Jann Mann Educational Center

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
ambitious
family and community involvement
school improvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
success
areas of focus
instruction
resources
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
growth
needs assessment

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jann Mann Educational Center

16101 NW 44TH CT, Opa Locka, FL 33054

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jamarv Dunn R

Start Date for this Principal: 8/29/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 1-12
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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: I (%)
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 Dade 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

Jann Mann Educational Center

16101 NW 44TH CT, Opa Locka, FL 33054

[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 1-12	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	2014-15	2013-14
Grade	I*	F

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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.

The mission of Jan Mann Educational Center is to provide a positive learning environment where students are motivated to learn new strategies for overcoming dysfunctional interpersonal patterns and to improve academically, socially, and vocationally so that they may, without difficulties, become productive members in an emerging global economy.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jan Mann Educational Center sees our students emerging into the world as holistic, culturally tolerant citizens who can contribute, compete and acquire the unique skills critical to becoming world class citizens in an international economy.

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
Patrice, Ramon	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principals Ms. Ramon assists the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. She ensures the fidelity of the MTSS model by monitoring and evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development to faculty needs.
Walker, Andrea	Administrative Support	As the assistant principals Ms. Walker assists the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. She ensures the fidelity of the MTSS model by monitoring and evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development to faculty needs.
Morris, Catherine	Administrative Support	As the Administrative Support, Ms. Morris Initiates requisitions for textbooks, requests for maintenance service, requests for personnel action and other support services, and compiles and maintains inventory of property and textbooks. She schedules meetings and maintains appointment calendars, prepares reports, correspondence, memoranda and other documents, and may draft responses to routine correspondence to ensure that there is a smooth operation of the school.
Odi, Olubukola	Teacher, K-12	As an instructor, Mr. Olubukola acts as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.
Floyd, Michael	Teacher, K-12	As an instructor, Mr. Floyd acts as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.
Lafaille, Eddy	Administrative Support	As an instructor, Mr. Lafaille acts as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.
Dunn, Ja Marv	Principal	As principal, Ja Marv Dunn serves as school's instructional leader. Mr. Dunn provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. He uses data to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Mr. Dunn establishes high expectations for all students and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and the appropriate Response to Intervention (RtI).

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	27	46	47	17	20	8	2	167
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	46	47	17	20	8	2	167
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	19	23	24	11	5	0	0	82
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	23	8	6	0	0	60

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	13	30	36	10	10	1	1	101

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)
20

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	27	46	47	17	20	8	2	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	46	49	16	7	1	0	156
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	39	55	16	15	0	0	135

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	33	45	35	14	10	1	0	138

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%	61%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	61%	59%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	57%	54%	0%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	67%	62%	0%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	52%	0%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	56%	0%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)												Total
	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)	27 (0)	46 (0)	47 (0)	17 (0)	20 (0)	8 (0)	2 (0)	167 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	27 ()	46 ()	47 ()	17 ()	20 ()	8 ()	2 ()	167 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	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)	19 (0)	23 (0)	24 (0)	11 (0)	5 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	82 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	20 (0)	23 (0)	8 (0)	6 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	60 (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
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
	2018	11%	54%	-43%	51%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	11%	60%	-49%	56%	-45%
	2018	3%	59%	-56%	58%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	18%	55%	-37%	55%	-37%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
10	2019	27%	53%	-26%	53%	-26%
	2018	17%	54%	-37%	53%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		27%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	3%	40%	-37%	46%	-43%
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	10%	43%	-33%	48%	-38%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	6%	65%	-59%	65%	-59%
Compare		-6%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	73%	-73%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	67%	-67%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	25%	63%	-38%	61%	-36%
2018	13%	59%	-46%	62%	-49%
Compare		12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	21%	54%	-33%	57%	-36%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Compare		21%			

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										27	
FRL										21	
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	7
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	28
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	83%
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	27
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	21
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.

An analysis of the of the 2019 FSA assessment reflects a 11% decrease in the number of students demonstrating proficiency in ELA.

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

Several factors contributed to student decline in proficiency.These factors include lack of consistent instruction for middle grades Language Arts. Another contributing factor was the high number of truant students and students who are transient.

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.

Data analysis of 2019 administration of the FSA reflects that students at Jan Mann Educational Center were at 0% proficiency, compared to a state average of 59%. Students in grades 6-8 demonstrated the lowest levels of proficiency. Students in grade 7 were 0% proficiency.

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

The greatest area of improvement was in Algebra I. Students in Algebra I were at 25% proficiency, which reflects a 12% increase over the previous year's administration. The school added an intensive math component, which allowed for remediation and enrichment opportunities.

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

When reflecting on the EWS data, one area of concern is the number of who students who had 18 or more days absent.

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

1. Increased student attendance
2. Increasing the number of students who make learning gains in ELA.
3. Increasing the number of students who make learning gains in Math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	An analysis of the 2019 student data reveals that 0% of students in Grade 7 made learning gains in reading.
Rationale	Jan Mann Opportunity has a transient student population. Students in Grade 7 enter our school at least two grade levels behind and need additional remediation to master the tested benchmarks.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our school will increase Grade 7 reading proficiency by 10%. Our overall goal will be specifically focused on increasing overall learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ja Marv Dunn (jaydunn@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students at Jan Mann Educational Center will use the following evidence-based strategies: 1. iReady 2. Common Lit 3. HMH Collections 4, Data Chats
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The Language Arts/Reading teachers will utilized the District based resources such as IReady and HMH Collections to achieve learning gains. IReady will prepare students for testing by allowing them to practice the reading benchmarks. HMH Collections, specifically, the assessments will be used to prepare students for the FSA Assessments.
Action Step	
Description	1. IReady diagnostics will be administered during 3 assessment periods. 2. Data chats will be conducted with students after the diagnostic period to create a remediation plan 3. The Instructional Leadership Team will participate in monthly meetings to review student data and evaluat progress. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Ja Marv Dunn (jaydunn@dadeschools.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).

A primary area of focus for leadership at Jan Mann Educational Center is truancy. This area is considered one of the largest barriers to student achievement. The School Leadership Team(SLT) will meet weekly to review student attendance data and monitor the attendance plan being implemented through the Student Services Department.

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.

As an alternative setting, students are given the opportunity to meet with guidance counselors and school social workers during the initial registration process. Parents and students are given the chance to share any information they believe is pertinent in successfully understanding the diverse needs of their students, which may include cultural backgrounds, language barriers, etc. In this way, classroom teachers are able to create an atmosphere where all students feel included and are comfortable with their learning environment.

Jann Mann Educational Center has developed several partnerships throughput the community to support its vision and mission. One of the partnerships created has been with Florida Memorial University(FMU), which borders the school on the south side. Among the many things developed through this partnership, the school has worked with student interns, developed mentorship programs, had faculty members from FMU participate in the school advisory committee and participated in FMU's teacher recruitment program. The school has also developed partnerships with local churches and business, all with the goal of encouraging student achievement.

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.

The Student Services department, along with the leadership team analyze attendance and suspension data, as well as referral data to offer support to families and students at Jan Mann Educational Center. Further, the Student Services Department meets with the administrative team weekly to review student issues as it relates to student behavior, attendance and suspensions. The MTSS team meetings are scheduled for those students who fall in the Tier 3 category for behavior and academics. Families who feel they need extended services are also given information/referrals for outside agencies.

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

Jann Mann Educational Center is an alternative education center for grades 6-12 . As a result, students are assigned to us administratively through the district Office of Alternative Education, the student population is fluid and is not subjected to the articulation process. With this in mind, every effort is made to assist students with their transition back to a traditional school setting when they have been approved to exit our program.

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.

The school leadership team uses a multifaceted process to identify and align resources to meet the needs of students. The team collaborates regarding decisions impacting student performance. Adjustments are made as necessary. The Principal has ultimate responsibility for all budgetary decisions, but input from the members of the leadership team is sought and valued. The assistant principal has been assigned to monitor the property control inventory including instructional materials and technology resources to ensure they are allocated
to maximize student performance. Most personnel are funded through state and local funds. Nutrition Program funds help provide free breakfast to all students school-based students and free or reduced lunch to qualifying students.

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

The goal of Jann Mann Educational Center is to reinforce good choices academically and socially and provide students with those skills which will help them to become productive members of society. Student services members, in conjunction with the classroom teachers, work with students to insure completion of the electronic Portfolio Educational Plan (ePEP), reviewing career goals and programs of study as part of the career planning process. All applied technology courses include career planning components. Students meet individually with their assigned guidance counselor for articulation/subject selection; however, due to the size of the school, course offerings are limited. Because students are placed at Jann Mann Education for a short period of time and then returned to their home school, the counselor also addresses student course selections at their home schools as well courses offered through adult education and virtual school. Additionally, our career academy focuses on developing specific career job training skills and seeks to offer internship opportunities.