Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Somerset Arts Academy

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Somerset Arts Academy

1700 N KROME AVE, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetcityarts.com

Demographics

Principal: Idalia Suarez M

Start Date for this Principal: 9/9/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (53%) 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	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 Arts Academy

1700 N KROME AVE, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetcityarts.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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	78%

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

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Somerset Arts Academy is to develop flexible leaders who continuously grow through diverse learning opportunities that promote meaningful connections and the arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Somerset City Arts is to build 21st-century lifelong leaders who are creative, collaborative, innovative and resilient.

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
Rodriguez, Laura	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal will support the principal in areas concerning personnel, facilities, academics, activities, and budget. Together, with the principal, the AP will evaluate the effectiveness of the schools academic program through walkthroughs, weekly monitoring of lesson plans, teacher professionalism, communication, and teacher observations.
Suarez, Idalia	Principal	The principal oversees the overall functioning of the school concerning personnel, facilities, academics, activities, and budget. The principal will evaluate the effectiveness of the leadership team and staff by conducting walkthroughs, observations, and data chats. The principal will conduct weekly leadership team meetings to discuss data, curriculum, and concerns across all grade levels and content areas.
Lorenzo, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	She will provide immediate support across grade levels in mathematics and science. She will help support the implementation of school wide math, science and STEM academic programs as well as model and provide feedback and resources to assist teachers.
Mendez, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	She will provide immediate support across grade levels in reading and writing. She will help support the implementation of school wide reading and literacy academic programs as well as model and provide feedback and resources to assist teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 9/9/2020, Idalia Suarez M

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (53%) 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	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	79	75	72	67	59	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	417
Attendance below 90 percent	3	10	4	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
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	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	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 9/9/2020

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	80	75	68	59	68	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	4	0	2	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	6	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	10	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	12	0	3	27	16	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	8	6	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	80	75	68	59	68	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	4	0	2	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	6	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	10	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	12	0	3	27	16	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	8	6	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	67%	62%	57%	63%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	62%	58%	54%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	58%	53%	44%	58%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	61%	69%	63%	63%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	66%	62%	60%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	55%	51%	40%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	55%	53%	49%	52%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	63%	60%	3%	58%	5%
	2018	61%	61%	0%	57%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	64%	11%	58%	17%
	2018	66%	60%	6%	56%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	64%	60%	4%	56%	8%
	2018	66%	59%	7%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	67%	-4%	62%	1%
	2018	68%	67%	1%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	69%	5%	64%	10%
	2018	78%	68%	10%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	49%	65%	-16%	60%	-11%
	2018	69%	66%	3%	61%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	53%	1%	53%	1%
	2018	46%	56%	-10%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	31	75		35	67	60					
ELL	57	61	47	57	59	45	41				
HSP	64	69	52	61	48	39	51				
WHT	76	77		64	53	40	69				
FRL	63	71	55	57	47	41	50				

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	40			20							
ELL	45	61	79	68	57	57					
HSP	66	65	55	79	61	61	47				
WHT	63	63		54	63		40				
FRL	62	67	67	67	63	52	45				

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	33	40		18	30						
ELL	37	46	50	51	58	36					
HSP	61	51	48	65	60	38	41				
WHT	73	66		63	56		72				
FRL	61	52	46	60	57	40	44				

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	58
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	465
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	55
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57

Hispanic Students	
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	63
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our data from 2019 reveals a significant drop in Lowest 25 percentile in Math. After analyzing our school wide data, we determined that we need to increase the rigor on our math assessments, as this was one of the contributing factors to last year's performance. We will now add i-Ready standard mastery assessments to assess students after they have mastered each math standard. In addition, teachers will be using the item specs to enrich classroom assessments to increase rigor. The school is providing math interventions to those students demonstrating deficiency. Our I-ready AP3 results from end of year 2020 demonstrated this method was successful in achieving learning gains for the lowest 25 percentile in math. We will continue to apply these practices to improve our data for 2020-2021.

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

Our data indicates that our Math learning gains showed the greatest decline from the prior year. After desegregating the data with members of the schools' leadership team as well as teachers, we determined several factors that contributed to this decline with one being the rigor of the assessments, not providing immediate feedback to students, not utilizing item specs with fidelity and not providing math interventions.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the Lowest 25th percentile in Math. After desegregating the data with members of the schools' leadership team as well as teachers, we determined several factors that contributed to this decline with one being the rigor of the assessments, not providing immediate feedback to students, not utilizing item specs with fidelity and not providing
math interventions.

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

The data component which showed the most improvement was Science Achievement with a ten point increase from 2018-2019. New actions that were taken in this area were incorporating problem based learning (PBLs), hands-on activities, and engaging students in critical thinking to dig deeper into science concepts.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data from Part 1, we determined that truancy, students with 15 or more absences is one of the areas for potential concern.

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

1. Increasing Math Proficiency, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25%
2. Increasing ELA Learning Gains
3. Increasing student Reading growth target according to I-Ready.
4. Increasing student Math growth target according to I-Ready.
5. Science Proficiency according to 5th grade Science FCAT.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing Math Proficiency, Learning Gains and Lowest 25th percentile After analyzing our 2019 school wide data, we noticed a decrease in our Math proficiency, learning gains and our lowest 25%. We calculated a 10 point decrease in math achievement from 2018-2019, a 12 point decrease in learning gains and an eight point decrease in the component of lowest 25% making adequate learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to increase our Math Achievement and Learning gains from a 49% to a 54% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy that will be implemented for effectively increasing Math achievement and learning gains will be math Interventions. Students in grades 3-5 who scored a Level 1 or a Level 2 on the 2019 FSA, will be participating in weekly math interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that students struggling with mathematics may benefit from early interventions aimed at improving their mathematics ability and ultimately preventing subsequent failure. There is a high level of evidence that implementing these math interventions will result in increased numbers of proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School Leadership Team will analyze school wide data to determine which students in grades 3-5 scored a level 1 or level 2 on the 2019 Math FSA.
2. The School will use Standards Mastery to assess math standards in grades 3 thru 5 as they are taught.
3. The leadership Team will choose a teacher to provide those students with deficiencies ongoing interventions based on the data provided by the standards mastery assessments.
4. The leadership team will monitor for the fidelity of implementation of these interventions by conducting walk through during the scheduled interventions.
5. The leadership team will schedule growth monitoring assessments every 21 instructional days to see progress students have made.

Person Responsible	Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing ELA Learning Gains After analyzing our 2019 school wide data, our ELA Lowest 25% earned 53% learning gains. We calculated an 11% drop.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to increase our ELA Lowest 25% from 53% to at least the district average of 58%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leslie Mendez (lmendez@somersetcityarts.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy we will use is a focus on providing needed interventions, after-school tutoring, in-class supports, Wordly Wise vocabulary curriculum, and i-Ready Diagnostics and Instruction to increase ELA growth for our Lowest 25%.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that students struggling with literacy may benefit from early interventions aimed at improving their literacy skills and ultimately preventing subsequent failure. There is a high level of evidence that implementing these interventions will result in increased numbers of growth.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School Leadership Team will analyze school wide data to determine which students in grades 3-5 fall into the Lowest 25% subgroup.
2. The School will use Standards Mastery and Cold Reads to assess reading standards in grades 3 thru 5 as they are taught.
3. The Reading Interventionist will provide those students with deficiencies ongoing interventions based on the data provided by the standards mastery, i-Ready Diagnostic assessments.and previous FSA Score.
4. The leadership team will monitor for the fidelity of implementation of these interventions by conducting walk through during the scheduled interventions.
5. The leadership team will schedule growth monitoring assessments every 21 instructional days to see progress students have made.

Person Responsible	Leslie Mendez (lmendez@somersetcityarts.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In order to improve student growth,we plan on implementing i-Ready Instruction and Standards Mastery Assessments to monitor student data and provide needed interventions. To improve Science proficiency, we will have a concentrated emphasis on student centered learning through research- based instructional strategies such as project based learning, technology infused lessons and hands-on learning experiences.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$29,202.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1382	529-Technology-Related Textbooks	2012 - Somerset Arts Academy	General Fund		$19,602.00
			Notes: I-ready Instruction, Diagnostic & Teacher Toolbox			
		160-Other Support Personnel	2012 - Somerset Arts Academy	Ttitle III		$6,000.00
			Notes: After-School Tutoring			
	1382	399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	2012 - Somerset Arts Academy	General Fund		$3,600.00
			Notes: NearPod			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$42,028.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	160-Other Support Personnel	2012 - Somerset Arts Academy	Title, I Part A		$36,720.00
			Notes: Reading Interventionist			
	3336	520-Textbooks	2012 - Somerset Arts Academy	General Fund		$2,538.00
			Notes: Wordly Wise Digital Curriculum for 3rd-5th Grade			
	3336	529-Technology-Related Textbooks	2012 - Somerset Arts Academy	General Fund		$2,500.00
			Notes: NewsELA Pro resource			
	3336	529-Technology-Related Textbooks	2012 - Somerset Arts Academy	General Fund		$270.00
			Notes: Top Score Writing Curriculum			
					Total:	**$71,230.00**