



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Miami Macarthur Educational Center

13990 SW 264TH ST, Naranja, FL 33032

<http://macarthursouth.dadeschools.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Earl Burth**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School 1-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

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

# Miami Macarthur Educational Center

13990 SW 264TH ST, Naranja, FL 33032

<http://macarthursouth.dadeschools.net/>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School 1-12</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Alternative Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
<b>Grade</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 Miami MacArthur Educational Center is to provide support as our students achieve emotional, social, civic, and academic growth.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision of Miami MacArthur Educational Center is to expose the students to real world situations that will Produce Better Decision Makers.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Branton, Daryl	Principal	Principal, Daryl Branton: As the school's instructional leader, Mr. Branton provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Mr. Branton establishes high expectations for all students, and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS).
Gutierrez, Armando	Assistant Principal	Mr. Guterrez, Assistant Principals assist the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. Mr. Guterrez ensures the fidelity of the MTSS by monitoring and evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs.
Gil, Lissette	Psychologist	Ms. Gil oversees the student services department. She recommends and provides psychological services to students and heads up the Threat Assessment Team.
Gold, Marlene	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Gold is the social science department chair, student government liaison and the United Teachers of Dade ( UTD) steward.
Gonzalez, Ergidio	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Mr. Gonzalez, is the Career/Technical education department chair. He ensures that all teachers are kept abreast of the requirements in the CTE area.
Hoo-Carroll, Tina	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Hoo-Carroll oversees the SPED department. He duties include but are not limited to writing and maintaining Individual Educational Plans (IEP), assisting with testing and providing support to the teachers within her department.
Iglesias-Cruz, Ely	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Iglesias-Cruz, is the schools testing chairperson. She facilitates all testing within the school. In her role as the mathematics department chair, she mentors new teachers and provides academic support to the teachers in her department.
Taylor, Millicent	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Taylor serves as the English language Arts (ELA) department chair. She conducts school-wide literacy training as well as subject specific support to her department.

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	17	26	10	14	12	91
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	14	8	12	8	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	11	5	3	2	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	20	3	10	8	60

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 8/14/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**Prior Year - Updated**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	63%	61%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	61%	59%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	57%	54%	0%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	67%	62%	0%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	52%	0%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	56%	0%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey													
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)												Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	11 (0)	17 (0)	26 (0)	10 (0)	14 (0)	12 (0)	91 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	7 ( )	10 ( )	14 ( )	8 ( )	12 ( )	8 ( )	59 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	11 (0)	11 (0)	5 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	36 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

### Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	11%	56%	-45%	52%	-41%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	9%	60%	-51%	56%	-47%
	2018	9%	59%	-50%	58%	-49%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
09	2019	8%	55%	-47%	55%	-47%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
10	2019	16%	53%	-37%	53%	-37%
	2018	11%	54%	-43%	53%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	10%	53%	-43%	54%	-44%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	0%	40%	-40%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	5%	43%	-38%	48%	-43%
	2018	5%	44%	-39%	50%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	18%	68%	-50%	67%	-49%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	65%	-65%
Compare		18%			

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	11%	73%	-62%	71%	-60%
2018	6%	72%	-66%	71%	-65%
Compare		5%			

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	33%	71%	-38%	70%	-37%
2018	27%	67%	-40%	68%	-41%
Compare		6%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	8%	63%	-55%	61%	-53%
2018	5%	59%	-54%	62%	-57%
Compare		3%			

  

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD					20					36	
BLK										40	
HSP										29	
FRL		17			18					36	

  

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											
BLK											
HSP											
FRL											

  

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD											
BLK											
HSP											
FRL											

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	9
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	66
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	78%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	20
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	29
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	12
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

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

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

Reading showed the lowest performance. There was an 11 percentage point decrease in comparison of the 2018 FSA ELA students achievement data to the 2019. There were many students who had two or more EWS indicators.

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

The percentage of students making learning gains in ELA showed the greatest decline. There were many students who exhibited two or more EWS indicators. The average daily attendance for the 2018-2019 school year was 73%.

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

The greatest gap between the school and the states average was in ELA reading proficiency. The states average was 81% in comparison to the school's 16%. 91% of the students data trends were at level 1 proficiency.

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

Math learning gains showed the most improvement. 39% of the students made learning gains. Students were enrolled in Algebra 1A and Algebra 1B allowing for students to have a mathematics course everyday on a double block schedule.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Math and reading learning gains are our major areas of concern. 89% of students achieved proficiency level 1 or 2 on the 2018-2019 FSA Mathematics and only 4% of Algebra 1 EOC students achieved a passing score.

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

1. Attendance
2. Course failures
3. Reading interventions
4. Math interventions
5. Assessments preparation

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	If we increase our focus on reading strategies and interventions then students will show learning gains on the FSA/ELA.
<b>Rationale</b>	The schools reading data reflects an 11 percentage point decrease from the 2018-2019 FSA ELA Assessment.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The school plans to achieve a 10 percentage point increase from the 2018- 2019 school year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Daryl Branton (pr7631@dadeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	All level 1 and level 2 students are enrolled in an intensive reading course.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Emphasis on the FSA/ELA learning gains will impact students ability to achieve passing scores.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Effective Questioning (HOTS)</li> <li>2. Data Driven Instruction</li> <li>3. Differentiated Instruction</li> <li>4. Technology Integration</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Millicent Taylor (141904@dadeschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

School safety is of the utmost importance in Miami- Dade County Public Schools (MDCPS). We conduct all district required drills and exercises and have access daily to a Miami Dade County school police officer.

**Part IV: Title I Requirements**



**Additional Title I Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

The school schedules EESAC meetings, parent workshops, student activities, Open House, Title 1 Meetings, Individual Counseling Meetings, and PTA general meetings to create a home to school connection.

In addition, parents are encouraged to attend Town Hall Meetings, Exit Meetings, IEP Meetings and other district-wide meetings. Through these meetings, parents are presented with strategies, resources and information that will allow them to assist their child(ren) with their academic progress.

**PFEP Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

All students and their parents meet with students services during the intake process. Students who may be in need of additional services are referred to that particular service provider. Counselors and social workers are accessible to students throughout the school day.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

During the intake process, students are given an overview of all of the schools rules and regulations. Those who meet exit criteria ( 5 or fewer absences, Grades of C or higher, less than 2 behavioral referrals) are invited along with their parents to a ceremony celebrating their achievements.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

All instructional and non-instructional personnel are cleared through the district and certified to hold their respective positions. Ongoing district required and individual choice professional development are offered throughout the school year. School site meetings ( faculty, department, leadership, EESAC) are scheduled on a monthly basis throughout the year. Each department chair facilitates their departments meetings. The administration is an active participant in ensuring that all district and school wide rules and procedures are implemented.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

Student are afforded the opportunity to visit the local colleges and Technical Colleges in the area. Many of our student qualify to attend vocational rehabilitation programs offered by the district.

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: If we increase our focus on reading strategies and interventions then students will show learning gains on the FSA/ELA.	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>