

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Somerset Oaks Academy



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	22
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Somerset Oaks Academy

1000 OLD DIXIE HWY, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetoaks.com

Demographics

Principal: Idalia Suarez M

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2014

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
2020-21 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: C (49%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (56%)
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	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	22
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Somerset Oaks Academy

1000 OLD DIXIE HWY, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetoaks.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	96%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

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 Oaks Academy is to foster the development of responsible, self-directed, life-long learners by maximizing student achievement. Somerset Oaks is committed to providing a safe environment where future leaders are inspired to learn, explore and create through student centered learning, all while developing the whole child.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Somerset Oaks Academy will provide a rigorous academic curriculum in a nurturing environment by setting high expectations for both students and teachers. The school will meet and exceed high standards of student achievement by delivering a rigorous school curriculum, where emphasis is given to personalization in student mastery of the State Standards. As well, it will supplement and enhance instructions through high-quality curricular and extra-curricular programs. The school will provide ample opportunities for students, families, and the community to be active educational partners in education. The school will continuously monitor, evaluate, and improve curriculum to achieve continuous student improvement each year.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
Gomez, Marcelo	Assistant Principal	The vice principal will support the principal in areas concerning personnel, facilities, academics, activities, and budget. Together, with the principal, the vice principal will evaluate the effectiveness of the schools academic program through walkthroughs, weekly monitoring of lesson plans, teacher professionalism, communication, and teacher observations.
Garcia, Annette	Teacher, ESE	Will oversee the special education program at the school and help monitor all ESE students and that they receive the services required by their IEP.
Cruz, Ximena	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal will support the principal and vice principal in areas concerning curriculum and its implementation school wide. She will provide professional development and PLC opportunities to the staff as deemed necessary. She will support core instruction, implementation of intervention and modeling best practices to ensure students meet Florida State Standards. The assistant principal, together with the principal and vice principal, will analyze school data and conduct data chats with teachers to help develop instructional strategies to implement throughout the year.
Ochoa, Yadira	Instructional Coach	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.
Detres, Vashti	School Counselor	She will oversee the school wide leadership program. She works directly with our ESE Department to provide support and services for our students.
Gonzalez, Carlos	Dean	He will oversee the overall implementation of the school code of conduct across all grade levels. He helps ensure the school wide behavior management system is in place and will support and monitor the effectiveness. He will also assist teachers in the implementation of the program along with provide guidance for individual classroom systems.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/1/2014, 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.*

1

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

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

630

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	90	73	70	54	48	76	94	61	58	0	0	0	0	624	
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	3	7	8	8	0	1	21	3	3	0	0	0	0	54	
Course failure in Math	3	12	4	12	4	9	24	8	6	0	0	0	0	82	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	18	6	10	12	4	0	0	0	0	69	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	29	25	19	7	5	2	0	0	0	0	87	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	26	7	22	8	4	42	31	27	22	0	0	0	0	189	

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	3	13	13	12	20	47	60	40	32	0	0	0	0	240	

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	4	6	0	7	1	2	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/13/2021

2020-21 - 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	66	69	48	49	74	98	65	65	69	0	0	0	0	603
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	3	1	6	19	17	13	13	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	2	1	1	3	6	15	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	18	6	10	12	4	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	25	19	7	5	2	0	0	0	0	87

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	5	2	7	45	29	28	24	0	0	0	0	140

The number of students identified as retainers:

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

2020-21 - 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	66	69	48	49	74	98	65	65	69	0	0	0	0	603	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	3	1	6	19	17	13	13	0	0	0	0	72	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	2	1	1	3	6	15	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	18	6	10	12	4	0	0	0	0	69	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	25	19	7	5	2	0	0	0	0	87	

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	5	2	7	45	29	28	24	0	0	0	0	140

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	6	0	2	5	0	1	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		

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				51%	63%	61%	46%	62%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	61%	59%	52%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	57%	54%	50%	57%	52%
Math Achievement				49%	67%	62%	56%	65%	61%
Math Learning Gains				49%	63%	59%	48%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	56%	52%	49%	55%	52%
Science Achievement				39%	56%	56%	41%	57%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				45%	80%	78%	46%	79%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	41%	64%	-23%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	60%	-8%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
06	2021					
	2019	54%	58%	-4%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
07	2021					
	2019	42%	56%	-14%	52%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2021					
	2019	46%	60%	-14%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	67%	-20%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	41%	69%	-28%	64%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	65%	-32%	60%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
06	2021					
	2019	66%	58%	8%	55%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
07	2021					
	2019	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
08	2021					
	2019	23%	40%	-17%	46%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	47%	53%	-6%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	19%	43%	-24%	48%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	46%	73%	-27%	71%	-25%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	62%	63%	-1%	61%	1%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tool used for K-2 was SAT-10 and the progress monitoring tool used for 3rd-8th was the FSA assessment.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			70
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			69
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			46
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			46
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			41
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			44
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			28
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			13
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			36
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			13
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			19
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			28
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			23
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			39
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			31
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			45
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			50
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			20
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			42
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	13	34	38	12	21	15	21				
ELL	30	44	54	21	21	17	21	44	33		
BLK	29	17		14	22		9				
HSP	37	42	45	26	23	19	30	47	50		
WHT	48	47		43	33						
FRL	37	41	44	27	23	19	27	48	48		
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	21	38	37	17	29	31		20			
ELL	47	56	59	51	54	51	37	21			
BLK	59	63		38	47						
HSP	50	57	51	48	49	43	38	44	58		

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
WHT	57	53		62	60						
FRL	50	56	52	48	50	42	40	44	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
SWD	24	47	50	29	61	64	55				
ELL	29	48	53	45	53	60	21	47			
BLK	58	44		58	40						
HSP	43	52	51	56	50	47	39	45			
WHT	55	62		60	46						
FRL	43	51	52	54	48	52	36	46			

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	18
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	43
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

After analyzing state assessment data and progress monitoring data it is evident that proficiency levels in ELA, Math, and 5th grade science have decreased since our 2019 state assessments.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The 2019 state assessment data as well as our progress monitoring data indicate that the greatest need for improvement is rising proficiency levels in in ELA, Math, and 5th grade science.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The virtual learning and school closures were the contributing factors to this need of improvement. We will implement differentiated instruction in the classroom and review data to target instruction to meet the needs of all students. Reading and Math interventions will take place and progress monitoring data will be used to adjust instruction as needed.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data that showed the most improvement was our 8th grade FCAT science as well as our 8th grade Algebra EOC.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors for this improvement was constant data analysis to implement data driven instruction along with individual student-teacher data chats to discuss areas of needed improvements and celebrate successes.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The strategies that need to be implemented include differentiated instruction as well as reading and math interventions. There will continue to be a strong emphasis on data driven instruction as well as student/teacher data chats.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The school will propose and organize professional development on differentiated instruction and data driven instruction to help promote student achievement.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

School administrators will monitor the fidelity of the interventions taking place by conducting walkthroughs as well track progress monitoring data to determine needs and growth.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After analyzing the assessment data, it is evident that there is a need to improve proficiency scores in ELA, math and science. Differentiated instruction will assist in promoting student achievement as it will help teachers tailor instruction to meet the needs of all students.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve by implementing effective differentiated instruction is to increase reading, math, and 5th grade science proficiency by 10 points in each grade-level.
Monitoring:	The leadership team will conduct classroom observations to observe differentiated instruction taking place in the classroom. Administrators will conduct data chats with teachers to see progress and areas of need. Assessment and progress monitoring data will be assess and analyzed to determine how student are responding to instruction and identify needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ximena Cruz (xcruz@somerset Oaks.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school will focus on the evidence based strategy of effectively implementing differentiated instruction as well as data driven instruction. This data driven instruction will assist in closing learning gaps by using targeted instruction. This implementation will be monitored through the checking of lesson plans. classroom walkthroughs, grade level planning sessions, as well as assessment data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction and data driven instruction will ensure that teachers are using data to guide planning and instruction to successfully target students. Adjustments will be made to plans and instruction as needed according to data.

Action Steps to Implement

The school will prepare professional development trainings on the topics of differentiated instruction and data driven instruction.

Person Responsible Yadira Ochoa (yochoa@somerset Oaks.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

After analyzing our school wide data, we noticed a significant decrease in our math proficiency across all grade levels.

Measurable Outcome:

The measurable outcome would be to increase our Math Achievement levels by 10 points.

Monitoring:

This will be monitored through checking lesson plans along with classroom walkthroughs, and constant monitoring of assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marcelo Gomez (mgomez@somerset Oaks.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidence based strategy that will be implemented for effectively increasing math achievements and learning gains will be a school wide fluency program and math interventions. Students will be provided with weekly drills and students who scored a level 1 or a level 2 on the FSA will be participating in Math Interventions 2 times a week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Research indicates that students struggling with math may benefit from early intervention in math fluency aimed at improving their math ability. There is a high level of evidence that implementing these math fluency drill and interventions, will result in increased numbers of proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Data will be analyzed to identify level 1 and 2 students to add to math interventions. The leadership team will monitor for the effective implementation of the math interventions and fluency drills. The leadership team will schedule growth monitoring every 21 instructional days to see progress students have made.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to our 2019 school wide data, there was a three point decrease from 2018-2019 FSA in ELA achievement for students with disabilities and a 12 point decrease in math.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to be at or above the Federal Index of 41%
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Annette Garcia (agarcia@somerset Oaks.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with disabilities will be provided with targeted small group instruction provided by our ESE support team to assist in raising proficiency levels and close learning gaps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	There is a high level of evidence that implementing small group, targeted instruction for our SWD will result in increased number of proficiency and growth.

Action Steps to Implement

ESE coordinator will create a schedule for ESE support department to provide students with small group instruction. Coordinator will monitor the fidelity of this small group instruction by completing daily walkthroughs as well as closely monitoring progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible Annette Garcia (agarcia@somerset Oaks.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Based on the data from last school year, our school falls into the low category into the "low" category in the School Safety Dashboard therefore, we will continue to implement all our safety precautions and protocols during this upcoming school year.

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.

The school implements a wide variety of communication methods in order to inform parents about upcoming events. Some of these methods include: monthly school calendar (posted on school website and emailed by homeroom teacher), PALS (Parents as Liaisons) newsletters, Constant Contact emails, Shutterfly class webpages, classroom websites, Parent Academy workshops and Remind 101. Principal and Assistant Principal will monitor implementation and review sign in sheets to determine the number of parents attending school or community events for effectiveness. Teachers also use Class DOJO/ as a means of communication on a daily basis to the parents in regards to academic and behavioral progress and/or concerns.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Key stakeholders include teachers, students, and community. In order to promote a positive culture and environment in our school, we have implemented the Leader in me character development program as well as Leader in Me Lighthouse team meetings. These meetings include a variety of stakeholders that discuss was to build a character education program for our students. Our parent association known as parent PALS, meets monthly to discuss events or other activities that can be implemented to create a positive culture in our school. Grade level meetings are also held monthly to discuss the needs of each grade level and what needs to be implemented to ensure students have a positive learning environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$23,188.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	1382	690-Computer Software	3033 - Somerset Oaks Academy	General Fund		\$23,188.00
			<i>Notes: i-Ready Diagnostic and Instruction and teacher tool-box</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$12,543.52
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3336	520-Textbooks	3033 - Somerset Oaks Academy	General Fund		\$12,543.52
			<i>Notes: Ready Math Curriculum</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$3,850.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	1382		3033 - Somerset Oaks Academy	General Fund		\$3,850.50
			<i>Notes: National Geographic Learning Intensive Curriculum</i>			
Total:						\$39,582.02