

Seminole County Public Schools

Journeys Academy



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	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Journeys Academy

1722 W AIRPORT BLVD, Sanford, FL 32771

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michael Showalter

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-12
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)	86%
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	CS&I
* 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 Seminole 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	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Journeys Academy

1722 W AIRPORT BLVD, Sanford, FL 32771

[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)
Combination School 4-12	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 Seminole 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.

Journeys Academy will effectively impact student achievement and personal growth by providing an academically sound education, positive behavior supports, opportunities and structure.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The individualized needs of our students are at the forefront of every decision we make, every word we say, and every action we take.

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
Bevan, Kenny	Principal	Academic leader and manager of all school operations.
Benjamin, Kawanya	Assistant Principal	Assistant academic leader and manager of all school operations.
Sanks, Twyla	School Counselor	Scheduling, testing, group and individual student counseling.
Tillman-Sparrow, Hope	Other	Student discipline and assistant manager of school operations.
Godshalk, Tami	Administrative Support	Student registration, confidential management of school information.

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	1	17	22	12	23	3	4	82	
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	3	0	1	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	7	0	1	25	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	9	4	6	0	1	33	

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	1	4	1	4	0	1	12

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	7	5	5	6	1	0	24	
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)

11

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

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%	77%	61%	0%	83%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	65%	59%	0%	70%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	62%	54%	0%	63%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	81%	62%	0%	75%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	69%	59%	0%	65%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	67%	52%	0%	62%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	76%	56%	0%	78%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	86%	78%	0%	86%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	17 (0)	22 (0)	12 (0)	23 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	82 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	25 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	12 (0)	9 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	33 (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
04	2019					
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2019	0%	64%	-64%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	7%	60%	-53%	54%	-47%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
07	2019	8%	58%	-50%	52%	-44%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	9%	61%	-52%	56%	-47%
	2018	15%	63%	-48%	58%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
09	2019	25%	61%	-36%	55%	-30%
	2018	22%	60%	-38%	53%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
10	2019	0%	61%	-61%	53%	-53%
	2018	23%	60%	-37%	53%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2019					
	2018	0%	69%	-69%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2019	0%	65%	-65%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	66%	-66%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	65%	-65%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	13%	61%	-48%	54%	-41%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	18%	32%	-14%	46%	-28%
	2018	9%	46%	-37%	45%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	62%	-62%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	64%	-64%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	25%	57%	-32%	48%	-23%
	2018	7%	58%	-51%	50%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%
2018	8%	72%	-64%	65%	-57%
Compare		-8%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	5%	72%	-67%	71%	-66%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	19%	77%	-58%	68%	-49%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	14%	61%	-47%	61%	-47%
2018	12%	66%	-54%	62%	-50%
Compare		2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	64%	-64%	57%	-57%
2018	13%	63%	-50%	56%	-43%
Compare		-13%			

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
BLK											
FRL											
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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	0
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	0
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	0
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Journeys Academy Federal Percent of Points Index reflects deficiencies in the graduation rate of African American and Economically Disadvantaged students. As an alternative center that is focused on supporting at risk students via temporary placement, Journeys Academy does not graduate students. The graduation rate associated with Journeys Academy reflects students who exit their placement and do not return to their zoned school.

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

N/A - no prior year data available.

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 - no prior year data available.

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

N/A - no prior year data available.

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

Retained and non proficient students

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

1. Transition success
2. Focus on Social Emotional Learning
3. Monitoring at risk students
4. Review of environmental data
5. Utilization of PLCs

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Transition success and focus on social emotional learning
Rationale	As an alternative center with short term placement, Journeys Academy is focused on supporting students social emotional learning and decision making and preparing students to be successful when returning to their zoned school.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increasing the number of students who successfully transition from Journeys Academy who then earn a high school diploma.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kenny Bevan (kenny_bevan@scps.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research indicates utilization of early warning system to identify at-risk students to determine needed supports increases their likelihood for future academic success and graduation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Journeys Academy will use the SCPS early warning system to identify students who are at risk academically and behaviorally display academic, and support students to make positive decisions and meet with academic success.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identifying students who are not being successful at school for academic or behavioral reasons. A concerted effort towards increasing composite proficiency levels of ELLs or remaining at a composite score of 4, 5, or 6. 2. Develop and maintain a "point system" approach to reinforce positive behaviors in the middle and high school. 3. Implementing a tiered, behavioral leveled system which focuses on recognition of positive behaviors instead of adverse behaviors. 4. Administrators and teachers at Journeys Academy will implement Restorative Practices, a philosophy of guiding principles (not a program or specific activity) that sees relationships as central to learning, growth and a healthy school climate for students and adults. 5. Have scheduled career training opportunities for students to be trained and motivated to stay focused on their academic progression.
Person Responsible	Kenny Bevan (kenny_bevan@scps.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).

N/A