

Washington County School District

# Washington Institute For Specialized Education



## 2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>R.A.I.S.E</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>

# Washington Institute For Specialized Education

680 2ND ST, Chipley, FL 32428

<http://www.wcsdschools.com>

## Demographics

**Principal: Becky Dickson**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/27/2021

<b>2021-22 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Function</b> (per accountability file)	
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (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 Washington 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.**

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.

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

Due to COVID -19, the students from WISE were re-assigned to their home schools for the school year 2020-21. WISE does not have any students enrolled for the school year 2021-22 at this time as they are continuing their enrollment at the assigned home school. Student placement will be re-evaluated at the end of the first semester or sooner if needed.

In 2020-21 Chipley High School had 5 grade 9, 4 grade 10, 5 grade 11 and 4 grade 12 students reassigned.

In 2020-21 Vernon High School had 4 grade 9, 1 grade 10, 3 grade 11 and 1 grade 12 students reassigned.

In 2020-21 Roulhac Middle School had 3 grade 7 and 3 grade 8 students reassigned.

In 2020-21 Vernon Middle School had 1 grade 6 and 3 grade 7 students reassigned.

Students had the option of online learning only, brick and mortar with face to face instruction in 2020-21. Internet and laptops were provided to students who did not have access at home. All students will be face to face at their home school for the school year 2021-22.

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

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.

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

### 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
Riviere, Brian	Principal	Principal, Vernon High School
Clemmons, Alicia	Principal	Principal, Chipley High School
Cox, Sam	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal at Chipley High School reassigned former administrator of WISE
Peoples, Troy	Other	Oversees district policies and personnel
Holley, Will	Teacher, K-12	teacher at Chipley High School - reassigned from WISE
Brock, Cheryl	Administrative Support	secretary/data entry - reassigned to Chipley High School from WISE

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

No

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

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Friday 8/27/2021, Becky Dickson

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

**Demographic Data**

### Early Warning Systems

**2021-22**

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	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	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Friday 8/27/2021

**2020-21 - Updated****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	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	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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement					48%	56%		49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains					46%	51%		50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					32%	42%		45%	44%
Math Achievement					41%	51%		37%	51%
Math Learning Gains					45%	48%		38%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					38%	45%		30%	45%
Science Achievement					70%	68%		60%	67%
Social Studies Achievement					67%	73%		60%	71%

### Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	0%	47%	-47%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2021					
	2019	9%	47%	-38%	55%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				



ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2021					
	2019	0%	47%	-47%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	39%	-39%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	0%	46%	-46%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	67%	-67%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	9%	65%	-56%	70%	-61%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	49%	-49%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	49%	-49%	57%	-57%

### Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD										70	
BLK										80	
WHT										47	
FRL										58	7
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

### ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	65
Total Components for the Federal Index	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	70
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	80
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	47
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

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

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

The MTSS process was followed to monitor student progress.

**Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, 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.

**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?**

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.

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

Students fall behind academically due to low attendance and course failure. Support to encourage attendance and use of acceleration strategies and credit recovery will help students get back on a path to graduation.

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

Credit recovery will be available to get students back on track to graduate. After school tutoring will be available. Intensive Reading and Intensive Math courses will be offered for Level 1 and Level 2 students.

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

Teachers will be trained in standards based teaching strategies, differentiated instruction and the appropriate use of digital tools.

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

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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:**

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

In 2021-2022, the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup will increase to at least 41% meeting expectations as determined by the ESSA data.

**Monitoring:**

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

The principals at each school and the Director of Curriculum will monitor reassigned student's progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

All Level 1 and 2 ELA students will be enrolled in Intensive Reading. Intensive Math will be offered. Edgenuity will be utilized for remediation and credit recovery.

MTSS research shows that improvement and growth in ELA and reading is shown when struggling reading students are identified and provided specific interventions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

School grade results, FSA ELA/Math scores and ESSA data were used to determine the areas of focus.

**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. 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**

[no one identified]

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

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

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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:**

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

In 2021-2022, the African-American subgroup data will increase to at least 41% meeting expectations as determined by the ESSA data.

**Monitoring:**

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

The principals at each school of the reassigned students and the Director of Curriculum.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

All Level 1 and 2 ELA students will be enrolled in Intensive Reading. Intensive Math will be offered. Edgenuity will be utilized for remediation and credit recovery.

MTSS research shows that improvement and growth in ELA and reading is shown when struggling reading students are identified and provided specific interventions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

School grade results, FSA ELA/Math scores and ESSA data were used to determine the areas of focus.

**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. 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**

[no one identified]

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

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

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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:**

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

In 2021-2022, the White subgroup data will increase to at least 41% meeting expectations as determined by the ESSA data.

**Monitoring:**

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

The principals at each school of the reassigned students and the Director of Curriculum.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

All Level 1 and 2 ELA students will be enrolled in Intensive Reading. Intensive Math courses will be offered. Edgenuity will be utilized for remediation and credit recovery.

MTSS research shows that improvement and growth in ELA and reading is shown when struggling reading students are identified and provided specific interventions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

School grade results, FSA ELA/Math scores and ESSA data were used to determine the areas of focus.

**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. 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**

[no one identified]

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

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



## **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.**

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.

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.

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

Parents and students will have access and support from teachers and school staff to develop a plan for academic success that will lead to graduation. Local businesses will participate in college and career fairs to expose students to options and allow students to establish contacts.