

Marion County Public Schools

Mcso Adults



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	10
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	0

Mcso Adults

700 NW 30TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34475

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Dwan Thomas

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2021

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	59%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to provide an alternative educational experience by helping at risk students achieve academic and social success while working towards their educational goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to forge strong, positive connections with students so they can achieve independence, build confidence, become productive citizens, and gain academic knowledge.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

MCSO serves youth awaiting adjudication up to 18 years old and ESE students up to their 22nd birthday. Instruction is individualized to meet each student's needs. We develop quality individualized educational plans that inspire and engage students held in confinement and get them excited about their education. Our school partners with Breakfree Education and uses resources designed to offer opportunities for students to engage in meaningful and relevant project-based learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Thomas, Dwan	Program Manager	To oversee implementation of the school's SIP as an administrator and to support the Leadership Team with their duties.
Luckey, Steven	Lead Educator	Implement the SIP on a daily basis while collecting and aggregating school data.
Jamerson, Shawntavia		To provide ESE services to the school's students.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

N/A

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/26/2021, Dwan Thomas

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

2

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

2

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

19

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

0

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	0	7	5	8	7	13	40	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	4	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	2	2	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	2	5	21	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	2	8	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	7	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	3	3	6	2	4	18

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

Wednesday 6/30/2021

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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 Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement					46%	56%		44%	56%
ELA Learning Gains					48%	51%		48%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					39%	42%		37%	44%
Math Achievement					40%	51%		44%	51%
Math Learning Gains					43%	48%		42%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					37%	45%		31%	45%
Science Achievement					61%	68%		60%	67%
Social Studies Achievement					71%	73%		67%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	0%	46%	-46%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
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
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

Low performing ESSA subgroups have not been identified for MCSO and a SIP was not completed in 20-21. However, in 20-21, MCSO's instructional focus was on student gains in reading proficiency and low performing students were monitored through regular formative assessment and periodic summative assessment.

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Low performing ESSA subgroups have not been identified for MCSO. However, the students showed improvement in reading proficiency because instruction was differentiated to address individual student academic needs.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Grade level assessment data for MCSO was not identified in this review but has been identified by our school as an area in great need of improvement. MCSO students' low achievement scores for the 10th grade ELA FSA assessments are most problematic.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Credit deficiency in core content classes amongst MCSO students is a negative trend across all grade levels and subgroups.

What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Diagnosing of essential missed learning, ongoing and regular progress monitoring, scaffolded and intentional instruction, and standards-based teaching and learning are targeted strategies for accelerated learning at MCSO.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development for MCSO staff will be provided by the Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System (FDLRS). The training will focus on differentiated instruction and lesson planning for student engagement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Improving ELA instructional practices was identified as a critical need based off of low achievement scores earned by MCSO students taking their 10th Grade ELA FSA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

25% of MCSO students taking their 10th Grade ELA FSA will score a 3 or better and 50% of MCSO students will pass the ELA section of the PSAT at or above 50th percentile for all test takers.

Monitoring:

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

MCSO students will be monitored through regular formative assessment and periodic summative assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Steven Luckey (steven.luckey@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Instructional scaffolding will be implemented for this Area of Focus. It is the support given to a student by an instructor throughout the learning process. This support is specifically tailored to each student; this instructional approach allows students to experience student-centered learning, which tends to facilitate more efficient learning than teacher-centered learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The main benefit of scaffolded instruction is that it provides for a supportive learning environment. Students share the responsibility of teaching and learning through scaffolds that require them to move beyond their current skill and knowledge levels. One of the main goals of scaffolding is to reduce the negative emotions and self-perceptions that students may experience when they get frustrated, intimidated, or discouraged when attempting a difficult task without the assistance, direction, or understanding they need to complete it.

Action Steps to Implement:

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

1. Conduct a comprehensive review and needs assessment of the current curriculum.

Person Responsible

Steven Luckey (steven.luckey@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Establish a consistent framework for curriculum components.

Person Responsible

Steven Luckey (steven.luckey@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Provide on-going professional development in curriculum development for all teachers.

Person Responsible

Dwan Thomas (dwan.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us)

4. Implement a Positive Behavior Intervention System to improve the culture for learning in the classroom and for the school as a whole.

Person Responsible

Steven Luckey (steven.luckey@marion.k12.fl.us)

5. Continuously monitor the success of the intervention process.

Person Responsible

Steven Luckey (steven.luckey@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Low performing ESSA subgroups have not been identified for MCSO, but this area of focus relates to our school's subgroups.

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.

MCSO strives to foster the development of positive school cultures through improved teaching strategies and schoolwide initiatives in which students are supported socially, emotionally, and academically. Our school's focus is to provide intervention and support opportunities for the least engaged youth or subgroups of at-risk students.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

MCSO partners with Breakfree Education to provide educational services that inspire and engage students held in confinement and get them excited about their education. The organization works directly with juvenile justice agencies across the country, providing the resources, training, and networks they need to make school relevant and meaningful for their students. Mr. Philip Confalone is our full-time classroom instructor at MCSO. He has certifications for Social Science 6-12, Exceptional Student Education, Emotionally Handicapped, Mentally Handicapped, and Varying Exceptionalities. Besides his qualifications, Mr. Confalone goes above and beyond to provide educational services to MCSO's students. Students are subject to cell confinement by jail staff if necessary and are not able to attend class, but Mr. Confalone will teach those students individually through their cell doors.