Lee County Jail

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lee County Jail

2266 2ND ST, Fort Myers, FL 33901

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: James Buchanon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-Adult
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)	0%
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

Lee County Jail

2266 2ND ST, Fort Myers, FL 33901

[no web address on file]

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 7-Adult	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.

Lee County Jail is committed to providing an education that allows each student
to reach his/her highest potential

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lee County Jail'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
Henderson, Harriett	School Counselor	Supports teachers and students to ensure academic progress.
Portier, Zaida	Administrative Support	Support administration.
Thompson, Mary	Instructional Coach	Monitoring students progress

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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)

1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/24/2019

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
	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 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
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**
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
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 enrolled in Lee County Jail attend school for 1 day to 9 months, they have an option to attend school, the majority of the students are level 1 and have a disability. The data does indicate a need to examine the impact Sheriff's policy to allow the student to make the decision to attend school and the impact this decision have on 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	Student Attendance
Rationale	Students attendance is impacted by their choice to receive educational services and by the Lee County Sheriffs department established medical and disciplinary lock down policy.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students will attend school a minimum of four hours per week.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Collaborating with Sheriff's staff to allow students having elected to receive educational services, attend classes a minimum of four hours per week.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Collaborate with the Lee County Sheriff's department and with instructors to implement different strategies for behavior challenged students in order to attend a minimum of four hours of academic time per week.
Action Step	
Description	1. Meet with Sheriff's representative to work out a plan for attendance. 2. Provide allowable incentives to students to increase attendance desire 3. Plan will be monitored every 45 days 4. 5.
Person Responsible	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

#2	
Title	Social and Emotional Learning
Rationale	Students are placed on disciplinary lock down due to inappropriate behavior.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Reduce the number of students placed on disciplinary lock down by 50% by the end of SY '19-'20.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Work with Sheriff's staff and the instructors to work with students on improving their behavior.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Develop a behavioral intervention plan.
Action Step	
Description	1. Train instructors and sheriff's staff in SEL. 2. Provide an engaging learning environment 3. Monitor student's attendance report every 45 days 4. Implement and monitor the behavioral intervention plan 5.
Person Responsible	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

#3	
Title	Students Reading Level
Rationale	The majority of students enrolling at the Lee Count Jail are below 2 or more grade levels in Reading. Their cohorts have graduated.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of SY '19-'20, Level 1 and 2 students shall gain the same average amount or more percentile points on STAR as their grade level 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 1.08
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Tutoring small group and differentiated instruction. Incorporating regular reading fluency check points. Encourage independent reading for pleasure. Teachers to implement 3 of Hattie's high yielding strategies for professional development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The majority of the students are below proficient in Reading
Action Step	
Description	1. Administer STAR assessment regularly 2. Incorporate reading and writing strategies in all instructional areas 3. Provide constructive feedback monitored every 45 days 4. Train teachers on Hattie's high yielding strategies 5. Provide various leveled, high interest reading texts
Person Responsible	James Buchanon (jameslb@leeschools.net)

#4	
Title	Proficient Students
Rationale	Although the 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 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 Provide rigorous materials at various levels Small group or possible individual one on one tutoring
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure students stay with current group level
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide professional development on differentiated instruction techniques 2. Monitor instruction and provide coaching 3. Provide opportunity for instructors collaboration via PLCs 4. Introduce 3 of Hattie's high yielding strategies 5. Monitor every 45 days via formative and STAR
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 by June 2020. Last year, the average percentile gain for current Level 1 seventh graders was 1.17; eight graders was .23; ninth graders was .32 and tenth graders was .16. The average percentile gain for Level 2 seventh graders was 1.78; eight graders was .97; 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, and small and large group instruction. Provide professional development in Mathematical strategies and curriculum resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The majority of the students are below proficient in Math

Action Step	
Description	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 an action plan 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

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.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Attendance				$350.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	590-Other Materials and Supplies	0667 - Lee County Jail	School Improvement Funds	0.01	$350.00
			Notes: Supplies as needed for school improvement			
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