

Collier County Public Schools

# Collier Juvenile Detention Center



2022-23 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>7</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>                | <b>10</b> |
| <b>R.A.I.S.E</b>                               | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>      | <b>15</b> |

## Collier Juvenile Detention Center

3315 TAMIAMI TRL E, Naples, FL 34112

[ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

Principal: Brent Klein

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

|  |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No                    |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 0%                    |
| <b>2021-22 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 Collier 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.

The Collier Juvenile Detention Center's (DJJ) mission is to provide instruction for detained school-aged students in basic subject areas and social/study skills to maintain their academics while incarcerated.

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

All students will complete school prepared for ongoing learning, community involvement, and global responsibilities.

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

The Collier Juvenile Detention Center serves students in fourth through twelfth grade who have been placed in the program pursuant to a recent arrest or by court order. The population consists of students from diverse backgrounds and ability levels who require a myriad of supports to learn how to be successful in school. Program specific supports include a structured school and classroom environment, clear behavior objectives, positive consequences tied to the behavior plan, small class sizes, and targeted academic support. Enrollment typically varies daily from 15-35 boys and girls, and academic services are provided year round.

### 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  |
|--------------|----------------|--|
| Klein, Brent | Principal      | Mr. Klein handles all staff hiring for Collier Juvenile Detention Center (DJJ), delegates leadership duties to the Lead Teacher, conducts staff evaluations, and manages the finances. He reports to the district and ensures DJJ meets all state and district compliance requirements. Mr. Klein leads bi-weekly meetings with the Leadership Team, which includes staff from all CCPS Alternative Schools sites. |
| Kamen, Tony  | Teacher, K-12  | Tony Kamen serves as the lead teacher at the DJJ. He leads weekly PLC meetings, assists with implementation of the PBIS plan, oversees daily operation of the DJJ program, and works with teachers to address student academic concerns at the classroom level. He also acts as the test coordinator for all district and state assessments.   |

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

No

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

Not Applicable.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Brent Klein

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

317

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

4

### Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

4

### Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

0

### Number of teachers with ESE certification?

1

### Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

### Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

2

## Demographic Data

## Early Warning Systems

### 2022-23

#### 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 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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 |       |
| 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**

Tuesday 8/30/2022

**2021-22 - 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 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 14 | 35 | 105 | 83 | 53 | 10 | 313 |       |
| 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  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
| 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  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     |    |

**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  |       |

**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      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        | 54%      | 51%   |        |          |       |        | 59%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 52%      | 51%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 41%      | 42%   |
| Math Achievement            |        | 35%      | 38%   |        |          |       |        | 58%      | 51%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 44%      | 48%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 46%      | 45%   |
| Science Achievement         |        | 51%      | 40%   |        |          |       |        | 72%      | 68%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        | 47%      | 48%   |        |          |       |        | 76%      | 73%   |

**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                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |



| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |

### Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| 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 |

### ESSA Data Review

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)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | N/A |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    |     |
| 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   |     |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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 related to the Areas of Focus?**

During the 2021 school year, there was not enough data provided to create data-driven areas of focus. The Standardized Testing for the Assessment of Reading/Math (STAR) system is the progress monitoring tool used at Detention. STAR is administered to all students during their first 10 days in Detention to determine reading and math levels. Students that stay in Detention for 21 days or more are considered long-term students and they are given STAR again when they exit the program to measure gains. A "gain" is defined as making at least 1/2 year of academic growth on the STAR assessment.

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

Learning gains in math for long-term students showed the most improvement from the 2021 SY to the 2022 SY. In 2022, 78% of long-term students demonstrated gains in math compared to only 55% of long-term students during the 2021 SY. This improvement can be attributed, in part, to smaller class sizes due to fewer juvenile incarcerations and strong instruction.

**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?**

Learning gains in ELA for long-term students improved 4% (58% to 62%), however, this remains an area of improvement. Additionally, ELA achievement remains below grade level for the vast majority of students.

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

Students in Detention generally score well below the state and district averages in all tested areas for which there is available data. This trend remains the same from graduation cohort to cohort and across all ESSA subgroups. New students to Detention are typically at-risk of not graduating or falling further behind their peers attending traditional school due to poor test scores, low GPAs, chronic absenteeism, lack of engagement, and lack of credits for high school students. The overarching mission of the Collier Juvenile Detention Center is to help students take responsibility for their actions while maintaining their academics during their period of incarceration.

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

Instructional staff, support personnel, and administration need to continue to work together to maintain a targeted focus on student achievement and academic progress on specific standards. This will help to tailor explicit and differentiated instruction to target specific student needs. In reading, an emphasis will be placed on reading and analyzing non-fiction and informational text. Students who can read for information will do better in all classes and the larger percentage of standardized tests cover non-fiction and informational text. In math, students in all grades need to focus on fundamental skills and fact fluency. Instruction must focus on standard attainment and mastery, and students need to receive targeted interventions in their areas of weakness.

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

All teachers will receive professional development from district curriculum experts on implementing the new math curriculum. Secondary reading and ELA teachers will also receive professional development from district curriculum experts and the reading coach to assist with implementing the new secondary ELA curriculum. High School ELA and math teachers will receive ACT and SAT specific professional development to better familiarize them with test requirements and to expand their knowledge of available resources. All teachers will receive PD on mentoring students, tracking student progress, and helping students track their own progress.

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. 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.

Data gleaned from the STAR assessment demonstrates that students entering the Collier Juvenile Detention Center (DJJ) score well below grade level in ELA. Increasing the overall achievement level of students taking the STAR assessment should have a positive effect on overall ELA performance for all students at DJJ. Stronger reading achievement will help students on all of their state assessments that they will take in their traditional school. Further, studies show that academic success impacts positively both behavior and attendance. Therefore, DJJ students that improve their reading achievement have a greater opportunity of success when they transition back to their home schools.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Students demonstrating ELA learning gains on the STAR assessment will increase 13% from 62% to 75%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Success will be monitored using the STAR assessment for all students that attend DJJ for 21 consecutive days or more.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tony Kamen (kamento@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

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

Teachers will use explicit, systematic instruction tied to state standards during their ELA and reading lessons. To meet the needs of individual learners and to improve areas of student weakness, teachers will use data gleaned from classroom assessments to provide corrective feedback and to differentiate instruction. Students will also receive targeted ELA and reading instruction to help them overcome areas of weakness.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Explicit, Systematic instruction contributes to each student's ability to clearly understand new content and to make connections to previously taught content while helping students continuously acquire knowledge that grows with complexity. Differentiated instruction with corrective feedback helps raise student awareness of errors to aid in self-correction and self-regulation while simultaneously helping the learning to improve fluency in specific areas of weakness through individual instruction.

**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) Explicit, Systematic instruction will be implemented in each class.

**Person Responsible**

Tony Kamen (kamento@collierschools.com)

2) Student progress will be monitored weekly through classroom assessments. Teachers will then use this data to provide corrective feedback and to differentiate instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Tony Kamen (kamento@collierschools.com)

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**  
If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please

Student data from all of the aforementioned progress monitoring tools will be disaggregated by ESSA subgroup - SWD, ELL, Hispanic students, Economically Disadvantaged - to monitor the math performance of students in each group. The ESE inclusion teacher that work with students with

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.

disabilities at DJJ will work with each classroom teacher to aid in the progress monitoring of students on their caseload and they will provide one-on-one support to target individual areas of weakness.

**#2. 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.

Data gleaned from the STAR assessment demonstrates that students entering the Collier Juvenile Detention Center (DJJ) score well below grade level in math. Increasing the overall achievement level of students taking the STAR assessment should have a positive effect on overall math performance for all students at DJJ. Stronger reading achievement will help students on all of their state assessments that they will take in their traditional school. Further, studies show that academic success impacts positively both behavior and attendance. Therefore, DJJ students that improve their reading achievement have a greater opportunity of success when they transition back to their home schools.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Students demonstrating math learning gains on the STAR assessment will improve 5% from 78% to 83%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Success will be monitored using the STAR assessment for all students that attend DJJ for 21 consecutive days or more.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tony Kamen (kamento@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

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

Teachers will use explicit, systematic instruction tied to state standards during their math lessons. To meet the needs of individual learners and to improve areas of student weakness, teachers will use data gleaned from classroom assessments to provide corrective feedback and to differentiate instruction. Students will also receive targeted math instruction to help them overcome areas of weakness.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Explicit, Systematic instruction contributes to each student's ability to clearly understand new content and to make connections to previously taught content while helping students continuously acquire knowledge that grows with complexity. Differentiated instruction with corrective feedback helps raise student awareness of errors to aid in self-correction and self-regulation while simultaneously helping the learning to improve fluency in specific areas of weakness through individual instruction.

**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) Explicit, Systematic instruction will be implemented in each class.

**Person Responsible**

Tony Kamen (kamento@collierschools.com)

2) Student progress will be monitored weekly through classroom assessments. Teachers will then use this data to provide corrective feedback and to differentiate instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Tony Kamen (kamento@collierschools.com)

**Monitoring ESSA  
Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more

Student data from all of the aforementioned progress monitoring tools will be disaggregated by ESSA subgroup - SWD, ELL, Hispanic students, Economically Disadvantaged - to monitor the math performance of students in each group. The ESE inclusion teacher that work with students with

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.

disabilities at DJJ will work with each classroom teacher to aid in the progress monitoring of students on their caseload and they will provide one-on-one support to target individual areas of weakness.

### Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

**Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.**

PBIS linked to classroom management strategies

**Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.**

The staff at the Collier Juvenile Detention Center works hard to create a positive school culture and environment for incarcerated students. The overarching goal is to make the academic portion of each student's day the best part of their experience at DJJ. While incarceration is a consequence of the students' actions outside of DJJ, it can also be an opportunity for students to refocus on their academics. During classroom time, students will receive positive recognition and rewards under the PBIS plan. The classroom teachers will collect the data and the lead teacher will present it at each PLC meeting. Based on the data, the PLC team will make adjustments to the PBIS plan.

**Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.**

Key stakeholders of the Collier Juvenile Detention Center are the students, Collier County Sheriff Office Juvenile Justice Officers, and education officials from the Department of Juvenile Justice and Florida Department of Education. PBIS data is shared with students on a daily basis, and it is shared with county and state officials at meetings held regularly throughout the calendar year.

**Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.**

Classroom teachers take the lead with the PBIS plan by reviewing classroom rules and procedures every day. Daily review is critical to the success of the plan because students enroll and withdraw on a continuous basis. Rules and procedures are also posted in each classroom for quick reference during class. Teachers then are tasked with implementing the plan throughout the class period to ensure immediate impact of the desired effect. Finally, students receive rewards for adhering to the plan at the end of each class and then at the end of the week.

**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.

| Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring          |
|--|--|
| 1) Classroom teachers review the rules, procedures, and structure of the PBIS plan.                            | Klein, Brent,<br>kleinb@collierschools.com |
| 2) Classroom teachers implement the plan in the classroom and reward students when appropriate under the plan. |  |
| 3) PLC team meets to review data and discuss adjustments, if necessary.  |  |
| 4) Lead teacher collects data and shares it at meetings with county and state officials.                       |  |