

The School District of Lee County

# Sw FI Addiction Services The Vince Smith Center



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# Sw FI Addiction Services The Vince Smith Center

2450 PRINCE ST, Ft Myers, FL 33916

<http://www.leeschools.net/juvenilejustice>

## Demographics

**Principal: James Buchanon**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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 Lee 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](http://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**

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# Sw FI Addiction Services The Vince Smith Center

2450 PRINCE ST, Ft Myers, FL 33916

<http://www.leeschools.net/juvenilejustice>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 6-12</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternative Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p>

## School Grades History

Year  
Grade

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.**

Vince Smith Center is committed to providing an education that allows each student to reach his/her highest potential.

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

Vince Smith Center's vision is to provide students a quality and comprehensive education that will assist them in their quest to become productive members of our society.

### 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
Buchanon, James	Principal	Monitor school's programs and progress.
Henderson, Harriett	School Counselor	Supports teachers and students to ensure academic progress.
Portier, Zaida	Administrative Support	Support administration.
Lee, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	Monitor students progress
Negron, Edwin	Instructional Technology	Technical 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	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
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	8	0	14

**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	5	0	5

**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

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

1

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

Thursday 7/25/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	8	0	14

**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	5	0	5

**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	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	8	0	14

**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	5	0	5

**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%	55%	56%	0%	53%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	49%	51%	0%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	37%	42%	0%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	50%	51%	0%	41%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	45%	48%	0%	34%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	43%	45%	0%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	62%	68%	0%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	67%	73%	0%	63%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	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 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (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 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (5)	0 (0)	5 (5)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	2 (2)	3 (3)	8 (8)	0 (0)	14 (14)

**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
06	2019					
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
	2018					



ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	57%	-57%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	0%	61%	-61%	65%	-65%

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	0%	62%	-62%	68%	-68%
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	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%

**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	

ESSA Federal Index	
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.**

EOC/FSA Reading and Math.

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

n/a

**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.**

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

1. Moving level ones to level two in ELA
2. Moving level ones to level two in Math
3. Increasing number of students scoring level 3 in FSA/EOC to 40%
- 4.
- 5.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Instructor attendance
<b>Rationale</b>	During the SY '18-'19, the instructional staff were absent an average of 13 days, excluding in-service and professional development. The average is 15 days if you include in-service and professional development training.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	To maintain the amount of certified instructors contact with students from 215 days to 240 days by the end of June 2020.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Negotiate with Teacher Association of Lee County and provide instructors with documented research on the impact of instructors absenteeism on the academic advancement of students.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Instructor absenteeism will be monitored every 5 days via People Soft and individual meetings will be monitored every 45 days.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meet with instructors to go over absenteeism</li> <li>2. Review the data</li> <li>3. Identify areas or reasons for absenteeism</li> <li>4. Design an individual employee's plan to improve attendance</li> <li>5. Provide incentives for perfect attendance</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Social and Emotional Learning
<b>Rationale</b>	Students who arrive at the Vince Smith Campus who are under-performing tend to lack motivation to continue with their education and often view the academic component of the program as a waste of their time.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase the number of students earning credits from 60% to 80% by June 2020.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Theresa Lee (theresaal@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students goal setting for completion of assignments. Teachers and students will conference weekly regarding academic progress.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students engage and begin to value the educational opportunities provided.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monitor student progress through the STAR assessment.</li> <li>2. Students completion of assignment to be monitored bi-weekly.</li> <li>3. Administration walk throughs to observe student engagement.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Students's Reading Levels
<b>Rationale</b>	In Reading, some students are two or more grade levels below their cohorts.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Level 1 and 2 students shall gain the same average amount or more percentile points on STAR as their grade level cohorts by June 2020. Last year, the average percentile gain for current Level 1 seventh graders was .84; eighth graders was 1.21; ninth graders was .12 and tenth graders was .71. The average percentile gain for Level 2 seventh graders was .75; eighth graders was .97; ninth graders was .44 and tenth graders was 1.2
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	All instructors teach reading and writing strategies. Provide constructive feedback/coaching. Implement three of Hattie's effective high yielding strategies.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The plan is to monitor every 30 days via formatives and every 45 day via STAR.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Administer STAR assessment</li> <li>2. Review lesson plans and feedback for engaging activities</li> <li>3. The instructor will implement 3 of Hattie's high yielding strategies</li> <li>4. The instructor will follow the District's Instructional Guide</li> <li>5. The instructor and teacher's assistant need to scaffold and support students performing below their current grade level through teaching reading strategies and one-to-one intervention.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

<b>#4</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math Levels
<b>Rationale</b>	In Math, some/most of the students performing are two or more grade levels below their current grade-level.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Level 1 and 2 students shall gain the same average amount or more percentile points on STAR as their grade level cohorts by June 2020. Last year, the average percentile gain for current Level 1 seventh graders was 1.17; eighth graders was .25; ninth graders was .32 and tenth graders was .16. The average percentile gain for Level 2 seventh graders was 1.78; eighth graders was .99; ninth graders was -.06 and tenth graders was .30
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Theresa Lee (theresaal@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Provide coaching to assist with tutoring, modeling, small and large group instruction. Provide professional development in mathematical strategies and curriculum resources.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Monitored every 30 days via formative Monitored every 45 days via STAR
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide opportunity for instructor collaboration in PLCs</li> <li>2. Monitor instruction via lesson plans and observations</li> <li>3. Review data from progress monitoring</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Theresa Lee (theresaal@leeschools.net)

<b>#5</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Proficient Math Levels
<b>Rationale</b>	The majority of the students who are proficient or above in FSA-Math and/or EOCs Algebra 1 / Geometry struggle to maintain their proficiency.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Level 3 and above students shall gain the same average amount or more percentile points on STAR as their grade level cohorts by June 2020. Last year, the average percentile gain for current Level 3 and above seventh graders was .49; eight graders was .88; ninth graders was .49 and tenth graders was 1.05.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Provide opportunities for differentiated instruction. Provide rigorous materials at various levels. Small group or possible individual one on one tutoring.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Ensure students stay with current group level
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide professional development on differentiated instruction techniques</li> <li>2. Monitor instruction and provide coaching</li> <li>3. Provide opportunity for instructors collaboration via PLCs</li> <li>4. Introduce 3 of Hattie's High yielding strategies</li> <li>5. Monitor every 45 days via formative and STAR</li> <li>6. Summative every 60 day</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

**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.**

N/A

**PFEP Link**



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

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

**Part V: Budget**

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructor attendance</b>				<b>\$350.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0682 - Sw FI Addiction Services The Vince Smith Cntr	School Improvement Funds	0.01	\$350.00
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Social and Emotional Learning</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Students's Reading Levels</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Math Levels</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Proficient Math Levels</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$350.00</b>