

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Somerset Arts Academy



2021-22 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Somerset Arts Academy

1700 N KROME AVE, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetcityarts.com

Demographics

Principal: Idalia Suarez M

Start Date for this Principal: 9/15/2008

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: 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	
* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Somerset Arts Academy

1700 N KROME AVE, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetcityarts.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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	88%

School Grades History

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

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 Arts Academy is to develop flexible leaders who continuously grow through diverse learning opportunities that promote meaningful connections through 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	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.
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.
Lorenzo, Nicole	Instructional Coach	She will provide immediate support across grade levels in all subject areas. She will help support the implementation of school wide reading, writing, math, science and STEM academic programs as well as model and provide feedback and resources to assist teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/15/2008, 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

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

408

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

2

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

2

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	66	73	64	75	65	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	17	15	12	13	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	4	16	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/15/2021

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	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	

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	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	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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 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				67%	62%	57%	65%	62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				70%	62%	58%	65%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	58%	53%	64%	59%	48%
Math Achievement				61%	69%	63%	71%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	66%	62%	61%	64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	55%	51%	47%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				55%	55%	53%	45%	58%	55%

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	63%	60%	3%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	64%	11%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	63%	67%	-4%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	74%	69%	5%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	65%	-16%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	54%	53%	1%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The school utilized i-Ready Diagnostic Assessments to progress monitor during the 2020-2021 school year for all grade levels.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16%		30%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32%		54%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15%		29%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14%		20%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22%		31%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8%		33%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17%		31%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6%		23%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	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	24	44	40	16	24		7				
ELL	45	69		18	13		33				
HSP	55	57	38	32	19	17	20				
WHT	79	45		57	18		55				
FRL	57	61	46	34	23	17	22				
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				

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	300
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	38
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	51
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	39
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 and Mathematics.

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

Due to the disruption in the learning environment caused by school closures, quarantines and virtual instruction, a decrease in proficiency was noted in our state assessment and progress monitoring data which contributed to this need for improvement. We will implement differentiated instruction in the classroom and use data driven instruction to meet the needs of all students. In addition, identified students will receive reading and/or math intervention as evident by student progress monitoring data.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was our 5th grade science proficiency based off the 2019 assessments.

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 tracking of progress monitoring data to determine needs and growth.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

Measurable Outcome:

The school will work towards increasing ELA proficiency by 8% on the state assessment.

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:

Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Our school will focus on effectively implementing differentiated instruction as well as data driven instruction. This data driven instruction will assist in closing learning gaps by using targeted instruction to meet the needs of our students. This implementation will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, grade level planning sessions, as well as progress monitoring assessment data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Due to the learning gaps identified in our diagnostic assessments, it is imperative that we provide targeted instruction to close these gaps and increase reading proficiency. By implementing differentiated instruction, teachers will be able to meet the needs of all students and provided necessary instruction at their levels.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide ongoing coaching in differentiated instruction
2. Meet with teachers for data chats to identify needs
3. Progress monitor students

Person Responsible

Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After analyzing the assessment data, it is evident that math proficiency is a critical need. The school will implement a more rigorous curriculum, Ready Math.

Measurable Outcome: The school's overall math proficiency will increase by 8% as measured by the spring 2022 administration of the FSA.

Monitoring: This implementation will be monitored through the checking of lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, grade level planning sessions, as well as assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: The teacher will facilitate meaningful discourse that encourages all learners to develop deeper understanding of math concepts. The teacher will provide differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to increase proficiency this strategy will increase rigor and deeper understanding for students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development on new curriculum
2. Ongoing coaching on differentiated instruction
3. Progress monitoring
4. Student and teacher data chats

Person Responsible: Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The school had 15% of students identified as chronically absent for the 2019-2020 school year.

Measurable Outcome: The school will decrease the percentage of chronically absent students by 8% for the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring: Attendance bulletins will be checked daily.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Laura Rodriguez (lrodriguez@somersetcityarts.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: The school will engage students through inviting classrooms and lessons and an overall positive school climate. The school will communicate with parents of students who are at risk, the counselor will hold truancy meetings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Providing incentives for students to attend school is an effective practice. In addition, communicating with parents and holding truancy meetings with at risk students is also effective.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Check attendance bulletin daily
2. Document students who are at risk for chronic absenteeism
3. Communicate and hold truancy meetings

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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 non reporting school category. 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 has adopted Leader in Me as its social and emotional program. Leader in Me focuses on building leaders within the school community. This program promotes the idea that everyone has greatness and is capable of creating their best life. We implement Leader in Me by providing time in the master schedule to teach the Leader in Me curriculum and we hold monthly assemblies to highlight student leaders and promote the 7 habits. We have a lighthouse team comprised of students, teachers, staff and parents who meet monthly to discuss schoolwide initiatives and activities.

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.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$95,528.78
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3336	520-Textbooks	2012 - Somerset Arts Academy	General Fund		\$81,328.78
<i>Notes: Wonders Curriculum</i>						
	3336	399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	2012 - Somerset Arts Academy	General Fund		\$14,200.00
<i>Notes: i-Ready Diagnostic & Instruction</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$13,413.78
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22

	3336	520-Textbooks	2012 - Somerset Arts Academy	General Fund		\$13,413.78
			<i>Notes: Ready Math Curriculum</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$15,557.26
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3336	590-Other Materials and Supplies	2012 - Somerset Arts Academy	General Fund		\$15,557.26
			<i>Notes: Leader In Me Program</i>			
					Total:	\$124,499.82