

Washington County School District

Washington Institute For Specialized Education



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Washington Institute For Specialized Education

680 2ND ST, Chipley, FL 32428

<http://www.wcsdschools.com>

Demographics

Principal: Becky Dickson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cox, Sam	Principal	Reassigned as Chipley High School Assistant Principal from WISE oversee all school activities
Brock, Cheryl	Administrative Support	secretary/data entry
Peoples, Troy	Other	Director of ESE Services
Holley, Will	Teacher, K-12	Edgenuity credit recovery
Clemmons, Alicia	Principal	Principal of Chipley High School
Riviere, Brian	Principal	Principal of Vernon High School

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/20/2020, Becky Dickson

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

0

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	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 .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/23/2020

Prior Year - As Reported
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	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%				
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%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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
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%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	0
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	29
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
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%	2

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

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?

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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A critical need identified in the state assessment data. These subgroups missed the target federal index of 41% and are not meeting expectations.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-2021, the 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. 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 Steps to Implement

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
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)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A critical need identified in the state assessment data. These subgroups missed the target federal index of 41% and are not meeting expectations.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-2021, the African-American 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. 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 Steps to Implement

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
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)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A critical need identified in the state assessment data. These subgroups missed the target federal index of 41% and are not meeting expectations.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-2021, the White 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. 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 Steps to Implement

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
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

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

Due to COVID -19, the students from WISE were re-assigned to their home schools. The student's placement will be re-evaluated at the end of the first semester or sooner if needed.

Chipley High School had 5 grade 9, 4 grade 10, 5 grade 11 and 4 grade 12 students reassigned.

Vernon High School had 4 grade 9, 1 grade 10, 3 grade 11 and 1 grade 12 students reassigned.

Roulhac Middle School had 3 grade 7 and 3 grade 8 students reassigned.

Vernon Middle School had 1 grade 6 and 3 grade 7 students reassigned.

Students have the option of online learning only, brick and mortar with face to face instruction.

Internet and laptops will be provided to students who do not have access at home.

Students will be monitored on Edgenuity credit recovery and provided interventions as needed through the home school.

We will test at least 95% of students.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Each home school the WISE students have been re-assigned to will build positive relationships through working with volunteers and mentors, parent conferences, transition staffings, graduation ceremonies, college and career fairs and other community events.

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

The schools use 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.

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.

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

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: White	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00