Mcarthur High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mcarthur High School

6501 HOLLYWOOD BLVD, Hollywood, FL 33024

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Alfred Broomfield

Start Date for this Principal: 9/15/2020

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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

Mcarthur High School

6501 HOLLYWOOD BLVD, Hollywood, FL 33024

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	66%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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 McArthur High School is to ensure an optimum teaching and learning environment which enables students to become physically, intellectually, socially, and emotionally strong. The curriculum provides experiences that allow students to develop competencies in preparation for accepting the responsibilities and challenges of adults in a changing society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

McArthur High School is dedicated to striving for excellence in an ever-changing world. Providing students real-world 21st-century learning experiences, rigorous college preparatory, and interdisciplinary strategies that prepare our students to be college and career ready. Creating a safe learning environment while maximizing all student's potential for becoming global productive citizens in society. We embrace diversity, offer equitable opportunities for all, and promote pride in our school and community.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Broomfield, Alfred	Principal	1. Assume administrative responsibility and instructional leadership, under the supervision of the superintendent in accordance with rules and regulations of the School Board, for the planning, management, operation, and evaluation of the educational program of the school to which the individual is assigned. 2. Submit recommendations to the Superintendent regarding the appointment, assignment, promotion, transfer, and dismissal of all personnel assigned to the school. 3. Assume administrative responsibility for all records and reports required regarding pupils, for the transfer of pupils within the school, and for the promotion of pupils. 4. Have the authority to discipline students up to and including the suspension of students from school or from a school bus as provided for in F.S.1003.32. 5. Enforce the Broward County Schools Code of Student Conduct.
Robinson, Susan	Assistant Principal	11th Grade Proactive Team Alumni Cafeteria Duty Over Brace Advisor Grants Over Guidance Kids of Character Medical and Nurse Matriculation New Teacher Development RTI SEL Staff Development Substitutes Underclassmen Awards
Smith, Nadine	Instructional Coach	Literacy coach for all 9-12 grades. Supports all English and reading teachers
Meinsen, Brittnany	SAC Member	SAC Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 9/15/2020, Alfred Broomfield

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

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	507	583	514	538	2142
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	134	142	227	605
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	54	36	25	157
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	90	62	17	259
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	90	62	17	259
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	151	0	0	298
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	151	0	0	298
	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	108	58	60	331

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	40	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	17	7	25	67

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/15/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	472	565	489	543	2069
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	134	142	227	605
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	54	36	26	158
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	90	62	12	254
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	151	0	0	298

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	108	58	60	331

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	1	40	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	17	7	25	67

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	472	565	489	543	2069
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	134	142	227	605
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	54	36	26	158
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	90	62	12	254
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	151	0	0	298

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	105	108	58	60	331

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	1	40	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	17	7	25	67

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	42%	57%	56%	42%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	52%	51%	41%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	45%	42%	27%	43%	41%
Math Achievement	31%	51%	51%	41%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	40%	44%	48%	38%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	43%	45%	24%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	59%	66%	68%	56%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	66%	71%	73%	69%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
09	2019	39%	57%	-18%	55%	-16%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	53%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	40%	53%	-13%	53%	-13%
	2018	38%	53%	-15%	53%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	57%	67%	-10%	67%	-10%
2018	47%	62%	-15%	65%	-18%
Compare		10%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	67%	-2%	70%	-5%
2018	66%	66%	0%	68%	-2%
Compare		-1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	22%	61%	-39%	61%	-39%
2018	21%	63%	-42%	62%	-41%
Compare		1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	36%	56%	-20%	57%	-21%
2018	53%	51%	2%	56%	-3%
Compare		-17%			

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	22	28	31	19	30	39	36	44		92	60
ELL	25	39	35	27	46	54	45	65		86	78
ASN	43	38		31	31		64	75		100	72
BLK	37	43	44	29	42	44	56	57		95	77
HSP	43	44	40	34	43	46	61	71		93	80
MUL	64	78		36	25			67		92	64
WHT	45	41	29	26	26	33	45	71		89	78
FRL	38	43	40	30	39	43	57	64		94	79
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	22	35	31	19	26	22	29	42		84	50
ELL	25	38	38	28	32	29	43	45		69	55
ASN	59	56		45	44		47	71		79	53
BLK	35	42	37	29	38	33	42	58		96	68
HSP	43	44	37	40	40	33	49	73		90	71
MUL	53	39		46	58			81		100	86
WHT	52	44	46	51	54	23	54	74		93	75
FRL	40	43	37	36	40	35	44	65		91	70

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	13	24	21	23	34	32	32	38		75	56
ELL	14	35	35	35	46	22	45	41		63	54
ASN	56	40	18	51	42		90	72		94	80
BLK	34	39	23	30	34	22	48	62		90	56
HSP	44	41	33	43	40	24	57	69		86	65
MUL	48	58		45	23		67	100		73	
WHT	45	43	11	49	41	33	62	76		91	68
FRL	37	38	25	37	36	23	54	67		88	62

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	598
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	57
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Our lowest-performing students are our students with disabilities. This subgroup has increased ten percentage points from 2018 to the 2019 FSA data. However, with not taking the FSA in 2019 they are still below 41% at only a 40% proficiency rate.

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

Based on the data the component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year is our multiracial subgroup. The biggest factor that contributed to this decline was their math scores.

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 math achievement has the greatest gap. 9th-grade Algebra scores are the lowest in all EOC scores. The trend has continued to stay at only a 20% proficiency rate.

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

Biology had the highest improvement with an increase of 10% points. Our school on top of a Saturday review camp implemented a pull-out and push-in program for science.

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

The students with the lowest proficiency rate are our students with disabilities. An area of concern is the lack of one on one time students have with their facilitator.

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

1. Students with Disabilities
2. Math Proficiency
3. ELL
4. ELA
5. Science proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESE support facilitators will be working with students and teachers on their caseload in preparation for the FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	McArthur High school ESE department will rasie sores by approximately 3% by the end of 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Robinson (susan.robinson@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Create a support facilitator resource room for one on one small group intervention
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Allow space for collaboration, which in turn give students a quiet space for facilitators to monitor and provide different support based instruction depending on the needs of each student on a private and conducive environment to increase student development.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify ESE Students needing support
2. Separate ESE facilitators caseload based on student needs
3. Provide additional options for pull-outs, computers, and continual support
4. Formative and summative assessments from teachers are given continuously to determine the type of remediation needed for student support that the ESE facilitator will implement
5. Based on the date from IEP meetings and interim reports ESE facilitators will continue to make adjustments to students individualized plans

Person Responsible	Susan Robinson (susan.robinson@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	From the last FSA test in 2019 school year, students were showing only a 42% proficiency which is 15% lower then the district of Broward County. Literacy at McArthur went down from 42% to 42% and to avoid creating a trend of a decline in proficiency on the ELA FSA, McArthur will target our literacy students to help them succeeded.
Measurable Outcome:	McArthur will increase three percentage points in proficiency for the 2020 reading and writing exam.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nadine Smith (nadine.smith@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The literacy coach will push in and pull out students that need extra remediation based on common formative assessment scores. The literacy coach will work individually with teachers to help increase the quality of instruction delivered and have students work on various computer programs to increase their proficiency in different literacy standards
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Working in small or individual groups allow students to understand and increase their content knowledge more efficiently. Working on various computer programs such as Khan Academy has proven data that it has increase student test scores.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will take a diagnostic formative assessment in their reading and English classes
2. Teacher and literacy coach will analyze data
3. Teacher and literacy coach will create individualized plans for student achievement
4. Literacy coach will pull out students or push into classes based on common formative assessment data
5. Literacy coach will guide and work with teachers in developing curriculum and remediation content

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Guidance counselor will work with individual students and monitor students that are struggling. Department chair will meet with various professional learning communities to create effective crunch time plans to help students that are failing to meet proficiency succeeded.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

To ensure that stakeholders are fully involved in various process at McArthur High school, the school hold monthly school advisory council meetings. In these meeting stakeholders are presented with various information and able to give input. McArthur also to ensure that the social and emotional needs of all students are meet follows their SEL plan.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$56,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5200	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0241 - Mcarthur High School	General Fund		$56,000.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7000	120-Classroom Teachers	0241 - Mcarthur High School	General Fund		$2,500.00
			Notes: Saturday and push in and pull out program to improve ELA proficiency			
					Total:	$58,500.00