

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Arts Academy Of Excellence



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Arts Academy Of Excellence

780 FISHERMAN ST, Opa Locka, FL 33054

www.artsacademynorth.org

Demographics

Principal: Floyd Barber

Start Date for this Principal: 9/17/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2022-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: D (37%) 2017-18: F (15%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	CS&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 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

Arts Academy Of Excellence

780 FISHERMAN ST, Opa Locka, FL 33054

www.artsacademynorth.org

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 6-12	Yes	94%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	100%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	D	D	F

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 Arts Academy of Excellence (AAE) is to provide a highly effective, rigorous, engaging educational program and experience that ensure student achievement in all core content areas while enabling students an opportunity to realize their maximum potential through the study and exploration of the arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

AAE's vision statement is to focus on the arts and the creation of a shared vision and mission in which a community builds a sense of commitment revolving around student learning and achievement. Through this shared vision, individualized student learning and academic achievement will be improved through the effective implementation of the Florida Continuous Model (FCIM) as a continuous monitoring process and improvement mechanism for teaching and learning.

The school will provide a high quality educational program to students in grade 6-12 that incorporates wrap-around services and a curriculum that integrates performing arts and academics. Our aim is to develop students both academically and artistically that will not only assist with them being prepared but also with them successfully thriving as citizens in the real-world and as performers that challenge the conventions of traditional forms of art.

Our vision includes the belief of:

- A strong academic program infused with activities and instruction that support the artistic potential of students.
- Exposing students to performing and fine arts that encourage each student to individually work in a creative, cooperative and collaborative manner while promoting independent thinking and a self-sufficient, sustainable mindset.
- Students learning best in a participatory, exploratory, and creative environment placed within a firm framework of high standards of teaching and learning.
- Students developing an understanding of, and access to, master classes and artistic partnerships that promote exposure and encourage participation in an artistically developing society.

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
Barber, Floyd	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 9/17/2020, Floyd Barber

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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

6

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2022-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: D (37%) 2017-18: F (15%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	CS&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	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	1	4	9	14	5	8	0	41
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	0	4	0	24
One or more suspensions	0	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	0	
Course failure in Math	0	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	0	0	0	4	8	14	0	1	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	14	0	4	0	30

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	4	8	14	0	1	0	27

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/17/2020

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	19	7	9	3	0	56	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	3	6	1	0	18	
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	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	16	5	8	3	0	50	

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	5	10	16	3	2	3	0	39	

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	

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	7	11	19	7	9	3	0	56	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	3	6	1	0	18	
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	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	16	5	8	3	0	50	

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	5	10	16	3	2	3	0	39	

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	

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	21%	59%	56%	0%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	39%	54%	51%	0%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	48%	42%	0%	45%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	27%	54%	51%	0%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	44%	52%	48%	0%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	45%	0%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	20%	68%	68%	0%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	76%	73%	0%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	30%	58%	-28%	54%	-24%
	2018	19%	53%	-34%	52%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	21%	56%	-35%	52%	-31%
	2018	17%	54%	-37%	51%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	23%	60%	-37%	56%	-33%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
09	2019	18%	55%	-37%	55%	-37%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	20%	58%	-38%	55%	-35%
	2018	5%	56%	-51%	52%	-47%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	14%	53%	-39%	54%	-40%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	21%	40%	-19%	46%	-25%
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	21%	43%	-22%	48%	-27%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	71%	73%	-2%	71%	0%
2018	45%	72%	-27%	71%	-26%
Compare		26%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	63%	-18%	61%	-16%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%
Compare		45%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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
BLK	18	39		19	37						
FRL	18	39		25	47			70			
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
BLK	17	32		4	5						
FRL	10	29									
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

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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	221
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
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%	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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

ELA lowest 25%
Math lowest 25%

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

There was no decline in the data.

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 when compared to the state average is seventh grade mathematics. Attendance was a factor that contributed to the gap.

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

Sixth grade ELA and mathematics data components showed the most improvement. Increased rigor and the implementation of i-Ready daily were actions the school took in this area.

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

Two potential areas of concern were attendance and proficiency on state assessments.

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

1. ELA lowest 25%
2. Math lowest 25%
3. Attendance
4. Increase parental involvement and engagement
5. Set high expectations for teachers to students and motivate them in the process.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data demonstrates students need additional intervention support in the area of mathematics
Measurable Outcome:	The school will demonstrate an increase of 5% in the percent of students who score proficient on the FSA Mathematics assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Floyd Barber (942017@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of i-Ready and Mathletics instructional technology programs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	There are research-based and classroom-evidenced programs for improving outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementation of i-Ready for 25 minutes daily in both the core and intensive mathematics classes/courses.
2. Incorporate the Mathletics instructional technology programs to provide remediation and enrichment for students.

Person Responsible Floyd Barber (942017@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data demonstrates students need additional intervention support in the area of reading.
Measurable Outcome:	The school will demonstrate an increase of 5% in the percent of students who score proficient on the FSA Reading assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Floyd Barber (942017@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of i-Ready instructional technology programs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These are research-based and classroom-evidenced programs for improving outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementation of i-Ready for 25 minutes daily in both the core and intensive reading classes/courses.

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.

The remaining school wide improvement priorities will be addressed by improving instruction in all content areas. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to: adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet specific needs of all students, drive decisions regarding targeted professional development and identify and develop interventions.

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.

Although Arts Academy of Excellence (AAE) will work diligently to continue to build positive relationships with families to increase involvement, including efforts to communicate the school's mission and vision, and keep parents informed of their child's academic and behavioral progress. This engagement and involvement will include a combination of research-based frameworks, that describe effective and practical types of involvement— parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community. This will include a broad range of school, family, and community activities that will collaboratively engage parents, students, teachers and staff, community members, and partnerships to work together to ensure meeting the needs of all students and are well integrated within the school's overall mission, vision, and goals. These efforts will be used to improve the school, strengthen families, build community support, and increase student achievement and success. Also, creating two-way communication channels between school and home that are effective and reliable will immediately provide for a discussion and participation in a home-school connection and geared toward cooperatively working to meet student needs and improve academic performance.

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: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00