

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Somerset Academy Charter High 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Somerset Academy Charter High School (South Homestead)

305 NE 2ND RD, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetacademy.dadeschools.net

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)	High School 9-12
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)	88%
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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: D (36%)
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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Somerset Academy Charter High School (South Homestead)

305 NE 2ND RD, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetacademy.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)
High School 9-12	Yes	86%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	89%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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
Steele, Laura	Assistant Principal	
Lopez, Alina	Principal	
Morfa, Caridad	Assistant Principal	
Berry, Lakisha	Other	Testing Chair
Socas, Cristina	Dean	
Ball-Llovera, Kelly	Instructional Coach	
Marques, Sonia	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

22

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	88%
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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: D (36%)
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	0	0	0	0	151	131	105	107	494
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	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	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	11	12	17	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	7	7	27	74

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	49	1	1	23	74

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	1	1	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	15	9	18	59

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/17/2020

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	0	0	0	0	133	117	109	78	437
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	15	7	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	1	2	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	1	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	23	16	5	68

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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	133	117	109	78	437
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	15	7	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	1	2	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	1	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	23	16	5	68

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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	56%	59%	56%	54%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	54%	51%	70%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	48%	42%	68%	45%	41%
Math Achievement	50%	54%	51%	41%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	44%	52%	48%	45%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	51%	45%	53%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	58%	68%	68%	32%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	76%	73%	66%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	54%	55%	-1%	55%	-1%
	2018	61%	54%	7%	53%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	55%	53%	2%	53%	2%
	2018	62%	54%	8%	53%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	55%	68%	-13%	67%	-12%
2018	62%	65%	-3%	65%	-3%
Compare		-7%			

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	72%	71%	1%	70%	2%
2018	68%	67%	1%	68%	0%
Compare		4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	55%	63%	-8%	61%	-6%
2018	31%	59%	-28%	62%	-31%
Compare		24%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	38%	54%	-16%	57%	-19%
2018	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Compare		-12%			

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	35	40		29	47		56				
ELL	37	47	50	43	50	38	59	47			
BLK	36	31		33	33						
HSP	54	55	47	51	45	36	57	70		87	39
WHT	74	63		52	43		71				
FRL	54	52	43	51	43	36	59	68		95	31

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	42	38		28	35	30					
ELL	21	57	80	31	39	40		54			
BLK	40	60		33	47						
HSP	61	67	71	41	40	39	61	69		95	45
WHT	73	80		58	65						
FRL	58	66	64	40	44	34	59	71		96	33

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	25	57		25	36		9				
ELL	25	59	50	50	61		21				
BLK	30	60			20						

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
HSP	55	71	73	44	48	56	30	64		88	29
WHT	58	70		45							
FRL	55	68	64	41	46	52	34	59		94	35

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	55
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	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	609
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	49
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	61
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	55
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.

Mathematics- in overall proficiency (44%), gains (50%), and the performance of the lowest 25% of the students (33%). This low performance can be attributed to a lack of foundational mathematical computation skills, deficiencies which have compounded from previous school years. Further, we have also determined that a reason for the low performance can also be attributed to the lack of individualized remediation for this subject area and insufficient tutoring opportunities.

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

ELA--learning gains (54%, a 15 point decrease from the previous year) and the performance of the lowest 25% of students (41%; a 27 point decrease from the previous year). We can attribute the low performance to a lack of foundational reading skills, deficiencies which have compounded from previous school years. Further, high school students lacked an individualized remediation program in ELA and insufficient tutoring opportunities.

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.

Geometry proficiency--overall proficiency was 38% compared to state average of 57% (a 19 point difference). In addition to lacking foundational mathematic skills, many students in Geometry were also Algebra 1 retakers. Retakes occurred every quarter, and took away from class time, further, their intensive classes were designed to support success on the Algebra EOC, and not Geometry.

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

Algebra I--24 point increase from previous year (55% compared to 31%). Enhanced teacher collaboration (teaching team that co-planned and collaborated frequently) and frequent progress monitoring to ensure students were mastering standards.

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

Student's scoring a 1 on their graduation requirement assessment

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

1. Math achievement
2. ELA achievement.
3. ESSA Subgroup Black/ African American Achievement
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Math achievement was the lowest of all components.

Measurable Outcome: 54% overall proficiency

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

Evidence-based Strategy: ALEKS online remediation program, tutoring/intervention

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students lacked foundational knowledge in mathematics from previous years--there were many skill gaps. Mandating a program designed to remediate deficiencies should support the filling in of those gaps and help students perform on grade level. Tutoring will support students individually.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementation of ALEKS online individualized remediation program
2. Targeting tutoring
3. Online purchase of textbooks to facilitate remote learning instruction

Person Responsible Laura Steele (lstele@somersetacademysh.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: ELA overall proficiency showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019.

Measurable Outcome: Overall ELA proficiency of 59%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kelly Ball-Llovera (kmaes@somersetacademysh.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of Reading Plus online individualized remediation program, tutoring/ intervention

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Reading Plus is a program designed to provide students with reading remediation at their level, use of this program should support students in improving foundational reading skills and mastering grade level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Reimplement Reading Plus
2. Provide tutoring opportunities
3. Online purchase of textbooks to facilitate remote learning instruction

Person Responsible: Laura Steele (lstele@somersetacademysh.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Achievement levels for the Black/African American ESSA subgroup fell below the 41% threshold to 33%.

Measurable Outcome: The Black/ African American ESSA subgroup will increase by 8% percentage points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Target the Black/African American ESSA subgroup with pull-out tutoring throughout the day and after school tutoring sessions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students with a learning gap require 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: Lakisha Berry (lmacias@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 graduation requirement assessment.

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.

We will continue to promote the 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. Student services will help provide students with the opportunity to go on College Tours to help promote post-secondary studies. Student Services will also encourage students to take Industry Certification courses to promote interest in different careers like Culinary Studies, Digital Technology, Business, etc. 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.

The school will continue to implemented a social-emotional learning curriculum. During our school-wide Focus block, twice a week, students participate in many character education activities. This allows us to introduce and promote character traits that we want to develop in the students and incorporate into the social emotional learning curriculum, engage students in college and career readiness activities through presentations from community leaders, college representatives and other professionals. We have a mentoring program where students who need additional support are paired with an adult in the school to meet on a weekly basis. Mentors help students reach various scholastic and personal goals.

Somerset Academy South Homestead became a CollegeBoard SAT Test Center. This will better help us provide our students with the opportunity to take the SAT in a familiar environment. The school will continue to offer an SAT and ACT Prep course, as well as a college readiness course to help prepare students for the different types of assessments including, but not limited to PSAT, SAT, ACT, EOC's. The course will also serve as a way to educate students on career awareness, resume building, and college preparation. Industry Certification Courses and programs will be a focus as well. CTE courses like ServSafe, Adobe Photoshop, Illustrator, Premiere Pro, Microsoft MOS will be offered and supplemented with GMetrix and Edgenuity.

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				\$11,491.50
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
3374	160-Other Support Personnel	7034 - Somerset Academy Charter High (S Homestead)	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00	
<i>Notes: Tutoring</i>						
6500	690-Computer Software	7034 - Somerset Academy Charter High (S Homestead)	Title, I Part A		\$8,491.50	
<i>Notes: ALEKS remediation program, USA Test Prep</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$14,000.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
3374		7034 - Somerset Academy Charter High (S Homestead)	Title, I Part A		\$14,000.00	
<i>Notes: Supplemental Programs like Edenuity</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				\$53,000.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
6000	160-Other Support Personnel	7034 - Somerset Academy Charter High (S Homestead)	Title, I Part A		\$53,000.00	
<i>Notes: paraprofessionals for push-in, pull out salaries</i>						
Total:					\$88,491.50	