

Broward County Public Schools

Somerset Academy Charter High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	7
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Somerset Academy Charter High

20805 JOHNSON ST, Pembroke Pines, FL 33029

somersetacademy.com

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Broward County School Board on 11/7/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Empowering students to explore global learning opportunities to promote and enrich their communities and the communities we serve.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Somerset Academy, Inc. promotes a transformational culture that maximizes student achievement and the development of accountable, global learners in a safe and enriching environment that fosters high-quality education.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Iber, Karina	Vice Principal	
Miller, Ed		
Valdes, Gabriela		
Hernandez, Yamile	ESE Specialist	
Horta, Jessica	ESE Specialist	
Cardoso, Christie		

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Somerset Academy Charter High School meets quarterly with the School Advisory Forum (SAF) to discuss school needs. Through the SAF, we host an open forum where parents communicate concerns and present suggestions. Additionally, school leaders and staff members meet biweekly as a Curriculum Council to discuss school data and to create goals to support student achievement and school improvement. Stakeholder input is used to develop a plan of action to support students and to identify areas of weakness. Leaders present school data to department chairs and coaches. Department chairs and coaches meet with individual departments and teachers to disseminate data and discuss ways to support students who are not showing progress. Community leaders and counseling staff host parent nights and informational sessions on ways to support their students at home and to build partnerships. Special program leaders (ESOL, ESE, 504, Gifted) involve students in their goal development and provide additional support and resources to ensure that students are a part of the process and held accountable for their achievement. Stakeholder surveys are sent to all parents, staff, and students to collect feedback on their school experience.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Somerset Academy Charter High leadership team will regularly monitor implementation of the SIP through monthly meetings. Administration will meet with academic coaches and special programs staff (ESE specialist, ESE teachers, coaches, interventionists, etc.) where data will be presented and discussed to ensure that the interventions in place are effective and that student progress is being made. Instructional adjustments will be made to the SIP based on data and student needs.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	90%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	40%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	62	50	50	64	52	51	65		
ELA Learning Gains				58			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			39		
Math Achievement*	53	36	38	51	41	38	41		
Math Learning Gains				60			23		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			17		
Science Achievement*	81	60	64	68	35	40	65		
Social Studies Achievement*	74	66	66	72	51	48	70		
Middle School Acceleration					50	44			
Graduation Rate	96	90	89	100	54	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	66	61	65	80	66	67	74		
ELP Progress	65	50	45	72			76		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	497
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	733
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	100

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	49			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	70			
HSP	71			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	69			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	1	
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	62			
HSP	68			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	62			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	62			53			81	74		96	66	65
SWD	27			32			48	45		46	6	
ELL	38			46			82	52		57	7	65
AMI												
ASN	76			90			82	75		92	6	
BLK	62			59			72	73		55	6	
HSP	61			50			84	73		67	7	65
MUL	73			60						71	4	
PAC												
WHT	58			44			69	77		69	6	
FRL	57			49			80	71		60	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	64	58	49	51	60	59	68	72		100	80	72
SWD	22	47	42	22	50	56	24	20				
ELL	46	53	42	47	68	57	41	41		100	77	72
AMI												
ASN	77	63		64	62		82	85				
BLK	58	58	48	46	56	67	57	62		100	69	
HSP	65	57	50	52	61	56	71	74		100	84	75
MUL	42	36		45	55			80				
PAC												
WHT	67	63	60	51	65	67	73	70		100	76	
FRL	61	58	49	46	56	61	63	58		100	71	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	65	55	39	41	23	17	65	70		99	74	76
SWD	23	34	25	16	24	22	13	44		100	33	
ELL	39	47	40	27	23	18	55	52		100	73	76
AMI												
ASN	84	62		46	24		87	92				
BLK	58	51	41	33	18	9	52	66		100	59	
HSP	65	53	37	43	26	21	67	69		98	75	79
MUL	79	71		42	18			75				
PAC												
WHT	71	62	39	48	18	17	68	69		100	81	
FRL	55	51	35	33	18	17	57	61		100	63	79

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	63%	49%	14%	50%	13%
09	2023 - Spring	63%	49%	14%	48%	15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	48%	7%	50%	5%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	46%	12%	48%	10%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	63%	17%	63%	17%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	62%	11%	63%	10%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 lowest component for Somerset Academy Charter High School in the 2022-2023 school year was in the area of Algebra. In Algebra, the school average was 55%, although it was above the district and state average. The contributing factors to last year's low performance was that there was a change in standards and the students still show a deficit in prior math standards due to the pandemic years. In the 2021-2022 school year, the school average for Algebra was a 51%, showing an increase of 4% in the 2022-2023 school year.

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 in 2022-2023 from the prior year (2021-2022) was English Language Arts (ELA) from 64% to 63% (by one percent). A factor that contributed to the decline from the previous year was a change of teacher in two grade levels (9th and 10th). Additionally, there were first year teachers in the department. It was the first year that the FAST was administered. The 9th grade cohort averaged 63% and the 10th grade cohort also averaged 63% on the FAST PM3 ELA administration.

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.

Somerset Academy Charter High School students outperformed the district and state in all data components during the 2022-2023 school year. In ELA 10th grade, Somerset Academy Charter High School outperformed the state by 13%. In ELA 9th grade, Somerset Academy Charter High School outperformed the state by 15%. In Algebra, Somerset Academy Charter High School outperformed the state by 5%. In Geometry, Somerset Academy Charter High School outperformed the state by 10%. In Biology, Somerset Academy Charter High School outperformed the state by 17%, and in History, Somerset Academy Charter High School outperformed the state by 10%.

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 Biology, from 68% to 80%. Somerset Academy Charter High school provided after school and Saturday tutoring. Biology teachers provided additional support to students during their schedule planning period. After school tutoring was provided from January to May. Students had after school tutoring available twice a week from 2:15-3 p.m. Additionally, Saturday tutoring was offered for students who needed additional support. The science department implemented a new standards based program called PENDA. PENDA provides supplemental instruction as well as standards based assessments. Teachers analyzed the standards based assessments to identify areas of weakness. Teachers scheduled common planning biweekly to analyze the data and plan accordingly to address the deficits. Within the science classes, teachers implemented groups where students had the opportunity to receive direct instruction as well as time on PENDA to support individual needs.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

N/A

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

Somerset Academy Charter High School's first highest priority for school improvement in the upcoming school year is to increase learning gains and proficiency for Students with Disabilities (SWD) in the area of mathematics.

Somerset Academy Charter High School's second highest priority for school improvement in the upcoming school year is to increase learning gains and proficiency for Students with Disabilities (SWD) in the area of reading.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Somerset Academy Charter High School's Area of Focus is to support Students with Disabilities (SWD) to increase learning gains and proficiency in both reading and math.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, reading scores for Students with Disabilities will improve by 6% given intervention in the intensive reading class.

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, math scores for Students with Disabilities will improve by 6% given intervention in the intensive math class.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Data collection from interventions and direct services provided by an ESE teacher, teacher, and interventionist. The leadership team will meet regularly to discuss data and monitor the effectiveness of the interventions. Data points will be collected biweekly through assessments provided by interventionist depending on student goal. Assessments will be given through the Read180 platform for Tier 2 and System44 for Tier 3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gabriela Valdes (gvaldes@somersetacademy.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based interventions being implemented for students for Students with Disabilities in reading are explicit instruction, technology integration, reading comprehension strategies, graphic organizers, scaffolding and the Five (5) Components of Reading - Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary and Comprehension. The platforms for interventions are Read180 and System44.

The evidence-based interventions being implemented for students for Students with Disabilities in math are explicit and systematic instruction, problem solving skills, cooperative groups, mastery of learning, technology integration, scaffolding, and feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for using evidence-based strategies with students is grounded in the belief that education should be based on research and data-driven practices to maximize student learning and achievement. The reasons include improved learning outcomes, equity and fairness, accountability and data-driven decision making. Read 180 leverages adaptive technology to personalize instruction for students and provides powerful data for differentiation to teachers. Read 180 builds students' literacy skills from phonics to fluency to proficiency and is a Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention solution that supports students reading below grade level, students with disabilities, special education students, and multilingual learners.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Somerset Academy Charter High School's Area of Focus is to support teachers through mentoring programs to increase teacher retention.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, at least 80% of current instructional staff will commit for the 2024-2025 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Teacher participation in the mentorship and new teacher program will be monitored monthly. Additionally, teachers will complete a climate and culture survey by December 2023 and then again in June 2024.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gabriela Valdes (gvaldes@somersetacademy.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teacher mentoring program.

The teacher mentoring program at Somerset Academy Charter High School is made up of veteran teachers, coaches and an administrator that oversees the program. New teachers meet in a group monthly and receive specific professional development in alignment with the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs). Each month, the administrator along with coaches, review a FEAP and ensure that teachers reflect on each one meaningfully. Each month, new teachers are presented with support and assistance with various tasks, depending on the teachers' needs. Each new teacher has a mentor, usually their department chair. Additionally, the administrator meets with each new teacher individually throughout the year to address concerns and to provide support. By the end of the new teacher mentoring program, teachers are familiar with all of the FEAPs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the University of Pennsylvania study conducted by Dr. Kralik and Dr. Ingersoll and various studies including those from the Intercultural Development Research Association and the Department of Education, it is shown that comprehensive teacher mentoring improves retention by 40%. Through mentorship programs, teachers feel supported and have access to resources and peer relationships. Mentorship programs also empowers veteran teachers as they are supporting new teachers and have a platform to present their knowledge and skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The leadership team will meet to discuss the staffing needs to ensure that the interventions are implemented with fidelity.