84	61				
WHT	79			93							
FRL	72	65	56	94	77	80	60				

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	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	572
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	73
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	55
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	74
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 the Covid-19 No Florida State Assessments were administered. Data will reflect 2019 Performance- ELA Lowest 25% was the lowest performance component. The school went from a 64% to a 57% the contributing factors was the change in student population and demographics. 4012 moved it's location to another campus (location 2 miles away) with all new students . The new students were mainly from the private school sector and were not use to test taking, test taking strategies and were missing Reading foundational skills. This year due to the pandemic students have not been exposed to vocabulary, reading, reading strategies,test taking strategies and will be missing Reading foundational skills.

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

Due to the Covid-19 No Florida State Assessments were administered. Data Analysis will reflect 2019 Performance- ELA Achievement showed the greatest declined from 79% to 58%. The factors that contribute to the decline is the change in demographics from 2017-2018 compared to 2018-2019 . The new students were mainly from the private school sector and were not use to test taking, test taking strategies and were missing Reading foundational skills.In 2020-2021 we contribute the

decline to the pandemic students have not been exposed to vocabulary, reading, reading strategies,test taking strategies and will be missing Reading foundational skills.

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 the Covid-19 No Florida State Assessments were administered. Data Analysis will reflect 2019 Performance- We exceeded the state in all data components. In Math we surpassed and made 100% learning gains. In ELA achievement we surpass the state but by only 5%- this was our lowest surpass due to new studet demographics in which they come from the private school sector and were not use to test taking, test taking strategies and were missing Reading foundational skills.

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

Due to the Covid-19 No Florida State Assessments were administered. Data Analysis will reflect 2019 Performance- Math Lowest 25% had 100%- weekly math drills, Reflex Math, iReady, Khan Academy and DI/small group instruction was utilized i the most effective way to bridge the gaps the students had. Weekly Data Chats with the students increased their motivation and the buy in- they can do this.

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

Due to the Covid-19 No Florida State Assessments were administered. Data Analysis will reflect 2019 Performance-
1. ELA Achievement and Learning Gains
2. Maintaining the 100% in Math Lowest 25%

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

Due to the Covid-19 No Florida State Assessments were administered. Data Analysis will reflect 2019 Performance- Remediation for all students is the most important/highest priorty to bridge the learning gap. While incorporating the items listed below:

1. Increase the ELA Achievement and Learning Gains
2. Maintaining the Math Lowest 25% at 100%
3. Increase percent of proficiency in 3rd Grade ELA FSA
4. Increase percent of proficiency in 4th Grade ELA FSA/ Learning Gains
5. Increase percent of proficiency in 5th Grade Science FCAT

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The focus will help increase- the lowest 25% in ELA and the overall ELA achievement percentile. The ELA teachers at SASP are focusing on rigorous curriculum with the use of such resources like, NWEA, iReady Tool Box, i Read to Write, iReady, iReady Standards Mastery , Performance Coach, Wordly Wise and StoryWorks. Teachers will also focus on building skills in understanding connotative language as it related to vocabulary and providing opportunities for students to respond to the essential question through "Writers Journals." In addition teacher will use iReady, iReady Standards Mastery and iReady Toolbox, a comprehensive progress monitoring computer based program aligned to the State Standards, which will help provide students the opportunity to read and respond to grade-level texts across the curriculum and standards based bi-weekly assessments. Teachers will utilize vertical planning to provide support on low-performing benchmarks. After school bi-weekly tutoring is being provided with the classroom teachers.
Measurable Outcome:	The school will increase from 58% to 62% in the overall ELA achievement percentile.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karina Palomares (kpalomares@somersetsilverpalms.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our strategy is to utilize intervention programs to lessen the learning gap and build the foundational skills. This year our students will use personal data trackers to track their growth data by benchmark.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing this strategy allows the parents, students, and teachers a clear understanding of how students are performing in each content area/standard. Students will be assessed at the beginning of the year on all benchmarks, this data will then be analyzed and logged in their data folders. Teachers then will use the data folders to group students by strengths and weaknesses. During small groups, students will be provided remediation and continuously reassessed to show growth. As needed, the students will be moved between groups in order to ensure that their learning needs are continuously being met. The data folders will facilitate open communication and understanding by all parties involved in how to best support our students.

Action Steps to Implement

As a collaborative effort we have developed an action plan that will monitor the learning gains of the students in order to ensure that even with our barriers our students are achieving at the necessary levels of rigor and understanding. Our plan includes progress monitoring and instructional support through professional development. In order to monitor the effectiveness of our action plan both administration and instructional leaders such as department heads will meet biweekly to discuss progress and data. These meetings will run throughout the calendar school year from August through June. Within these meetings the participants will discuss the evidence collected such as, lesson plans, assessments data, and personal data trackers.

Person Responsible	Karina Palomares (kpalomares@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 the Covid-19, Remediation for all students is the area of focus 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: ELA				$31,995.65
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			4012 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms At Princeton	Other Federal		$18,000.00

			Notes: iReady Technology Program with Standards Mastery and Toolbox-ELA and Math			
			4012 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms At Princeton	Other Federal		$6,983.90
			Notes: Performance Coach Grade 3-5 ELA & Math Wordly Wise 3-5th Grade			
			4012 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms At Princeton	Other Federal		$3,187.75
			Notes: Science Books for grades 4-5			
			4012 - Somerset Academy Silver Palms At Princeton	Other Federal		$3,824.00
			Notes: Seesaw			
					Total:	**$31,995.65**