

Volusia County Schools

# Daytona Juvenile Residential Facility



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide  
Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                     | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                      | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                        | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>                | <b>12</b> |
| <b>R.A.I.S.E</b>                               | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>      | <b>0</b>  |

## Daytona Juvenile Residential Facility

1386 INDIAN LAKE RD, Daytona Beach, FL 32124

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/alternative-education/pages/departments-of-juvenile-justice-sites.aspx>

### Demographics

Principal: Patricia Corr

Start Date for this Principal: 12/1/2016

|  |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| <b>2021-22 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active                |
| <b>School Function</b><br>(per accountability file)  |                       |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>6-12   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Alternative Education |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | No                    |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 0%                    |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) |                       |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |                       |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating</b>   | 2023-24: No Rating    |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

### SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Alternative Education will assist in developing graduation assurance through a structured alternative program, during an unintentional break in the traditional school environment, by providing academic instruction through challenging and differentiated curriculum within a safe and positive learning environment.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our greatest contribution is to be sure that there is a teacher in every classroom who cares that every student, every day, learns, grows, and feels like a human being; they don't care until they know we care.

**Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.**

This High Risk Secured Intensive Residential Commitment program is contracted by the State of Florida, Department of Juvenile Justice. The mission is to provide a structured environment in a residential setting for a maximum of 30 male clients, ages 13-21, who have been adjudicated in court and committed by the State of Florida. The program is designed to provide rehabilitation for committed youth through performance contracting and behavior modification. The length of stay is 12 to 18 months.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name               | Position Title            | Job Duties and Responsibilities      |
|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Johns, Dale        | Principal                 | Admin oversight- all 6 sights        |
| Kirvan, Colleen    | Assistant Principal       | admin oversight- 4 residential sites |
| Plummer, Michael   | Teacher, Career/Technical | Technology input/Teams contact       |
| Pelletier, Rebecca | School Counselor          | DAC and SIP contact                  |
| Cioffi, Joseph     | Teacher, K-12             | DJRF contact                         |
| Williams, LaKeshia | Teacher, K-12             | DOC contact                          |
| Cruz, Sheila       | Teacher, K-12             |                                      |
| Vaughn, Alexis     | Instructional Coach       | Riverview Contact                    |
| Nass, Keri Lynn    | Teacher, K-12             | Alt Ed contact                       |
| Haigh, Tracy       | Teacher, K-12             |                                      |
| Schervish, Michael | Assistant Principal       | Admin oversight - Sip Contact        |
| Cotto, Maggie      | Teacher, K-12             | Riverview contact/ Teams contact     |
| Jenkins, Steafon   | Assistant Principal       | Admin oversight- Highbanks           |
| Nazario, Lisette   | School Counselor          | Counselor - Highbanks                |
| Garbutt, Ann       | School Counselor          | Counselor- Riverview                 |

**Is education provided through contract for educational services?**

Yes

**If yes, name of the contracted education provider.**

Volusia County Schools

**Demographic Information****Principal start date**

Thursday 12/1/2016, Patricia Corr

**Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?**

5

**Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?**

0

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.**

5

**Total number of students enrolled at the school.**

3

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

1

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

1

### Demographic Data

## Early Warning Systems

### 2021-22

**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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 1  | 0  | 3 |       |
| 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 | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1 |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 1  | 0  | 3 |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |   |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |   |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 1 | 1  | 1  | 0     | 3  |

**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 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1 |       |
| 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**

Friday 6/4/2021

**2020-21 - 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 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 4  | 1  | 25 |       |
| 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 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  |       |
| Course failure in Math                        | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |    |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2  | 0  | 0  | 3  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 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 |       |
| 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 | 3 | 4 | 4  | 2  | 0  | 13 |       |
| 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 Review**

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      | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       |        | 52%      | 56%   |        | 51%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       |        | 49%      | 51%   |        | 47%      | 53%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       |        | 37%      | 42%   |        | 37%      | 44%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       |        | 48%      | 51%   |        | 49%      | 51%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       |        | 49%      | 48%   |        | 50%      | 48%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       |        | 38%      | 45%   |        | 44%      | 45%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       |        | 76%      | 68%   |        | 71%      | 67%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       |        | 69%      | 73%   |        | 66%      | 71%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**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                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 09                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 10                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        |        |          |                       |       |                    |

| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |

### Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| 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 |
| 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 |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index                           |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)                 |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students         |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | N/A |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target |     |

| ESSA Federal Index  |  |
|---|--|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       |  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  |  |
| Percent Tested  |  |
| Subgroup Data   |  |

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

In reflection to the areas of focus, within ESSA subgroups, progress monitoring reports are in place for weekly conference and discussion. Our stakeholders team meets and reviews areas of concern and isolates individual needs for graduation assurance.

#### Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Science Proficiency.  
New educational program, Edgenuity, course completions.  
Professional development for instructors and staff, reading interventions, social - emotional training, PLC and progress monitoring tools.

#### What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

MATH Proficiency / ELA Proficiency.  
Students lack foundation in math and reading skills, along with attendance issues , students lack positive relationships with staff and adults in general. Students lack Goal Setting Skills

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Lack of Math Proficiency.  
Students lack foundation in math and reading skills, along with attendance issues , students lack positive relationships with staff and adults in general.  
Students in Alternative ED. tend to lag behind all other subgroups in GPA, EOC's, FSA, and graduation rate

#### What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

MATH/ELA Proficiency best practices in the classroom remediation of Math and Reading skills, Continue productive PLC's and monitoring meetings, develop positive teacher/student relationships, increase in course completions / graduation assurance through credit retrieval, successful transition back to zoned school, increase in graduation assurance rate.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

There will be eight faculty meetings, both school and district lead, that will provide everyone an opportunity to develop professional skills in teacher clarity, success criteria, profile of environments, curriculum, and teaching supports.

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

#### **Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Math Proficiency - Students Lack foundation in Reading Skills.

Students are not on track when they come to our programs; if they are, we must maintain their progress

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students in our program for more than 20 days will be on track to complete course with 70% proficiency.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Weekly progress monitoring, course completions/quarterly grades, on target with target date in Edgenuity.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Joseph Cioffi (jmcioffi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Differentiation through scaffolding

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Scaffolding has a .82 effect size (Hattie). The ELA proficiency not only showed low performance, but also nearly the greatest decline from the prior year, and the ELA component had Nearly the greatest gap when compared to the state average. This Data component showed the lowest performance according to last years EWS indicators. Students in Alternative Ed. tend to Lag behind all other subgroups in GPA, EOC's, FSA, attendance and graduation rate.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Assess individual student needs
2. Provide supplementary resources
3. Progress monitoring/Edgenuity
4. Teacher/Student ratio (small group; 1:1)
5. Provide emotional /behavioral supports
6. Guided notes
7. Gradual release
8. Break tasks down into small steps
9. Professional Development for Instructional staff in Social-Emotional Training, Blended Learning, and Effective PLC's. In order to foster better student - teacher relationships
10. Emphasis on graduation assurance through credit retrieval
11. Remediation of Foundational skills in Math and Reading

**Person Responsible**

Joseph Cioffi (jmcioffi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of

Weekly progress monitoring, course completions/quarterly grades, on target with target date in Edgenuity.

the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ELA Proficiency -Students Lack foundation in Reading Skills.

Students are not on track when they come to our programs; if they are, we must maintain their progress.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students in our program for more than 20 days will be on track to complete course with 70% proficiency.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Weekly progress monitoring, course completions/quarterly grades, on target with target date in Edgenuity.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Joseph Cioffi (jmcioffi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Differentiation through scaffolding

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Scaffolding has a .82 effect size (Hattie). The ELA proficiency not only showed low performance, but also nearly the greatest decline from the prior year, and the ELA component had Nearly the greatest gap when compared to the state average. This Data component showed the lowest performance according to last years EWS indicators. Students in Alternative Ed. tend to Lag behind all other subgroups in GPA, EOC's, FSA, attendance and graduation rate.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Assess individual student needs
2. Provide supplementary resources
3. Progress monitoring/Edgenuity
4. Teacher/Student ratio (small group; 1:1)
5. Provide emotional /behavioral supports
6. Guided notes
7. Gradual release
8. Break tasks down into small steps
9. Professional Development for Instructional staff in Social-Emotional Training, Blended Learning, and Effective PLC's. In order to foster better student - teacher relationships
10. Emphasis on graduation assurance through credit retrieval
11. Remediation of Foundational skills in Math and Reading

**Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of

Weekly progress monitoring, course completions/quarterly grades, on target with target date in Edgenuity.

the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Graduation Assurance- Students lack study skills, confidence, motivation, and Students lack positive relationships with staff.

#### Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase graduation rate through increased program completion. Students in our program for more than 20 days will be on track to complete course with 70% proficiency

#### Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Weekly progress monitoring, course completions/quarterly grades, on target with target date in Edgenuity.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rosalind Little (ralittle@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#### Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Professional Development for teachers in Social Emotional Training, Blended learning, poverty awareness and cultural sensitivity.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.  
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Social Emotional learning

#### Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Professional Development for Instructional staff in Social- Emotional Training, Blended Learning, and Effective PLC's. In order to foster better student - teacher relationships
2. Emphasis on graduation assurance through credit retrieval
3. Remediation of Foundational skills in Math and Reading
4. Weekly Goal setting strategies one on one with teacher/student

#### Person Responsible

Rosalind Little (ralittle@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#### Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Weekly progress monitoring, course completions/quarterly grades, on target with target date in Edgenuity.



### **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.**

At our site, we involve all stakeholders. However, there are very few instances where we work with parents. Most of our interactions are with the program personnel. We are a team that works closely together with our buildings staff to enable student success. Educators and staff personal attend meetings and treatment team meetings with program and the betterment of students. Additionally, program personnel are all involved in school activities and meetings.

#### **Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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