

Duval County Public Schools

# Duval Mycroschool Of Integrated Academics And



## 2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                     | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                      | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                        | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>                | <b>12</b> |
| <b>R.A.I.S.E</b>                               | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>      | <b>0</b>  |

# 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: 10/1/2012

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2021-22 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Function</b><br>(per accountability file)  | Alternative  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Alternative Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 74%  |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students<br>White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   | 2021-22: No Rating<br>2020-21: No Rating<br>2018-19: No Rating<br>2017-18: No Rating<br>2016-17: No Rating                             |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating</b>   | 2023-24: No Rating   |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.**

Duval MYcroSchool Charter High School provides a premier high school dropout recovery program engaging students through relationship-focused, high-tech, and rigorous personalized learning experiences resulting in Real Learning for Real Life™.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Duval MYcroSchool's educational programs, including its curriculum, prepare students for today's economy with a strong emphasis on real life skills that can be transferred to the world of work and/or college. MYcroSchool has teacher-directed instruction in a student-centered environment with an innovative technology that engages students. MYcroSchool now offers the 18-credit ACCEL diploma for those students who qualify.

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

- 10% Hispanic
- 2% Asian and Native American/Pacific Islander
- 66% Black or African American
- 32% White
- 86% F/R Lunch status

Supports include Technology Plan for full wireless connectivity, mobile classrooms, advisory program, College Summit program, Direct instruction, Online Instruction, MYcroPaths Instructional Model for varied learning styles, flexible scheduling, partnerships with local trade schools and universities.

### 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 |
|------|----------------|---------------------------------|
|------|----------------|---------------------------------|

|                   |           |   |
|-------------------|-----------|---|
| Maldonado, Rachel | Principal | Overall operations, curriculum, scheduling, partnerships, governing board, evaluations, certification, professional development |
|-------------------|-----------|---|

**Is education provided through contract for educational services?**

Yes

**If yes, name of the contracted education provider.**

NewCorp

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 10/1/2012, Rachel Maldonado

**Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?**

4

**Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?**

2

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.**

6

**Total number of students enrolled at the school.**

225

**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 | 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                                    | 0           | 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     | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9  | 50 | 13 | 11 | 83    |   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 45 | 13 | 10 | 82    |   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 55 | 17 | 11 | 98    |   |

**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 | 17 | 76 | 24 | 104 | 221   |  |

**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 | 1  | 11 | 3  | 2     | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 28 | 5  | 5     | 52 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 7/9/2021

**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 | 17 | 76 | 24 | 104   | 221 |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 76 | 24 | 104   | 220 |
| 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 | 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 | 9  | 50 | 13 | 11    | 83  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 45 | 13 | 10    | 82  |

**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 | 17 | 76 | 24 | 104   | 221 |

**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 | 1  | 11 | 3  | 2     | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 28 | 5  | 5     | 52 |

**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            |        |          |       |        | 47%      | 56%   |        | 47%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains         |        |          |       |        | 48%      | 51%   |        | 49%      | 53%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       |        | 42%      | 42%   |        | 42%      | 44%   |
| Math Achievement           |        |          |       |        | 51%      | 51%   |        | 51%      | 51%   |

| School Grade Component      | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       |        | 52%      | 48%   |        | 55%      | 48%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       |        | 47%      | 45%   |        | 50%      | 45%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       |        | 65%      | 68%   |        | 61%      | 67%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       |        | 70%      | 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 | 7%     | 48%      | -41%                       | 55%   | -48%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 10                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 48%      | -48%                       | 53%   | -53%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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        | 4%     | 67%      | -63%                  | 67%   | -63%               |

| 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        |        |          |                       |       |                    |



| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 11%    | 68%      | -57%                  | 70%   | -59%               |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 5%     | 57%      | -52%                  | 61%   | -56%               |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 7%     | 61%      | -54%                  | 57%   | -50%               |

**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 |
| SWD                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 36                |                     |
| BLK                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 35                | 4                   |
| HSP                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 31                |                     |
| WHT                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 63                | 4                   |
| FRL                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 42                | 3                   |
| 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 |

**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 | 24 |

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |     |
|---|-----|
| 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                                       | 47  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 2   |
| Percent Tested  |     |

| <b>Subgroup Data</b> |  |
|----------------------|--|
|----------------------|--|

| <b>Students With Disabilities</b> |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
|-----------------------------------|--|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 36  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% |     |

| <b>English Language Learners</b> |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
|----------------------------------|--|

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 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% |     |

| <b>Native American Students</b> |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
|---------------------------------|--|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 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% |     |

| <b>Asian Students</b> |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|-----------------------|--|

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

| <b>Black/African American Students</b> |  |
|--|--|
|--|--|

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 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% |     |

| <b>Hispanic Students</b> |  |
|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--|

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students                                | 31  |
| 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   | 34  |
| 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                                | 23  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

**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?**

Students w/ disabilities at 12%. Contributing factors: limited exposure to testing in Fall 2020. Not enough time to get students on grade level due to varying enrollment dates. Cannot be completely determined since the FSA was given in Spring 2021, but not used to determine graduation rates due to COVID-19.

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

Both Black and White students showed declines in 1718 and 1819. Cannot be completely determined since the FSA was not given in Spring 2020 due to COVID-19. FSA was given in 2021 school year, but not used to determine grad rates.

**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?**

Cannot be completely determined since the FSA was not given in Spring 2020 due to COVID-19 and FSA was given but not applied to graduation rates in 2021. However, by looking at

Level 1 and 2 students, we can determine that areas for improvement among students of color need to be addressed.

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

Cannot be completely determined since the FSA was not given in Spring 2020 due to COVID-19 and FSA was given but not applied to graduation rates in 2021. Trends across grade levels include poor performance in Reading among 10th grade students, African American or Black students, Hispanic students, and ESE students. Based upon the aforementioned trends, the assessment coordinator position will be leveraged to assist with Reading, Math push in or pull out groups and assisting with state testing and data analysis.

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

1. Fidelity to the MYcroPaths model.
2. Professional development on equity and inclusion driven by underperforming demographic groups.
3. Advisory program
4. College Summit program
5. Test Prep summer boot camp
6. Leverage the Graduation Coach who is also the assessment coordinator position to boost student achievement in state testing, in turn boosting cohort grad rates.

### **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.**

1. Potential partnership with JASMYN to address LGBTQ+ students.
2. Baruti Kafele professional reading on equity and inclusion in instruction and relationship-building.
3. PLC meetings regarding data analysis led by the assessment coordinator.
4. Graduation pushes in and pulls out of the classroom and documents interventions and coachings.

## **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.

Greater attention to lowest performing groups: White, Black, and ESE students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Improve federal index from 1920 to 2122 by 5%.  
36.2%-->41.2%.

Led by the assessment coordinator and graduation coach during PLC:

**Monitoring:**

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

Progress monitoring in STAR quarterly Reading assessments.  
Progress monitoring in Achieve3000 quarterly Reading assessments.  
Progress monitoring in Fall and Spring state assessments.  
Progress monitoring in Fall and Spring SAT and ACT assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rachel Maldonado  
(rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

STAR Reading, Achieve3000, state assessments, SAT/ACT quarterly scores monitored and reported to all teachers during PLC. Identify target list of students by Winter Break. Teachers use PLC to support reading in the content area.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Using the data to target the correct students in the most effective FSA reporting categories will help improve the graduation rate. Push in and pull out with the assessment coordinator will be based upon school improvement data and shared-decision making during PLC for target students.

**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. Test all students in STAR and Achieve3000 Reading Q1 and Q2.
2. Meet and do comparison data during PLC led by assessment coordinator.
3. Determine which students fall under more than 1 demographic category. E.g. White, Black, and disabled.
4. Plan out MYcroPaths instruction with teacher.
5. Pull data for Q3 STAR/Achieve3000 Reading, compare, make adjustments to instruction if necessary.
6. Evaluate FSA, SAT, ACT scores.

**Person Responsible**

Rachel Maldonado  
(rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the

n/a

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.

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Reopening schools amidst a pandemic with unvaccinated people. This impacts student learning as it changes the manner in which the school responds to staff and student illness.

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

Improve the metric from 15% in 1920 to 13% in 2122.

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

The school will use MYcroCases, Achieve3000, ACT/SAT, PearsonNext, and RenPlace databases to monitor and cross reference student outcomes during PLC to increase the graduation federal index from 36.2% to 41.2%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rachel Maldonado  
 (rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)  
 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. Create intrinsic incentives for students via advisory that show growth on quarterly exams. e.g. posting on school hallway students that achieve passing scores, celebrating students on social media

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Use the data to target the correct students in the most effective FSA reporting categories. Using intrinsic strategies to celebrate student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

**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. Test all students in STAR and Achieve3000 Reading Q1 and Q2.
2. Meet and do comparison data.
3. Determine which students fall under more than 1 demographic category. E.g. White, Black, and disabled.
4. Plan out MYcroPaths instruction with teacher.
5. Pull data for Q3 STAR/Achieve3000 Reading, compare, make adjustments to instruction if necessary.
6. Evaluate FSA, SAT, ACT scores.

**Person Responsible**

Rachel Maldonado  
 (rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)

**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

n/a

it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Greater attention to lowest performing groups: White, Black, and ESE students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Improve federal index from 1920 to 2122 by 5%. 36.2%-->41.2%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Led by assessment coordinator during PLC: Progress monitoring in STAR quarterly Math assessments.

Progress monitoring in Fall and Spring state assessments.

Progress monitoring in Fall and Spring SAT and ACT assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rachel Maldonado

(rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

STAR Math, state assessments, SAT/ACT quarterly scores monitored and reported to all teachers during PLC. Identify target list of students by Winter Break. Teachers use PLC to support math instruction and data analysis led by assessment coordinator.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Using the data to target the correct students in the most effective FSA reporting categories will help improve the graduation rate during PLC.

**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. Test all students in STAR Math Q1 and Q2.
2. Meet and do comparison data during PLC led by assessment coordinator.
3. Determine which students fall under more than 1 demographic category. E.g. White, Black, and disabled.
4. Plan out MYcroPaths instruction with teacher.
5. Pull data for Q3 STAR Math, compare, make adjustments to instruction if necessary.
6. Evaluate FSA, SAT, ACT scores.

**Person Responsible**

Rachel Maldonado

(rachel.maldonado@duvalmycroschool.org)

**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.

n/a



## 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.

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.

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

Principal--sets up partnerships and fosters staff development around racial equity and LGBTQ+ services for students. Manages all learning plans for the school and follows up with results of the data gathered. Shares survey data during PLC and guides stakeholder planning to increase satisfactory results.

Support staff--makes sure all administrative tasks are complete and parent/student concerns are addressed with the appropriate instructional member. Keeps parents calm in the school and helps resolve disputes before they reach the teachers or Principal.

Teachers--provide thorough progress monitoring and communication regarding student achievement to parents, students, and guardians, minimizes confusion, teacher is first point of contact, uses advisory program for stakeholder satisfaction. Releases climate survey.