
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Duval Mycroschool Of Integrated Academics And Technologies

1584 NORMANDY VILLAGE PKWY STE 25, Jacksonville, FL 32221

www.mycroschooljax.org

Demographics

Principal: Rachel Maldonado

Start Date for this Principal: 9/6/2019

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)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	74%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Duval 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	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Duval Mycroschool Of Integrated Academics And Technologies

1584 NORMANDY VILLAGE PKWY STE 25, Jacksonville, FL 32221

www.mycroschooljax.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	Yes	%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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 Duval MYcroSchool of Integrated Academics and Technologies, Inc. (Duval MYcroSchool, Inc.) is to provide a premier high school drop-out recovery program engaging students through relationship-focused, high-tech, and rigorous learning experiences resulting in Real Learning for Real Life. Duval MYcroSchool views all at-risk students as 'at-promise'. MYcroSchool will provide these students with the opportunity to earn a high school diploma, leading to advanced study and expanded opportunities for success in the workforce through a sound theoretical framework of competency-based, authentic education, high expectations, an orderly atmosphere, strong emphasis on skill acquisition, frequent monitoring of progress to promote student success, and data-driven decisions in real-time to help scholars achieve their maximum potential and function positively in society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Duval MYcroSchool Vision of success characterizes:

STUDENTS as life-long learners and contributing members of society.

STAFF having an opportunity to make a difference in an environment of respect, recognition and professional growth.

COMMUNITIES benefiting from the success and contributions of MYcroSchool students.

Duval MYcroSchool provides a competency-based education in an individual student growth model coupled with rigor, relevance and relationships, in a high-tech and high-touch environment, facilitating a specialized learning experience and meaningful transformation that will enhance each student's ability to access and succeed in institutions of higher learning, the 21st century workforce and/or military service. Duval MYcroSchool promotes and provides opportunities to learn the skills needed to negotiate the complexities of life and to prepare for life educationally, technologically, economically, and socially.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Maldonado, Rachel	Principal	Overall school operations, discipline, professional development, school culture, business partnerships, school safety as priority, instruction, curriculum, student information system, master scheduling, governing board, management company, and district sponsor for deliverables and financials.
Cooley, Kathryn	Teacher, ESE	ESE/504/ESOL oversight, mental health referrals, professional development facilitator, 3rd administrative designee, BTAT
	Assistant Principal	graduation coach, 1st administrative designee, counseling students, advisory teacher, cohort management, testing coordinator

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	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/6/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	64	41	74	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	4	2	3	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	28	10	51	94

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	30	64	41	74	209

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	64	41	74	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	4	2	3	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	28	10	51	94

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	30	64	41	74	209

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%	47%	56%	0%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	48%	51%	0%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	42%	0%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	51%	51%	0%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	48%	0%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	47%	45%	0%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	65%	68%	0%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	70%	73%	0%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (30)	0 (64)	0 (41)	0 (74)	0 (209)
One or more suspensions	0 (27)	0 (4)	0 (2)	0 (3)	0 (36)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (5)	0 (28)	0 (10)	0 (51)	0 (94)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	7%	48%	-41%	55%	-48%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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
2019	4%	67%	-63%	67%	-63%
2018	6%	63%	-57%	65%	-59%
Compare		-2%			

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	11%	68%	-57%	70%	-59%
2018	19%	64%	-45%	68%	-49%
Compare		-8%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	5%	57%	-52%	61%	-56%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
Compare		5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	7%	61%	-54%	57%	-50%
2018	11%	57%	-46%	56%	-45%
Compare		-4%			

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										12	
BLK										21	8
HSP										14	
WHT										32	14
FRL										19	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
SWD											
BLK											
HSP											
WHT											
FRL											
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD											
BLK											
HSP											
WHT											
FRL											

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	18
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	35
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	12
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	15
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	14

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	23
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	19
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

According to the data set, while all demographic students performed under the metric for at least 1 year, white students performed the worst on the federal index for the past two years.

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

Influencing factors include: dropout recovery school, afternoon shift going very late until 5:30pm due to staffing and financial strain, outside influences of adult students

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.

38% in 1819 versus 63% in 1718 of 10th graders exhibited 2 or more early warning indicators.

1. Attendance
2. Larger population of students enrolled at the school
3. Staffing model and budgetary constraints
4. Ability to provide wrap around services

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

Altogether, students with disabilities showed the most improvement.

1. Offered incentives, dress down days, pizza, movie tickets
2. Consistently conferenced with students to make sure they knew what their weak areas were.
3. Focused the concentration on the Reading subtest--timed practice tests
4. Saturday school sessions
5. One-on-one intensive direct instruction

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

The amount of retained students enrolled in the 10th and 12th grades.
The amount of students below 90% ADA.

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

1. School safety.
2. School culture.
3. Cohort graduation rate.
4. Reading state assessment performance.
5. Math state assessment performance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Greater attention to the lowest performing group which is white students.
Rationale	EWS states that this is our worst performing group for first time FSA Reading test takers.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve the 23% federal index for 1819 to 19% index for 1920.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rachel Maldonado (rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	STAR Reading Quarterly Scores monitored and reported by ELA Teacher. This will provide a target list by Winter Break. Teacher can then be supported to plan intensive MYcroPaths instruction in ELA strategies for first-time targeted test takers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Use the data to target the correct students in the most effective FSA reporting categories. EWS data was used to determine the approach to instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Test all students in STAR Reading Q1 and Q2. 2. Meet and do comparison data. 3. Determine which students fall under more than 1 demographic category. E.g. White and disabled. 4. Plan out MYcroPaths instruction with teacher. 5. Pull data for Q3 STAR Reading, compare, make adjustments to instruction if necessary. 6. Evaluate FSA scores.
Person Responsible	Rachel Maldonado (rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)

#2	
Title	ESE Students were the highest performing group.
Rationale	EWS states that this was our highest performing group.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve the 12% federal index for 1819 to 10% index for 1920.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kathryn Cooley (kathryn.cooley@mycroschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase the amount of ESE student graduates. 2. Provide more direct instruction for students with disabilities in Geometry, Algebra 1, and English 3 and
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Use the data to target the correct students in the most effective FSA reporting categories. EWS data was used to determine the approach to instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Test all students in STAR Reading Q1 and Q2. 2. Meet and do comparison data. 3. Determine which students fall under more than 1 demographic category. E.g. White and disabled. 4. Plan out MYcroPaths instruction with teacher.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Black/African American Students performing below 41% in the current year
Rationale	EWS states that this is our 2nd worst performing group for first time FSA Reading test takers.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve the metric from 15% in 1819 to 13% in 1920.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rachel Maldonado (rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	STAR Reading Quarterly Scores monitored and reported by ELA Teacher. This will provide a target list by Winter Break. Teacher can then be supported to plan intensive MYcroPaths instruction in ELA strategies for first-time targeted test takers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Use the data to target the correct students in the most effective FSA reporting categories. EWS data was used to determine the approach to instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Test all students in STAR Reading Q1 and Q2. 2. Meet and do comparison data. 3. Determine which students fall under more than 1 demographic category. E.g. White and disabled. 4. Plan out MYcroPaths instruction with teacher. 5. Pull data for Q3 STAR Reading, compare, make adjustments to instruction if necessary. 6. Evaluate FSA scores.
Person Responsible	Rachel Maldonado (rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)

#4	
Title	Hispanic students trending the same as Black/African American students
Rationale	EWS states that this is our 2nd worst performing group for first time FSA Reading test takers trending along with Black/African American students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve the metric from 14% in 1819 to 12% in 1920.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rachel Maldonado (rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	STAR Reading Quarterly Scores monitored and reported by ELA Teacher. This will provide a target list by Winter Break. Teacher can then be supported to plan intensive MYcroPaths instruction in ELA strategies for first-time targeted test takers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Use the data to target the correct students in the most effective FSA reporting categories. EWS data was used to determine the approach to instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Test all students in STAR Reading Q1 and Q2. 2. Meet and do comparison data. 3. Determine which students fall under more than 1 demographic category. E.g. White and disabled. 4. Plan out MYcroPaths instruction with teacher. 5. Pull data for Q3 STAR Reading, compare, make adjustments to instruction if necessary. 6. Evaluate FSA scores.
Person Responsible	Rachel Maldonado (rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)

#5	
Title	Economically disadvantaged students need to perform better of FSA 10th grade Reading.
Rationale	EWS states that this is our 3rd worst performing demographic group of first time FSA Reading testers.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve the metric from 19% in 1819 to 17% in 1920.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rachel Maldonado (rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	STAR Reading Quarterly Scores monitored and reported by ELA Teacher. This will provide a target list by Winter Break. Teacher can then be supported to plan intensive MYcroPaths instruction in ELA strategies for first-time targeted test takers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Use the data to target the correct students in the most effective FSA reporting categories. EWS data was used to determine the approach to instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Test all students in STAR Reading Q1 and Q2. 2. Meet and do comparison data. 3. Determine which students fall under more than 1 demographic category. E.g. White and disabled. 4. Plan out MYcroPaths instruction with teacher. 5. Pull data for Q3 STAR Reading, compare, make adjustments to instruction if necessary. 6. Evaluate FSA scores.
Person Responsible	Rachel Maldonado (rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

1. 75% of "Full academic year" students will improve STAR reading scores by 1 grade level.
2. Improve the annual graduation rate in the federal cohort from 30.58% to 32% or higher.
3. Successfully train staff and students as observed by JSO or Guardian how to respond to active assailant crisis.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

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

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

n/a We are not a Title I school for the 1920 year.

PFEP Link

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

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

n/a We are not a Title I school for the 1920 year.

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

n/a We are not a Title I school for the 1920 year.

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

n/a We are not a Title I school for the 1920 year.

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

n/a We are not a Title I school for the 1920 year.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Greater attention to the lowest performing group which is white students.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESE Students were the highest performing group.	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Black/African American Students performing below 41% in the current year	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Hispanic students trending the same as Black/African American students	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Economically disadvantaged students need to perform better of FSA 10th grade Reading.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00