Washington Institute For Specialized Education

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Washington Institute For Specialized Education

680 2ND ST, Chipley, FL 32428

http://www.wcsdschools.com

Demographics

Principal: Becky Dickson   Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically **Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Washington Institute For Specialized Education

680 2ND ST, Chipley, FL 32428

http://www.wcsdschools.com

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)
High School 6-12	No	%

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mission: The mission of the Washington County School District is to empower all students to become well educated, productive citizens by providing appropriate, high quality, and rigorous educational programs in a safe learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

One hundred percent of Washington County students will graduate and be prepared to complete post-secondary educational opportunities or enter the workforce as successful citizens in our society.

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
Cox, Sam	Principal	oversee all school activities
Hodge, Rachel	School Counselor	guidance counselor
Brock, Cheryl	Administrative Support	secretary/data entry

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4	6	6	2	28
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	6	6	2	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	1	0	5	12

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	3	3	4	4	6	6	2	28

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	2	3	0	2	3	3	2	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	4	4	2	14

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
4

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/20/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	1	4	13	19	21	13	11	24	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	47	4	3	2	4	61
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	10	17	13	6	17	77

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	2	4	14	19	22	13	12	25	111

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%	48%	56%	0%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	46%	51%	0%	46%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	32%	42%	0%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	41%	51%	0%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	45%	48%	0%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	38%	45%	0%	50%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	70%	68%	0%	58%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	67%	73%	0%	66%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	3 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	6 (0)	2 (0)	28 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ()	3 ()	4 ()	4 ()	6 ()	6 ()	2 ()	27 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	12 (0)

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

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	
06	2019	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%	
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison							
07	2019	0%	47%	-47%	52%	-52%	
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	51%	-51%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		0%					
08	2019	0%	55%	-55%	56%	-56%	
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		0%					
09	2019	9%	47%	-38%	55%	-46%	
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	53%	-53%	
Same Grade Comparison		9%					
Cohort Comparison		9%					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2019	0%	47%	-47%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	57%	-57%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	39%	-39%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	39%	-39%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	0%	46%	-46%	48%	-48%
	2018	18%	45%	-27%	50%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	67%	-67%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	67%	-67%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	9%	65%	-56%	70%	-61%
2018	0%	58%	-58%	68%	-68%
Compare		9%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	49%	-49%	61%	-61%
2018	14%	56%	-42%	62%	-48%
Compare		-14%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	49%	-49%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	41%	-41%	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
BLK											
WHT										29	
FRL	20									13	
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	14
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	57
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	75%

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 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	0
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	29
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	17
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.

The lowest reported performance data is the 14% decrease in Algebra 1 EOC. It is difficult to identify the reason, but one contributing factor is having students enrolled for only a portion of the school year due to the nature of alternative school.

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

Algebra 1 EOC

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

The biggest gap is in Civics EOC. It is -71% from state average. There were none reported in 2018 or 2019, so the comparison is skewed.

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

The only recorded improvement is an increase from zero to 9% in History.

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

areas of concern are subgroups - economically disadvantaged, and white students
also percent tested

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

1. Test at least 95%
2. improve learning gains in subgroup economically disadvantaged
3. improve learning gains in subgroup white students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Subgroups - Black/African American, White and Economically Disadvantaged Students
Rationale	A critical need identified in the state assessment data. These subgroups missed the target federal index of 41% and are not meeting expectations.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In 2019-2020, the Black/African American student subgroup, the White student subgroup and Economically Disadvantaged subgroup data will increase to at least 41% meeting expectations as determined by the ESSA data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sam Cox (sam.cox@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	All Level 1 and 2 ELA students will be enrolled in Intensive Reading/Empower 180 Comprehension. Edgenuity will be utilized for remediation and credit recovery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	MTSS research shows that improvement and growth in ELA and reading is shown when struggling reading students are identified and provided specific interventions. School grade results, FSA ELA/Math scores and ESSA data were used to determine the areas of focus.
Action Step	
Description	1. Hiring highly qualified, reading endorsed teachers for ELA and intensive reading courses 2. All Level 1 and 2 ELA students will be identified and enrolled in Intensive Reading/Empower 180 Comprehension 3. Review progress monitoring and classroom assessments to monitor student growth 4. Ensure differentiated instruction through classroom observation and data assessment 5. Provide instructional resources and supports when needed
Person Responsible	Sam Cox (sam.cox@wcsdschools.com)

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).

We will test at least 95% of students.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

WISE will build positive relationships through working with volunteers and mentors, parent conferences, transition staffings, graduation ceremony, and other community events.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Students are offered and provided mental health services through the district LMHC, Anchorage, Florida Therapy, and Life Management.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The school uses staffing meetings with students and parents with the home zoned school before any movement to or from another school. The district is also utilizing the behavior analyst as a transition assistant for students.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Our number one desired student outcome is graduation with a standard high school diploma. Our second most important student outcome is for our graduates to be successful contributing members of society. Everything we do, from behavior modification to credit recovery, is to this purpose and outcome.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

We try to dual enroll as many of our students as possible in our local technical school, the Florida Panhandle Technical College.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Subgroups - Black/African American, White and Economically Disadvantaged Students	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00