

Seminole County Public Schools

Scps Consequence Unit



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

Scps Consequence Unit

1151 E 28TH ST, Sanford, FL 32773

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: De IR Dre Garnes

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2016

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
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 was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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

Scps Consequence Unit

1151 E 28TH ST, Sanford, FL 32773

[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 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 was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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.

The vision of the Department of Alternative Programs is to effectively impact student achievement by providing an academically sound education, positive behavior supports, consequences and structure, and life-long learning opportunities for students to be productive members in society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The mission of the Department of Alternative Programs is to utilize school, home and community collaboration to empower students to achieve their maximum potential in academic development, personal growth, and career development while reflecting on their past, present and future, enabling them to exceed all expectations.

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
Garnes, Deirdre	Principal	Personnel Hiring/Management, SCPS Alternative Programs, SCPS Discipline Procedures, Informal Discipline Hearings, Administrative Assignments/Recommendations for Expulsion, SCPS Transition Contact for Department of Juvenile Justice youth, HOPE Scholarship Management, Safe and Drug Free Schools Initiatives, Anti Bullying Policy and Initiatives, and Discipline Data Monitoring .
Pitters, Siobhan	Assistant Principal	Teacher Observations/Evaluations, Lesson Plan Management/Review, Master Schedule, LEA for MTSS, Student Study Team and IEP/504 meetings, GED Coordination and Monitoring, Professional Development Implementation, Student Discipline, Management/Monitoring of Student Achievement Data, and Student/Enrollment/Academic Placement.

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	1	3	7	3	5	4	23
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	1	2	4	1	1	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	4

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	1	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	4	1	1	1	8	
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 8/28/2019

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%	63%	56%	0%	61%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	56%	51%	0%	53%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	43%	42%	0%	44%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	55%	51%	0%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	49%	48%	0%	49%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	45%	0%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	73%	68%	0%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	78%	73%	0%	79%	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)	1 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)	4 (0)	23 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	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)	1 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	4 (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	0%	58%	-58%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	61%	-61%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	61%	-61%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	61%	-61%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	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	0%	61%	-61%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	0%	57%	-57%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	74%	-74%	71%	-71%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	75%	-75%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	77%	-77%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	66%	-66%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	63%	-63%	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
BLK											
WHT											
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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	0
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
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

Hispanic Students	
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	0
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Data indicates that the graduation rate for the 2017-2018 cohort at Eugene Gregory Memorial Youth Academy (EGMYA) fell well beneath the minimal federal high school graduation rate of 67%. No students in 2017-2018 cohort graduated. The 2017-2018 graduation rate is consistent with the two, previous cohort graduation rates which indicated that 0% of all students graduated in both the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 cohorts. Factors contributing to this include students being reported in the incorrect cohort and poor student attendance (truancy). In addition, students who temporarily enrolled in EGMYA for behavioral/legal consequences, then subsequently failed to enter a zoned school at the conclusion of the temporary assignment.

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.

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.

EOC related components reflect greatest gap. There is no prior year data to reflect upon trends. Students are temporarily enrolled in EGMYA for behavioral/legal consequences.

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)

Course failures and retained students

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

1. Improving data related to graduation rate.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Attendance Improvement and Transition Support
Rationale	The purpose of the program at EGMYA is to support students with behavioral infractions and legal involvement. Students who begin high school as a first time 9th grader at EGMYA are then transitioned to a zoned school at the conclusion of their assignment. Many of these students, due to further legal issues and continued truancy do not enter their zoned school upon completion of their assignment to EGMYA. Therefore, EGMYA will focus on improving attendance and transition services aimed at specifically supporting students while enrolled at EGMYA and upon reentry to their zoned school.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	EGMYA will improve the current average daily student attendance from 10.28% to 50% by the conclusion of the 2019-2020 school year. EGMYA will ensure that 100% of every first time 9th grade student will enroll in either their zoned high school or their next required alternative placement upon exit.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Deirdre Garnes (deirdre_garnes@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	Seminole County Public Schools utilizes an early warning system (EdInsight) to identify at-risk students who display academic, behavioral and attendance concerns/deficiencies. EGMYA students with poor attendance have correlating low standardized test scores and low academic achievement. By using the data from the early warning system, EGMYA will be better able to identify and support students with a history of chronic absenteeism.
Action Step	
Description	<p>A. Attendance Improvement:</p> <p>Step 1 – Each first period teacher will contact the parent/guardian of every student who is absent each day to communicate the absence and assess additional needs for student support.</p> <p>Step 2- EGMYA will communicate in writing daily attendance to Juvenile Probation Officers, Seminole County Sheriff's Office Intervention Officers and others as deemed appropriate in an effort to coordinate appropriate interventions.</p> <p>B. Transition Support</p> <p>Step 1 – Every EGMYA student who is administratively assigned will receive wrap around, follow-up services from the district mental health counselor (DHMC) during the transition process and for one full semester upon re-entry to their zoned school.</p>
Person Responsible	Siobhan Pitters (siobhan_pitters@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).