Stewart Treatment Center

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Stewart Treatment Center

3875 TIGER BAY RD, Daytona Beach, FL 32124

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

Demographics

Principal: Patricia Corr

Start Date for this Principal: 9/11/2019

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
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	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
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.](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

Stewart Treatment Center

3875 TIGER BAY RD, Daytona Beach, FL 32124

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

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)
Combination School KG-12	No	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

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 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.

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 and position title 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 contact / TEAMS contact
Cotto, Maggie	Teacher, K-12	Riverview contact / TEAMS contact
Schervish, Michael	Assistant Principal	Administrative overight - SIP contact
Kirvan, Colleen	Assistant Principal	Adminstrative Support
Pelletier, Rebecca	School Counselor	DAC and SIP contact
Midgette, Tim	Teacher, ESE	DJRF contact
Jenkins, Steafon	Assistant Principal	Administrative oversight - Highbanks
Whitmore, Logan	Administrative Support	Riverview support
Jennison, Heidi	Instructional Coach	Riverview and Highbanks teacher support

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	2	3	7	7	4	2	25
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	1	0	1	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	6

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	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	6

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	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
3

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 9/11/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	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	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	

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%	55%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	53%	59%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	44%	54%	0%	43%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	55%	62%	0%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	59%	0%	52%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	45%	52%	0%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	61%	56%	0%	56%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	72%	78%	0%	75%	75%

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	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	7 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	25 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	3 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	10 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	6 (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.

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
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	50%	-50%	54%	-54%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	47%	-47%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	50%	-50%	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
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	0%	47%	-47%	54%	-54%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	29%	-29%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	37%	-37%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	57%	-57%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	72%	-72%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	65%	-65%
Compare	0%				

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	66%	-66%	71%	-71%
Compare	0%				

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	63%	-63%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	68%	-68%
Compare	0%				

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	61%	-61%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	57%	-57%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	55%	-55%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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
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
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

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 lack foundation in math and reading skills, along with attendance issues , students lack positive relationships with staff and adults in general. Students lack Goal Setting Skills

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 ED. tend to lag behind all other subgroups in GPA, EOC's, FSA, attendance and graduation rate. Lack of remediation of foundational 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 lack foundation in math and reading skills, along with attendance issues , students lack positive relationships with staff and adults in general.
Students in Alternative ED. 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.
New educational program, Edgenuity, course completions.
Professional development for 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? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance, course completion and remediation.
student goal setting.
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. M,ATH/ELA PROFICIENCY - Best practices in the classroom remediation of Math and Reading skills
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	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	Students Lack foundation in Math Skills. Students are not on track when they come to our programs; if they are, we must maintain their progress.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	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	Sheila Cruz (skcruz@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 Step	
Description	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	Sheila Cruz (skcruz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	Rational 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.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	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	Sheila Cruz (skcruz@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 Step	
Description	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	Sheila Cruz (skcruz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Graduation Assurance
Rationale	Students lack positive relationships with staff, students have attendance issues,
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	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	Sheila Cruz (skcruz@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Professional Development for teachers in Social Emotional Training
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students lack foundation reading, math, and social skills, students lack positive relationships with staff,, students have attendance issues.
Action Step	
Description	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	Sheila Cruz (skcruz@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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).

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.

Please reference our comprehensive Parent Involvement Plans

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.

Teachers, counselors, and administrators work together to assist youth. Regular academic counseling is provided with additional access upon request.

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

The Alternative Education School Counselor provides a systematic approach to place students returning to district schools at all sites where the student is enrolled long term (one quarter or more) to communicate academic and behavioral growth in the program. Most of the transitional information is exchanged through the use of email and student CrossPointe files. However, sending schools are invited to reach out to their student through a teacher to teacher exchange as well.

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.

The Alternative Education Leadership Team functions as a Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and a natural extension of the school's Problem Solving Team (PST). The school's leadership team will focus on PS/RtI meetings around two PLC Essential Questions: 1) "How do will we respond when they have not learned it?" and 2) "How do will we respond when they already know it?" The team meets regularly to engage in the following activities: Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; monitor and document the rate of academic and behavioral growth of all students; make adjustments in instructional techniques and provide extensive interventions, differentiated instruction, modified blended/ digital learning for all students in the classroom through whole and small-group settings, established in addition to school-wide screening schedule, such as review of reading pre-post assessments) and math data, minimally three times per year to identify each student's level of proficiency; document interventions and measured growth in the Academic Improvement Plan (AIP) and/or the Behavioral Intervention Plan (BIP) and identify students who continue to fall below expectations on critical measures of performance for additional supports. The MTSS/RtI team works in conjunction with the Professional Learning Communities (PLC), the Problem Solving Team (PST) and the ESE Behavioral Support Team (BST), review progress monitoring data at the grade level and the classroom level to identify students who are either meeting/exceeding expectations or those who are at risk for not performing at least proficient on required standards. 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 students, parents, and staff, including all special needs groups.

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

Each individual site school counselor meets with students to review graduation requirements and develop a course of student designed to meet the individual needs of the student future goals. Educational counseling sessions are based upon the goals of the student developing a plan A, B, or C.

Graduating seniors and students seeking alternate exit options are encouraged to explore programs providing a course of study in their desired field/area. Pros and cons of the various program focus on the realities of cost, distance, and requirements. Students are enabled to make a consumer decision and applications processes in place for articulation.