Brevard Public Schools

Devereux Hospital

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Devereux Hospital

8000 DEVEREUX DR, Viera, FL 32940

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Mary Bland M

Start Date for this Principal: 9/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: 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 Brevard 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

Devereux Hospital

8000 DEVEREUX DR, Viera, FL 32940

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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.

Devereux Advanced Behavioral Health changes lives – by unlocking and nurturing human potential for people living with emotional, behavioral or cognitive differences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Devereux School vision is to encourage, educate and empower students so that they leave with the skill set to be successful in their next environment.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kenney, Pamela	Principal	Oversee all aspects of the educational program including supervision of teachers, curriculum, discipline, budget, etc.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 9/1/2020, Mary Bland M

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	No

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: 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](#).	

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	1	2	2	1	6	9	13	6	7	1	48
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/16/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	2	2	4	1	6	6	7	8	6	1	43
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	1	1	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4	4	5	0	0	21

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	1	1	0	0	0	2

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	1	1	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	2	2	4	1	6	6	7	8	6	1	43
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	1	1	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4	4	5	0	0	21

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	1	1	0	0	0	2

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	1	1	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	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%	65%	61%	0%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	54%	0%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	67%	62%	0%	63%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	62%	59%	0%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	59%	52%	0%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	62%	56%	0%	62%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	82%	75%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey													
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**													**Total**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	64%	-64%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	61%	-61%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	60%	-60%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	58%	-58%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	63%	-63%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	65%	-65%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	62%	-62%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	59%	-59%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	64%	-64%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	61%	-61%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	67%	-67%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	68%	-68%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	43%	-43%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019					
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	53%	-53%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	74%	-74%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	73%	-73%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	70%	-70%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	60%	-60%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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
SWD	22	50		15							
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	29
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	87
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

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

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 with disabilities. It's impossible to compare one school year to another as the student population changes and the data is not reflective of the same students.

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

There is no data available for the previous year.

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.

There is no data due to not meeting the minimum requirement of students tested per grade level.

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

There is no comparison data to review.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Students enroll in the Devereux School following significant and traumatic histories. Often, records are incomplete.

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

1. Progress monitoring of reading and math
2. Communication with external and internal stakeholders
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	PROGRESS MONITORING READING: Students are assessed three times per year at grade level using curriculum based measurement. Approximately 70% of students are found to be significantly below grade level in the area of reading. Due to the nature of the population served (students with behavioral concerns), many students are non-compliant to bi-weekly progress monitor assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	90% of students identified as significantly below grade level in reading will be progress monitored every other week between benchmark periods.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Pamela Kenney (pkenney@devereaux.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of aimswebPlus curriculum-based measurement system
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	AimswebPlus is an online assessment, data management, and reporting system that provides national and local performance and growth norms for the screening and progress monitoring of math and reading skills for all students in Pre-K through 12. AimswebPlus uses two types of measures: curriculum-based measures and standards-based assessments. By combining these two types of measures, aimswebPlus provides the data that schools need for program planning and evaluation and for tiered assessment (multi-tiered system of supports [MTSS], also known as response to intervention [RTI]). Furthermore, aimswebPlus data provides teachers with the information needed to differentiate instruction and determine who will benefit from intensive intervention. Reports can be generated at the individual, classroom, school, and district levels in the aimswebPlus online system. aimswebPlus is used for benchmarking, universal screening, diagnosing strengths and weaknesses in Reading and Math, and for progress monitoring.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement benchmark assessments three times per year (Fall, Winter, Spring)
2. Develop schedule for progress monitoring
3. Implement PBIS program to support students participating in the progress monitoring

Person Responsible	Pamela Kenney (pkenney@devereaux.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Devereux students are not from the local community. Parents are not available to visit the school on a regular basis. Additionally, the relationship between schools and parents have been strained due to the route a student takes to require this level of restrictiveness. Devereux teachers will reach out to parents/guardians a minimum of two times per month for the purpose of sharing "good news" about their child.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Devereux teachers will reach out to parents/guardians a minimum of two times per month for the purpose of sharing "good news" about their child.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00