Daytona Juvenile Residential Facility

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Daytona Juvenile Residential Facility

1386 INDIAN LAKE RD, Daytona Beach, FL 32124

http://myvolusiaschools.org/alternative-education/pages/department-of-juvenile-justice-sites.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Dale Johns

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
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	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Volusia 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

We believe that all students should be provided an opportunity for educational success. Therefore, our mission is to assist in developing independent skills in students that promote graduation assurance through a structured alternative program during an unintentional break in the traditional school environment.
Alternative Education Strategies Include: Differentiated Instruction, Developing Individual Skills, Advocate Appropriately, Social Skills, Behavior Modification, Cornell Note-Taking, One Binder System, Goal Setting/Progress Monitoring, and Gradual Release Model

Provide the school's vision statement

Our greatest contribution is to be sure that there is a teacher in every classroom who cares that every student, every day, learns, grows and feels like a human being; they don't care until they know we care.

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
Johns, Dale	Principal	Administrative oversight - all 6 sites
Plummer, Michael	Teacher, Career/Technical	Technology input/TEAMs contact
Cotto, Maggie	Teacher, K-12	Riverview contact / TEAMS contact
Kirvan, Colleen	Assistant Principal	Administrative oversight - 4 residential sites
Pelletier, Rebecca	Guidance Counselor	DAC and SIP contact
Jenkins, Steafon	Assistant Principal	Administrative oversight - Highbanks
Whitmore, Logan	Administrative Support	Riverview support
Schervish, Michael	Assistant Principal	Administrative oversight - SIP contact
Little, Rosalind	Guidance Counselor	
Cioffi, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	
Cruz, Sheila	Teacher, K-12	
Nass, Keri Lynn	Teacher, ESE	
Vaughn, Alexis	Teacher, K-12	
Williams, LaKeshia	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Dale Johns

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
6

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
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	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	11	4	1	25
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2

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	

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	3	4	4	2	0	13
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

Tuesday 8/25/2020

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	0	2	2	7	7	4	2	24
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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	1	0	4	1	3	2	11

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	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	7	4	2	24
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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	1	0	4	1	3	2	11

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	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	52%	56%	0%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	49%	51%	0%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	37%	42%	0%	37%	44%
Math Achievement	0%	48%	51%	0%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	0%	49%	48%	0%	50%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	38%	45%	0%	44%	45%
Science Achievement	0%	76%	68%	0%	71%	67%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	0%	69%	73%	0%	66%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**							**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

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 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)	
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 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

Math Proficiency/ ELA Proficiency.
Students demonstrate a lack of foundation in math and reading skills.
Students to staff/adult relationships need improvement.
Student goal setting skills need to be focused and developed.

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

Graduation Assurance- through credit retrieval.
Students in Alternative education tend to lag behind all other subgroups in GPA, EOC's, FSA, and Graduation rate.
Students in Alternative education also demonstrate a lack of remediation of foundation skills in math and reading.

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

Math Proficiency.
Students demonstrate a lack of foundation in math and reading skills.
Students to staff/adult relationships need improvement.
Student goal setting skills need to be focused and developed.
Students in Alternative education tend to lag behind all other subgroups in GPA, EOC's, FSA, and Graduation rate.

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

Science proficiency.
Continued use of the new educational program, edgenuity, course completions.
Professional development of instructors and staff, reading interventions, social-emotional training, PLC and progress monitoring tools

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

Course completion, remediation, Student goal setting, and professional training of teachers in social/emotional struggles of the students.

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

1. Math/ELA Proficiency
2. Productive PLC's
3. Positive Teacher/student relationships
4. Increase in course completions/ graduation assurance through credit retrieval
5. successful transition back to zone school, increase in graduation assurance rate

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Math Proficiency	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students lack foundation in mathematics reading skills. Students are not on track when they come to our programs; if they are, we must maintain their progress.
Measureable Outcome:	students in our program for more that 20 days will be on track to complete courses with a 70% proficiency or higher. weekly progress monitoring, course completions/quarterly grades, and on target with target date in edgenuity will be reviewed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joseph Cioffi (jmcioffi@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiation through scaffolding
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	scaffolding has a .82 effect size (hattie). the Math proficiency not only showed low performance, but also demonstrates a decline from mathematics components that are part of the proficiency gap when compared to the state average. this data component showed the lowest performance according to the last years indicators. students in alternative ed. tend to lag behind all other subgroups in GPA, eoc's, fsa, and graduation rate.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assess individual student needs
2. Provide supplementary resources
3. Progress monitoring/Edgenuity
4. Teacher/Student ratio (small group; 1:1)
5. Provide emotional /behavioral supports
6. Guided notes
7. Gradual release
8. Break tasks down into small steps
9. Professional Development for Instructional staff in Social-Emotional Training, Blended Learning, and Effective PLC's. In order to foster better student - teacher relationships
10. Emphasis on graduation assurance through credit retrieval
11. Remediation of Foundational skills in Math and Reading

Person Responsible	Joseph Cioffi (jmcioffi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Other specifically relating to ELA proficiency	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students Lack foundation in Reading Skills. Students are not on track when they come to our programs; if they are, we must maintain their progress.
Measureable Outcome:	Students in our program for more than 20 days will be on track to complete course with 70% proficiency. Weekly progress monitoring, course completions/quarterly grades, on target with target date in Edgenuity.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine (CJ) Allen (cjallen@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiation through scaffolding
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Scaffolding has a .82 effect size (Hattie). The ELA proficiency not only showed low performance, but also nearly the greatest decline from the prior year, and the ELA component had Nearly the greatest gap when compared to the state average. This Data component showed the lowest performance according to last years EWS indicators. Students in Alternative Ed. tend to Lag behind all other subgroups in GPA, EOC's, FSA, attendance and graduation rate.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assess individual student needs
2. Provide supplementary resources
3. Progress monitoring/Edgenuity
4. Teacher/Student ratio (small group; 1:1)
5. Provide emotional /behavioral supports
6. Guided notes
7. Gradual release
8. Break tasks down into small steps
9. Professional Development for Instructional staff in Social-Emotional Training, Blended Learning, and Effective PLC's. In order to foster better student - teacher relationships
10. Emphasis on graduation assurance through credit retrieval
11. Remediation of Foundational skills in Math and Reading

Person Responsible	Christine (CJ) Allen (cjallen@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Other specifically relating to Graduation Assurance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students lack study skills, confidence, and motivation. Students lack positive relationships with staff.
Measureable Outcome:	Increase graduation rate through increased program completion. Students in our program for more than 20 days will be on track to complete course with 70% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rosalind Little (ralittle@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Development for teachers in Social Emotional Training, Blended learning, poverty awareness and cultural sensitivity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Social Emotional learning

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development for Instructional staff in Social-
Emotional Training, Blended Learning, and Effective PLC's. In order
to foster better student - teacher relationships
2. Emphasis on graduation assurance through credit retrieval
3. Remediation of Foundational skills in Math and Reading
4. Weekly Goal setting strategies one on one with teacher/student

Person Responsible	Rosalind Little (ralittle@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

.

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.

At our site, we involve all stakeholders. However, there are very few instances where we work with parents. Most of our interactions are with the program personnel. We are a team that works closely together with our buildings staff to enable student success. Educators and staff personal attend meetings and treatment team meetings with program and the betterment of students. Additionally, program personnel are all involved in school activities and meetings.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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