
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Miami Macarthur Educational Center

13990 SW 264TH ST, Naranja, FL 33032

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

Demographics

Principal: Earl Burth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 1-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Miami Macarthur Educational Center

13990 SW 264TH ST, Naranja, FL 33032

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

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)
Combination School 1-12	Yes	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2013-14
Grade	

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/31/2020, Earl Burth

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.*

2

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.*

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

23

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 1-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 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	1	5	20	16	11	9	3	65
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	3	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	12	9	8	2	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	0	0	6	15	8	7	1	37

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/31/2020

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	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
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	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	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	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
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(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.

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%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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%				
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%				

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	18%	68%	-50%	67%	-49%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	65%	-65%
Compare		18%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	11%	73%	-62%	71%	-60%
2018	6%	72%	-66%	71%	-65%
Compare		5%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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

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	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%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
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%	2

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	20
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	29
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	12
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

DATA no captured due to no testing

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

No Testing

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.

No Testing

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

No Testing

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

Student attendance

Past Course failure

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

1. Improving upon Virtual Learning
2. Student attendance
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Basic skills will continue to be a major focus. If our student improve in these areas, they will do better on the states FSA assessments. Due to the Covid 19 pandemic, students will be under constant physical as well as academic observation. Becoming acclimated to the K12 or teams platform will be vitally important for students who will attend traditional brick and mortar as well as My school online. Teachers will undergo constant training and professional development to assist with delivery, engagement, remediation and enrichment.

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.

The school has been thoroughly cleaned and sanitized, classrooms painted and the garden manicured. The student services team along with other providers will be available to assist students who may be experiencing mental health, substance abuse or most other challenges. Community partners have provided financial assistance to purchase needed equipment. We will use a grant award from Florida International University for campus beautification projects including the butterfly garden.

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.

Total:	\$0.00
---------------	---------------