

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Summerville Advantage Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Summerville Advantage Academy

11575 SW 243RD ST, Homestead, FL 33032

<http://www.summervillecharterschool.com>

Demographics

Principal: Marjorie Lopez

Start Date for this Principal: 9/29/2020

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)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Summerville Advantage Academy

11575 SW 243RD ST, Homestead, FL 33032

<http://www.summervillecharterschool.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)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	85%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	97%

School Grades History

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

Summerville Advantage Academy exists as an International Learning Environment, which develops adaptive and active learners who embrace the exploration of other cultures as well as their own ancestral heritage through the utilization of art, music, and literature to excel and achieve academic heights.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision for Summerville Advantage Academy is to provide students with a challenging and rigorous curricula enabling students to be well prepared for secondary education and life through adherence to an unwavering mission, shared purpose, and clearly articulated goals.

Students will experience a cross curricula instructional approach using the Sunshine State Standards and benchmarks.

"Improving Student Achievement" will serve as the school's "mantra" and improvement will be facilitated and measured through a systematic and total organizational approach to leadership and management using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM).

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
Coats, Archalena	Principal	
Manas, Joanie	Dean	
Arbesu, Anaeli	Instructional Coach	
Castellon, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	
Gonzalez, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Bryant, Robin	Teacher, K-12	
Miranda, Helmat	Teacher, K-12	
Hagen, Julia	Teacher, K-12	
Cummings, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	
Becerra, Anna	Instructional Coach	
Ramjus, Terry-Ann	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/29/2020, Marjorie Lopez

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.*

0

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)	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)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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	52	88	85	96	107	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
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	21	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	3	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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

Tuesday 10/6/2020

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	72	78	97	106	75	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	514
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	21	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	

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	72	78	97	106	75	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	514
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	21	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	

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	48%	63%	61%	51%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	61%	59%	56%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	57%	54%	48%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	53%	67%	62%	60%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%	63%	59%	66%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	56%	52%	55%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	55%	56%	56%	56%	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	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	64%	-19%	58%	-13%
	2018	43%	60%	-17%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
05	2019	55%	60%	-5%	56%	-1%
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
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	49%	67%	-18%	62%	-13%
	2018	61%	67%	-6%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	69%	-27%	64%	-22%
	2018	59%	68%	-9%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2019	72%	65%	7%	60%	12%
	2018	62%	66%	-4%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
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	54%	53%	1%	53%	1%
	2018	58%	56%	2%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	50%	-50%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

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
SWD	27	20		40	60						
ELL	48	59	59	55	53	33	54				
BLK	45	52		45	63		63				
HSP	49	52	49	54	55	39	53				
FRL	47	49	49	54	58	47	55				
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	36			57							
ELL	46	49	50	55	58	63	58				
BLK	51	71		51	64						
HSP	56	59	54	62	63	47	63				
FRL	55	59	51	64	64	48	55				
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	35	48	44	50	62	56	46				
BLK	48	71		48	44						
HSP	51	55	50	62	69	58	58				
WHT	47	42		69	64		60				
FRL	51	55	44	60	66	50	55				

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	51

ESSA Federal Index	
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	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
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	54
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	49
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	50
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 4th grade Math (42%).

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was 3rd grade ELA (-20%).

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 4th grade Math (-22%).

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 5th grade Math (+10%)

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

After reflection on the EWS Data from Part 1 (D), the area of greatest concern is the percentage of students scoring Level 1 on State Assessments.

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

1. Analyzing data to align, plan for and improve instruction school wide.
2. Alignment of curriculum and instruction and insure that materials utilized are standards based.
3. Set high expectations for teachers and students and motivate them in the process.
4. Giving meaningful feedback to teachers regarding instruction, etc.
5. Increase parental involvement and engagement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the recent school closures and lack of current FSA data we will focus on improving instruction across curriculum areas. Teachers will be provided with ongoing professional development, monitoring and support for effective implementation and instruction of the core curriculum. Teachers, Instructional Coaches, and Administration will collaborate to analyze data in order to target and drive instruction. This process will be closely monitored to ensure that instruction is data driven and effective.
Measurable Outcome:	To facilitate the measurable outcome, ongoing training and support will be provided, careful and consistent monitoring will be in place to ensure curriculum and strategies are used with fidelity and instruction is effective. In order to measure the quality and effectiveness of core instruction in all content areas, ongoing progress monitoring and data collection must be used and adjustments made to instruction, when needed, in order to maximize student achievement and growth. All teachers and instructional leaders will work together to identify the resources and interventions needed in addition to core instruction for those students not responding to core instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anaeli Arbesu (aarbesu@summervilleadvantageacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will implement small group differentiated instruction on a daily basis to ensure that each student is receiving instruction based on their personalized learning goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this strategy is based on the 2019 FSA Data as well as the data from Baseline and Benchmark Assessments administered through out the year.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional support will be provide the to teachers through out the Weekly Lesson Plan Checks conducted by the Principal and members of the Instructional Leadership Team.

Classroom Walk Throughs from Instructional Coaches, Dean and Principal.

Informal and Formal Evaluations from Instructional Coaches, Dean and Principal

Completion of Progress Monitoring Plan (PMP) forms by the teachers.

Instructional Coach, Dean and Principal will monitor completion and quarterly updates of the PMP forms

Implementation of teachers utilizing a Formative Assessment Model that identifies evidence of student learning.

Observance by coaches and administration of the implementation of the Formative Assessment Model.

Observations and Classroom Walk-throughs, lesson plan reviews, instructional modeling and data chats

Person Responsible Archalena Coats (acoats@summervilleadvantageacademy.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The School Leadership Team will continue to monitor the action steps in place and provide ongoing instructional support which will include:

Data Analysis, MTSS, and LLT Meetings will take place in order to monitor effectiveness of using higher order thinking skills in the classroom.

Specific instructional strategies provided by Instructional Coach and Administration.

Implementation of professional development topics and strategies as observed in Walk Throughs, Informal and Formal Observations.

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.

The school plans to offer Parent Academies on a variety of topics to assist Parents with ways to support their child in becoming well rounded academically and socially. We have also scheduled parent meetings and events at a variety of times (morning, afternoons and evenings) to accommodate a variety of parent work schedules/availability. We also plan to have multiple activities that allow the parents to interact with the teachers, community members and Admin team.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00