

Volusia County Schools

Volusia Regional Juvenile Detention



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Volusia Regional Juvenile Detention Center

3840 OLD DELAND RD, Daytona Beach, FL 32124

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/alternative-education/pages/departments-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)	Combination School KG-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)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
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
Pelletier, Rebecca	Guidance Counselor	DAC and SIP Contact
Cotto, Maggie	Teacher, K-12	Riverview contact/TEAMS contact
Kirvan, Colleen	Assistant Principal	Administrative oversight - 4 residential sites
Jenkins, Steafon	Assistant Principal	Administrative oversight - Riverview
Schervish, Michael	Assistant Principal	Administrative oversight - Highbanks
Whitmore, Logan	Administrative Support	Highbanks support
Little, Rosalind	Guidance Counselor	DOC, SMA Beach House & RAP), DJRF - Counseling services and Director
Cioffi, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	DJRF Dept Lead Ed
Williams, LaKeshia	Teacher, K-12	DOC Lead Ed
Cruz, Sheila	Teacher, K-12	SMA Lead Ed
Vaughn, Alexis	Teacher, K-12	ELEMENTARY Lead Ed
Nass, Keri Lynn	Teacher, ESE	TOA - Lead Educator

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.*

0

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.*

0

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)	Combination School KG-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)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
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	4	5	12	9	2	0	32
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	0	2	2	1	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4	1	0	17

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	3	3	4	5	1	0	16

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	1	2	5	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	7	0	0	11

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/26/2020

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	4	6	10	16	4	0	40
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	0	0	10

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	1	0	4	5	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	10	16	4	0	40
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	0	0	10

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	1	0	4	5	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	54%	61%	0%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	53%	59%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	44%	54%	0%	50%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	0%	55%	62%	0%	54%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	59%	0%	50%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	45%	52%	0%	46%	52%
Science Achievement	0%	61%	56%	0%	64%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	72%	78%	0%	75%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
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
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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

Reading and Math Proficiency data component showed the lowest performance. When looking at Early Warning Signs, Level 1 Math Assessment youth were at 17, while ELA Level 1 youth were at 15. Similarly, youth receiving failing grades in English classes were 7 and youth failing Math courses were at 6. These are two areas that our students would benefit from deeper intervention strategies.

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

The greatest decline from last year was in all aspects of ELA acquisition. Contributing factors include the chaos of 4th grading period and summer instruction. Even though we put a beautiful remote learning plan together that involved all Education faculty and staff, it posed limitations to the free exchange of communication between student and instructor. Most communication was done visually and when other forms of communication were utilized, it was under less than ideal circumstances.

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

The greatest gap between school and state averages would be in the area of Graduation Assurance. Youth do not graduate from the Detention Center; they are included in graduation rates of the zoned schools. In addition, the average youth stay is 10 calendar days, making many long-term goals inappropriate for our site.

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

Retentions in current year were in more positive numbers when compared to last year. We make purposeful effort to create credit retrieval opportunities as appropriate for educational gains.

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

Core subject knowledge in ELA and Math are areas of concern as are our students' lack of foundational skills to build on.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Math proficiency
3. Positive Student Teacher relationships
4. Productive PLCs and Progress Monitoring
5. Successful transition back to their zoned school

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our youth lack foundational Reading skills. These skill deficits create an ever widening chasm between achievement and expected levels of achievement.
Measureable Outcome:	Students in our program, for more than 20 days, will be on target to complete an ELA course with a passing grade toward credit acquisition. This will be evidenced through weekly progress monitoring, course completions and grading period grades/credits.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kym Finn (kfinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiation via scaffolding
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When looking at Hattie's model, scaffolding has a high .82 effect size. ELA proficiency not only should perform at higher rates, but there should be a greater number of course completions. Students in Alternative Education tend to lag behind all other subgroups in the areas of GPA, EOC and FSA scores, attendance and graduation rates.

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 Kym Finn (kfinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our youth lack foundational Math skills. These skill deficits create an ever widening chasm between achievement and expected levels of achievement.

Measurable Outcome: Students enrolled in our program, for 20 days or more, will be on track to complete a Math course with a passing grade. Weekly progress monitoring, course completions and grading period grades earned in Edgenuity will be on track with target dates etc.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Natalie Rooney (ndrooney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiation through scaffolding

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Math proficiency indicated low performance as well as an unacceptable gap between school and state levels. This technique has a high impact of student learning, being a .82 effect size when noting Hattie's model. Students in Alternative Education tend to lag behind all other subgroups in GPA, EOC and FSA scores, attendance and graduation rates.

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 Natalie Rooney (ndrooney@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. DJJ Components specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Graduation Assurance is an area of focus because students lack positive relationships with staff.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the graduation rate through expedited record review and maintaining relevant and accurate record keeping. Alternative Education students tend to lag behind all subgroups in GPAs, EOCs, FSA and graduation rate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rebecca Pelletier (rpelleti@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Social and Emotional Learning and Professional Development for teachers in Social Emotional Training, poverty awareness and cultural sensitivity will impact healthy communication between student and instructor. When a strong rapport is established, youth feel safe to ask questions and take risks toward academic achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students in Alternative Education lack study skills and this will improve as positive relations with adults are developed and fostered. Stronger rapport between student and instructor yields a greater opportunity for academic gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development for Instructional staff in Social Emotional Learning, Poverty Awareness and Cultural Sensitivity Training, Blended Learning and Universal Design for Learning, and effective weekly PLC meetings.
2. Emphasis on graduation assurance through credit retrieval
3. Meeting with students individually on intake to provide and credit overview and determine a motivation for learning.

Person Responsible Rebecca Pelletier (rpelleti@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.

Leadership: All instructional personnel receive in-depth training in Mental Health First Aid, how to address crisis including escalation techniques. Classroom management, addressing all aspect of affect and behavior is also offered in RULER, SEL trainings...

Culture and Climate: The needs of all youth are met via support for all exceptionalities, ESOL, 504, youth with social and emotional concerns, homeless and migrant populations. Our youth are at risk and we train and support educators to meet the needs of all unique issues as they arise.

ESSA Subgroups: We serve a diverse cross cultural sampling at our facility, especially as youth come to our site from Volusia, St. John, Putnam and Flagler counties. The educators here are experienced and well trained in techniques to overcome cultural barriers to instruction.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The Alternative Education Leadership Team functions as a Multi-Tiered Systems of Support and a natural extension of the school's Problem Solving Team (PST). The team meets regularly to engage in the following activities and training: Social Emotional Learning, RULER, Universal Design for Learning, Blended Learning and Instruction, Poverty Awareness, and Cultural Sensitivity. Additionally, the Instructional team implements a Multi-tiered System of Supports and assesses the students Response to Intervention (MTSS/RtI), and the team works in conjunction within Professional Learning Communities (PLC), with the Problem Solving Team (PST) and the ESE Behavioral Support Team (BST). Together they review the progress monitoring data at both the grade level and the classroom level to identify the students who are either meeting/exceeding expectations or those who are at-risk for not performing at least a passing level on required state standards. For those students who are identified as at-risk, a multi-tiered system of supports are put into place to address the deficits and ensure grade-level proficiency as appropriate for the student. Based on the above information, the leadership team, teachers, and SAC identify priority professional development supports for the SIP. These needs drive professional development and the allocation of resources. The team collaborates, solves challenges, shares effective practices, evaluates implementation, makes decisions, and practices new processes and skills. The team also facilitates the process of building a consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions related to this

implementation. Under Title I Part A, our schools work with outside agencies that provide specific services to identified children and their families. These organizations team with our school to provide specific services to our students, parents, and staff, including all special needs groups.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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