

Okeechobee County School District

Tantie Juvenile Residential Facility



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Tantie Juvenile Residential Facility

5050 NE 168TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34972

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rozelle Bradley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 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
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Okeechobee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Tantie Juvenile Residential Facility

5050 NE 168TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34972

[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)
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 Okeechobee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Tantie Juvenile Residential Facility is working in partnership with students, families, and communities to provide students with the knowledge and skills needed to reach their highest learning and personal potential, in order to become productive members of the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students to continue secondary education, enroll in college and/or enter the workforce when returning to their own communities.

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
Bradley, Rozelle	Other	<p>Directs the activities of the program, establishes goals and plans, manages and administers the work program and develops policies and procedures in accordance with established goals and objectives.</p> <p>Interprets and administers applicable federal and state laws; develops, promulgates and implements rules and regulations requisite to effect compliance.</p> <p>Directs the compilation and summarization of statistical and other data from various sources for use by the department administration and other agencies.</p> <p>Directs and participates in the long and short range planning and evaluation activities of educational programs.</p> <p>Develops and administers the program budget; ensures an adequate structure and funding base to execute programs.</p> <p>Directs work operations and/or functional programs and has responsibility for employee evaluations and for effectively recommending the hiring, firing, promoting, demoting and/or disciplining of employees.</p> <p>Evaluates program goals, operations and performance; develops and implements alternative procedures to improve and meet program objectives.</p> <p>Directs activities to negotiate contractual arrangements with other agencies/ departments to provide required services.</p> <p>Prepares regular and special reports of educational program plans, activities, objectives and methods by which these objectives will be accomplished.</p> <p>Approves expenditures for the purchase of materials, supplies, equipment, and contracted services necessary to conduct program operations.</p> <p>Directs the design and development of in-service training programs.</p> <p>Coordinates and participates in the assessment of educational needs of student populations; coordinates the design, development and implementation of varied programs and services required to accommodate identified needs.</p> <p>Keeps abreast of modern or changing trends in educational theory, instructional methods and practices relevant to the needs of student populations.</p> <p>Directs the review and analysis of ongoing educational programs, recommends changes and improvements, and develops and implements new, revised or specialized educational programs.</p> <p>Participates in intra/inter departmental initiatives designed to research, improve and/or expand education programs and activities.</p> <p>Directs the review and analysis of research materials and other educational resource literature to ensure that educational programs reflect current learning theories and instructional techniques.</p> <p>Maintains liaison and coordinates activities with other departments or agencies to develop cooperative projects and programs and accomplish goals and objectives.</p> <p>Coordinates activities to ensure the security and integrity of confidential records and programs.</p> <p>Coordinates the development of public relations materials.</p> <p>Represents the department at conferences, seminars, or meetings relevant to educational program issues.</p> <p>Prepares and/or directs the preparation of regular and special reports, evaluations and correspondence containing findings, conclusions and recommendations.</p> <p>Directs the establishment and maintenance of essential records and files.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/31/2012, Rozelle Bradley

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.*

0

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

7

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 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
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	16	9	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	3	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	9	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	8	6	7	33	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	15	4	34	68	

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	3	7	7	2	4	23

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	1	1	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	14	14	57	
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	4	8	4	4	20	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	8	6	6	32	

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	5	1	2	9

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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	14	14	57	
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	4	8	4	4	20	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	8	6	6	32	

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	5	1	2	9

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	1	1	

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%	44%	56%	0%	38%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	44%	51%	0%	43%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	35%	42%	0%	34%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	38%	51%	0%	34%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	29%	48%	0%	34%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	28%	45%	0%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	67%	68%	0%	55%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	59%	73%	0%	55%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
BLK	18										
FRL	10	9									
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	5
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	23
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	49%

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%	0

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	18
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
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 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	6
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Reading showed the lowest performance. Students come to us after they have dropped out of school for months or years at a time, mostly due to them struggling with mastering the basic math and reading concepts or with their behavior in regards to complying with the rules. They have little to no interest in making up on the instruction that they have missed out on and is more interested in taking the GED as an alternative to a standard high school diploma. Our students are lacking behind their cohort group which reduce their motivation to perform well in scheduled classes. Students do not put forth effort when taking their state assessments since they get frustrated with taking the test several times and still performing at Level 1 and Level 2.

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

Reading shows the greatest decline from the prior year. More students are taking the reading assessment several times during the testing windows. Students who have to meet the math requirement have a greater chance of scoring well on the PERT test, which results in the concordant score for the Algebra I EOC.

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.

Social studies shows the greatest gap compared to the state average. Students show less and less interest in taking their history courses serious. Students get discouraged when the answer requires and extended response, and most of our students do not see the purpose of doing their best, since passing the EOC is not a graduation requirement.

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

Our ELA data showed the most improvement. Juniors and Seniors who took the test over three administrations showed an increase in their performance. 13/30 (43.3%) students improved their scale score by 1 or more points.

GED passing rates have increased from previous years. During the 18/19 SY 15 students earned their GED Certificates, and during the 19/20 SY 21 students earned their GED Certificates. This increase can be attributed to the increase of practice test opportunities, additional study materials and assigning study buddies.

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

Student performance on math and social study assessments should be cause for concern.

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

1. Reading
2. Math
3. Social Studies
4. Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students engagement plays a critical role in classroom performance for all students. More and more students are refusing to work on their assignments and assessments and they do not show concern when they are not passing their courses and state assessments. Students are not vested in their education and prefer to focus on having the GED as an alternative to graduating from high school.

Measurable Outcome: 10% less students will fail their reading and math classes, than the previous year.
The percentage of students scoring above Level 1 will increase by 5%.
The percentage of students scoring above Level 1 will increase by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rozelle Bradley (rozelle.bradley@youthopportunity.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will access the Edmentum Exact Path reading and math curriculum, which will be a new computer program that will increase students engagement and student learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students are more on task and engaged when using the computer and having the opportunity to work at their own pace. The program will also adjust to the students' performance level, which will guide them privately without the knowledge of their peers. Students will be able to see the progress that they are making when taking a post test.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will take the diagnostic assessments to determine their current level of performance.
2. Students will complete as many lessons as possible.
3. Students will complete a post test and show learning gains.

Person Responsible: Rozelle Bradley (rozelle.bradley@youthopportunity.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 19/20 School Year, 34/111 African American students scored above Level 1 in ELA and Algebra I EOC assessments. That accounts for only 31% of African American students who were tested. The students who scored above Level 2 did so after taking the ELA and ALgebra I EOC assessments more than once during the 19/20 School Year. These same students account for the biggest percentage of economically disadvantaged students. Students who do not pass their ELA and Algebra I EOC are in danger of not meeting all of the standard high school graduation requirements. The economically disadvantaged students who do not graduate with a diploma, will remain in the economically disadvantage category due to low income employment or no employment.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of African American Students and Economically Disadvantaged students scoring above Level 2 on the ELA and Algebra I EOC assessments will increase by 10% during the 20/21 FSA Test Administrations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rozelle Bradley (rozelle.bradley@youthopportunity.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will access the Exact Path Reading and Math diagnostic assessments and complete the assigned curriculum activities. These activities will strengthen the students' basic math and reading skills which will increase their ability to solve grade level and math, focused on problem solving skills and real world applications. Students will complete the Dave Ramsey Financial Literacy Program, where they will learn what financial health is and how to manage their finances and build assets.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	African-American and Economically Disadvantaged students who enter our school, have a history of dropping out of school, or being promoted to the next grade level without mastering the basic math and reading skills. These same students do not have training in financial literacy such as eliminating debt, creating a positive net worth and having a healthy relationship with money.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will access the Exact Path Reading diagnostic assessments and curriculum, where they will work at their own pace.

Students will complete the Dave Ramsey Financial Literacy Program.

Person Responsible Rozelle Bradley (rozelle.bradley@youthopportunity.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Teachers will implement a variety of instructional strategies and computer time, to increase the on task time of students and increase hands on activities to increase students engagement.

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.

Each student participates in a monthly treatment team meeting where the case manager, therapist, administrative representative, youth care worker, and transition manager review the educational, recreational and medical reports and the student's participation in treatment activities to determine monthly progress. The Juvenile probation officer, parents and aftercare case managers are able to participate in these meetings, in person or via phone. Students who progress through the program, will eventually enter the transition phase, where they are being prepared for returning to the community. The students participate in transition and exit meetings with their treatment team where their mental health treatment, educational needs and court sanctions are discussed. The parents and JPO participate in these meetings as well. The receiving school district receives notification of the student's return through the completion of Section A of the Educational Electronic Exit Plan (EEEP). The plan includes the student's academic history and anticipated release date. The district completes Section B and our school representative completes Section C after the exit meeting. Student records are uploaded into the plan for the receiving district to access and prepare for the student's return. The teachers also participate in Family Day 4 times a year, where they meet with parents in person to discuss their sons' progress, achievements and struggles. .

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: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00