

Wakulla County Schools

# Wakulla Institute



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

# Wakulla Institute

126 HIGH DR, Crawfordville, FL 32327

<https://www.wakullaschooldistrict.org/pathways>

## Demographics

**Principal: Susan Tillman**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Wakulla County School Board on 10/21/2019.

## 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](http://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

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Wakulla Institute

126 HIGH DR, Crawfordville, FL 32327

<https://www.wakullaschooldistrict.org/pathways>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-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 Wakulla County School Board on 10/21/2019.

### 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.

Wakulla Institute's faculty and staff will foster a nontraditional learning environment that meets the needs of each individual student while upholding academic integrity and promoting instructional innovation.

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

Wakulla Institute is committed to the success for all students, teachers, staff, and our school system. The academic and behavioral needs of all students are met through individualized and differentiated instruction that correlates to the Florida Standards to allow all students to succeed.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vernon, James	Assistant Principal	
Chancy, Sunny	Principal	
Tillman, Susan	Dean	

### Early Warning Systems

#### Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	8	2	3	3	2	29	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	2	10	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	2	1	1	1	1	13	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	2	1	2	1	14	

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	1	0	0	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	12	

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	3	1	3	0	2	1	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	2	0	8

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

8

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 7/29/2019

### 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	2	3	3	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	1	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	2	0	0	13

**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	3	5	5	2	1	0	16

### Prior Year - Updated

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	2	3	3	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	1	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	2	0	0	13

**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	3	5	5	2	1	0	16

## 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%	41%	61%	0%	49%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	41%	59%	0%	50%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	43%	54%	0%	0%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	25%	62%	0%	37%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	20%	59%	0%	49%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	21%	52%	0%	33%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	38%	56%	0%	47%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	0%	78%	0%	73%	75%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)	8 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	29 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)	2 (3)	1 (5)	0 (5)	1 (2)	1 (3)	2 (3)	10 (22)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	4 (2)	2 (4)	1 (2)	1 (0)	1 (1)	1 (0)	13 (9)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	1 (1)	1 (0)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (3)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)	5 (2)	1 (5)	2 (3)	1 (2)	2 (0)	1 (0)	14 (13)

**Grade Level Data**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	66%	-66%	58%	-58%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	61%	-61%	56%	-56%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				



ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
	2018	15%	66%	-51%	51%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	64%	-64%	56%	-56%
	2018	55%	74%	-19%	58%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-55%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
09	2019	0%	60%	-60%	55%	-55%
	2018	27%	53%	-26%	53%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-27%				
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	71%	-71%	64%	-64%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	60%	-60%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	63%	-63%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	59%	-59%	54%	-54%
	2018	19%	58%	-39%	54%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	48%	-48%	46%	-46%
	2018	40%	57%	-17%	45%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-40%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	58%	-58%	48%	-48%
	2018	20%	56%	-36%	50%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	80%	-80%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	85%	-85%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	78%	-78%	71%	-71%
2018	42%	79%	-37%	71%	-29%
Compare		-42%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	82%	-82%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	88%	-88%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	58%	-58%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	68%	-68%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	72%	-72%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	68%	-68%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

### Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
WHT										22	
FRL										31	
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	25
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	25
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	22
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	31
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Data component(s):

\* The lowest performance component was on the ELA at 23%. However, this is a 23% increase from the previous year when 0 students scored proficient.

Contributing factors:

Wakulla Institute, is an alternate school, with a fluid student population and several programs. Students can be returned to their home schools in as little as 9-weeks after their initial placement. There is high staff turn over at the school, with at least 3 of the 8 teachers being new each year, for the past two years. Only 2 educators have been with the school more than 2 years.

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

Data decline:

\* Geometry showed the greatest decline with 33% proficient (3 students) in 18-19 and 100% proficient (2 students) in 17-18.

Contributing factors:

Wakulla Institute, is an alternate school, with a fluid student population and several programs. Students can be returned to their home schools in as little as 9-weeks after their initial placement. There is high staff turn over at the school, with at least 3 of the 8 teachers being new each year, for the past two years. The staff member teaching Math was a returning teacher, out of the classroom for over 7 years, and also new to the school in the 18-19 school year.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Data -greatest gap:

\* FCAT Science (grades 5 & 8, with a total of nine students) showed the largest gap, with 0% proficient, as compared to the states 51%.

Contributing factors:

Wakulla Institute, is an alternate school, with a fluid student population and several programs. Students can be returned to their home schools in as little as 9-weeks after their initial placement. There is high staff turn over at the school, with at least three of the eight teachers being new each year, for the past two years. There were three new teachers in Science (one in 5th and two in 8th) last year. The 8th grade science position was turned over twice during the school year.

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

Data- most improved:

Math scores grades 3-8 showed the largest improvement with 62% proficient, 6% above the state and 42% above the previous year.

Actions:

There were several new actions put into place during the 2018-19 school year, including but not limited to a new instructor in that area. The following were used by the teacher:

\*iReady math materials were utilized in grades 3-8

- \*FSA assessment practice materials were used with students
- \*KAGAN strategies and groups were used with all students
- \*student whiteboards and other "hands-on" materials and resources were used at least three times a week
- \*progress monitoring using STAR math assessments and teacher made assessments

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

1. According to the EWS data, there are currently 14 students enrolled that scored a level 1 on the FSA. Of the 14, nine scored a level 1 in ELA and 5 in math, enrolled in grades 4-12, last year.

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

1. Increasing the percentage of students showing gains on the FSA ELA assessment.
2. Increasing the percentage of students achieving gains on the math FSA and EOC's.
3. Increase the graduation rate to meet the Federal percentage points index of at least 67%.
4. Increase the number of students in the two identified areas (White and Economically Disadvantaged) to above 40%,

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Increase and foster learning gains for students through targeted, individualized instruction.
<b>Rationale</b>	Our fluid, transient student population is often in the lowest quartile in FSA & EOC's, our students have often failed or are failing in at least one academic subject, are living with one parent/relative, are more than likely involved in the legal system, and are living with significant socioeconomic disadvantages. This is why learning gains are our target for our student population.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	70% of the Wakulla Institute's assessed students will show at least a 5% learning gain in all the FSA ELA, math and science assessments, including the math and science EOC's.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	James Vernon (james.vernon@wcsb.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Every student is viewed as an individual with specific needs and strengths. When a student is considered for enrollment in WI, all the available data for that student is reviewed by the administration. An individualized schedule is then written, a Response to Intervention plan is written and reviewed based on the students area(s) of need. Every student is scheduled in an intensive instruction course. If the student has an Individualized Education Plan or 504 plan those program/plan are reviewed and scheduled for an amendment meeting with the parent/guardian to address the need of the student. Every student that attends Wakulla Institute is scheduled in a Peer Counseling course, with a small group setting and a caring, dedicated staff member as a mentor. All students enrolled with a level one or two in math, ELA, or both are enrolled in Intensive courses for that subject area. Individualized remediation is set up for each student and tracked over the course of the nine weeks or semester.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Every student is an individual and should be treated as such. All student data (academic, behavioral, legal, economic and social) is reviewed to create the best possible successful situation at Wakulla Institute. Because of the unique situations of our students come to us from, a static formula for success is not possible. Finding an in depth specific plan, tailored to the student has the potential for a much more positive educational outcome, long term. Based on productivity in our credit recovery program and the return rate data as part of our exiting criteria, this strategy has shown to be much more successful that of a one size fits all approach.</p>
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collect all data on potential students specifically academic,behavioral, and attendance</li> <li>2. Develop an individualized and needs specific plan for that student through the Rtl, ESE, or 504 processes</li> <li>3. Progress monitor and track data of student growth using STAR</li> <li>4. Re-evaluate if the plan needs to be amended</li> <li>5. Provide long term success monitoring for students who exit the program into their home school</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	James Vernon (james.vernon@wcsb.us)

#2	
<b>Title</b>	Increase graduation rate for students in the program.
<b>Rationale</b>	Wakulla Institute is an alternate school whose student population comes from disciplinary and academic placement from the district. The fluid, transient student population is in the lowest quartile in one or more assessment area. These students have failed or are failing in at least one academic subject. They often are living with only one parent/relative. They are more than likely involved in the legal system. They experience significant socioeconomic disadvantages, due to these overwhelming facts. Several of the middle and high school students, age 16 or older, are recommended or placed at Wakulla Institute sometimes choose to withdraw and pursue a Graduation Equivalency Degree (GED) instead of perusing a high school diploma.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Wakulla Institute's graduation rate will show positive growth of at least 20% or higher to raise our graduation rate to the Federal Percentage Point Index of 67% or higher.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Sunny Chancy (sunny.chancy@wcsb.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students receive individualized goal setting, career mapping and long term success monitoring while in our program. In addition to monitoring when they return to their zoned school. Mentors visit them and track social, emotional and academic needs through weekly check in visits for their entire first nine weeks of return to the mainstream school system. Student data will be used to determine the best program fit for success when they enroll at Wakulla Institute.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students who have a long term educational goal oriented plan show much more proclivity to overcome adversity compared to those who simply attend school because they are required. Understanding the outcome of graduation and skill development to increase career opportunities is built into the curriculum at WI. Research has shown that long and short term goal setting help students reach milestone of success that they previously were not aware of as an option for them.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Intake meeting with an individualized plan to exit the program with long term goals established</li> <li>2. Exit criteria for academics, behavior, and attendance that requires students to meet minimal goal oriented benchmarks before return to the mainstream school system.</li> <li>3. College and vocational career mapping for each student as part of the educational curriculum and exiting strategy</li> <li>4. Long term success monitoring at home school site by mentors who visit students weekly</li> <li>5. Advocating by mentors, once they return be meetings with guidance at their new school site if students are struggling in any area</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	James Vernon (james.vernon@wcsb.us)



#3	
<b>Title</b>	Foster a positive student learning environment.
<b>Rationale</b>	Wakulla Institute is an alternate school. The majority of the student population is placed here for disciplinary or academic intervention. The fluid, transient student population is in the lowest quartile in one or more assessment area. These students have failed or are failing in at least one academic subject. They often are living with only one parent/relative. They are more than likely involved in the legal system. They experience significant socioeconomic disadvantages, due to these overwhelming facts.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase the Federal percentage of points index for Wakulla Institute students, specifically for white and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. Students will increase from 22% and 31% respectfully to above 40%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	James Vernon (james.vernon@wcsb.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Progress monitoring using STAR</li> <li>*Daily Peer Counseling class</li> <li>*Five Star Life Social Curriculum</li> <li>*Rtl/ESE/504 programs and processes</li> <li>*Remedial courses</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students academic success is part of the reentry process and matches their behavior modification needs. Long term educationally proficient school career is one of the most important aspects of our program. Sending students back to their zoned school on grade level with no educational gaps has been statistically proven to increase their potential for high school graduation with their same age peers.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Data collection to assess educational needs, STAR, FSA, FCAT, EOC's, discipline records, attendance</li> <li>2. Five Star Life social/emotional curriculum</li> <li>3. Providing an individualized plan to meet the needs of each student</li> <li>4. Four to six week progress monitoring using STAR, Achieve 3000, and 5STAR</li> <li>5. Use completion data as part of required exit criteria for return to the mainstream school system with a long term plan for success in place</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**