

The School District of Lee County

Southwest Florida Juvenile Detention Center



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Southwest Florida Juvenile Detention Center

2525 ORTIZ AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33905

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

Demographics

Principal: James Buchanan

Start Date for this Principal: 7/17/2019

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)	32%
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	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 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.

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

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

Southwest Florida Juvenile Detention Center

2525 ORTIZ AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33905

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

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)
High School 6-12	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 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.

Southwest Florida Regional Detention Center is committed to providing an education that allows each student to reach his/her highest potential.)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Southwest Florida Regional Detention 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.
Baskins, Joyce	Instructional Coach	Monitoring students progress
Eidem, Marion	Instructional Coach	Monitoring students progress
Thompson, Mary	Instructional Coach	Monitor students progress
Portier, Zaida	Administrative Support	Support administration.
Henderson, Harriett	School Counselor	Supports teachers and students to ensure academic progress.

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	
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	

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)

4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/17/2019

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	
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	

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%	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)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (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.

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					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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 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.

Students attending Southwest Florida Regional Detention Center are enrolled in school for 15 school days or less, they are required to attend school and the majority of students are level 1. The data does indicate a need to examine the impact of teachers' attendance and students' academic performance as compared to students enrolled in public schools.

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

This will be the first year in measuring the percentile gains of students in each level, each sub group and instructional attendance.

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. Meet with instructional coaches
2. Review the data
3. Identify the students needing assistance
4. Design an individual plan for the students
5. Set aside time for students to receive the individual instructions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Instructor attendance
Rationale	During SY' 18-'19 the instructors were absent an average of 20 days excluding in-service and professional development. The average is 23 days if you include in-service and professional development training.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase the amount of certified instructor contact time with students from 213 days to 225 days by the end of June 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Negotiate with Teachers Association of Lee County and provide instructors with documented research on the impact of instructors absenteeism on the academic advancement of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Instructors absenteeism will be monitored every 5 days via People Soft and individual meetings will be monitored every 45 days.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet with instructors to go over absenteeism 2. Review the data 3. Identify staff absenteeism 4. Design an individual plan for staff attendance 5. Provide incentives for perfect attendance
Person Responsible	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

#2	
Title	Social and Emotional Learning
Rationale	At least one student per period is removed from the academic setting due to perceived behavioral disruption.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease the number of students assigned teachers' generated lock down from 4 per day to 1 per day as measured by DJJ log, by June 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Harriett Henderson (harriettthe@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide Professional Development for all instructors in the area of Social and Emotional Learning. Implement Social and Emotional Learning curriculum in Keyboard class. Provide students' incentives in the form of recognition of success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring will occur bi-weekly via DJJ D-Cell log.
Action Step	
Description	1. Team training with instructors on social emotional curriculum 2. Develop a behavioral intervention plan to modify behaviors 3. Monthly incentive program with behavioral goals 4. 5.
Person Responsible	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

#3	
Title	Students Reading Level
Rationale	The majority of students enrolling at Southwest Florida Regional Detention Center are reading 2 or more grade levels below their cohorts.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	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 .084; 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 1.10.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	All instructors teach reading and writing strategies Provide constructive feedback/coaching Implement 3 of Hattie's effective high yielding strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress Monitoring will be conducted every 45 days via STAR
Action Step	
Description	1. Administer STAR assessment. 2. Review lesson plans and provide feedback for engaging activities 3. Provide summative assessment to progress monitor 4. 5.
Person Responsible	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

#4	
Title	Proficient Students
Rationale	Although majority of students are Level 1 and 2, Level 3, 4 and 5 students attending need challenging activities provided to continue learning gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Level 3 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 seventh graders was .49; eighth graders was .88; ninth graders was .49 and tenth graders was 1.05.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide opportunities for differentiated instruction within instruction Provide rigorous materials at various levels
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring will be conducted every 45 days via STAR and formatives every 30 days.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor instruction 2. Provide opportunity for instructors collaboration via PLCs 3. Professional development in differentiated instruction techniques 4. Provide coaching based on classroom observations 5.
Person Responsible	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

#5	
Title	Math Levels
Rationale	The majority of students are below grade level for math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	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.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide coaching to assist with tutoring, modeling, small and large group instruction. Provide professional development in Mathematical strategies and curriculum resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring will be every 45 days via STAR assessment. Formative assessment every 30 days.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide opportunity for instructors collaboration via PLCs 2. Monitor instruction via lesson plans review and observations 3. Review data from progress monitoring and develop action plans in PLCs 4. 5.
Person Responsible	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

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructor attendance				\$350.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	590-Other Materials and Supplies	0661 - Southwest Florida Juvenile Detention Center	School Improvement Funds	0.01	\$350.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Social and Emotional Learning				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students Reading Level				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Proficient Students				\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Levels				\$0.00
Total:						\$350.00