

Wakulla County Schools

Wakulla Coast Charter School Of Arts Science &



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Wakulla Coast Charter School Of Arts Science & Technology

48 SHELL ISLAND ROAD, St Marks, FL 32355

<http://www.coastcharter.us>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

C.O.A.S.T. will provide an educational choice to students and their parents that is characterized by:

1. The intensive study of the Arts and Sciences, in continuous progression and at the highest standards of achievement.
2. A structured environment resulting from a specific code of conduct with diligent attention to character development.
3. The infusion of technology into all subject areas, expanding the student's world beyond classroom boundaries.
4. Dynamic, integrated core curriculum designed to include the study and appreciation of Wakulla County's unique ecosystem.
5. Shared responsibility among students, parents, and teachers in the operation of the school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Here at C.O.A.S.T., we believe in a commitment to small schools, character development, creating informed citizens, setting a strong foundation in the core subjects, celebrating the arts, providing real-life learning, supporting educators, and highlighting Wakulla's unique environment. In a small school, staff, students, and families become closer which allows for cooperative support for students and to accommodate students' learning needs. We also believe in supporting our educators in their role in shaping the lives of every student. Character development also plays a role in a small school, teaching and reinforcing the character traits necessary to help shape our students into successful adults. Part of our student success is staying informed and becoming life-long learners about not only things they're interested in but the geography and peoples of the entire globe, as all human beings have value and should be treated with respect. As life-long learners, a strong foundation in the core subjects and arts is vital. Students need higher-order thinking skills to solve problems independently and the creativity/self-expression learned from the various arts in order to think outside of the box. To provide the most supportive, well-rounded learning environment and opportunities for both students and staff, we utilize local environmental resources to bring nature into the curricula. Through various activities and programs, we hope to foster appreciation and awareness of all that our county has to offer.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the 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
LaChapelle, Jeffrey	Principal	School Principal. In charge of coordination and planning of all instructional staffing and operations of school. School Principal will coordinate and participate in staff development through setting up professional development and on going training of all staff members. Principal will coordinate administrative oversight of instructional administration, budget planning, discipline planning and follow through as well as working with vendors as needed.
Dichio, Christine	Dean	Assist Principal in all instructional school needs. Communication with parents and staff on student data input and updates. Student minor discipline follow-up by working with teachers and intervention staff to correct discipline concerns. Working directly with title 1 coordinator, SAC coordinator and district office to be sure that we remain in compliance with grant qualifications. Communication and enforcements of attendance rules and notifications. Assist principal with classroom walk-throughs.
Bryan, Sydney	Teacher, ESE	Assist Principal in all instructional school needs. Communication with parents and staff on student data input and updates. Student minor discipline follow-up by working with teachers and intervention staff to correct discipline concerns. Working directly with title 1 coordinator, SAC coordinator and district office to be sure that we remain in compliance with grant qualifications. Communication and enforcements of attendance rules and notifications. Assist principal with classroom walk-throughs.
Gerrell, Lesley	Teacher, K-12	Intervention Specialist, SAC coordinator, Title I data and events coordinator. RTI and reading teacher to assist students and staff with reading tiered students. Middle school Intensive Reading instructional teacher working with students with reading struggles.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The stakeholders involved in the SIP development at COAST are the SAC Committee, teachers, other school staff and community members. Our SAC Committee consists of the Principal, Title I Coordinator, parents and teachers. All of these people work together to not only develop the SIP, but to check and make sure the SIP is being implemented throughout the school year.

Our SIP development process begins with the Title I Coordinator writing a draft plan that is given to all stakeholders to read and give input. Once all input is given and disseminated, the updated draft is then given to the SAC Committee to approve at the first SAC meeting. Once approved, the SIP is submitted for District approval.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

During the school year, the SIP will be monitored by the SAC Committee and COAST Board. Every SAC meeting will include a review of the SIP and student data to determine whether any updates should be made to the SIP to ensure continuous improvement. In addition, the subgroup we target in this SIP (Students with Disabilities) will be monitored even more frequently to ensure improvement or to make adjustments to instruction and the SIP in order to better target those students who need the most help.

Outside of scheduled reviews of the SIP by the SAC Committee and COAST Board, student data will be reviewed by the School Leadership Team and classroom teachers after every progress monitoring period to adjust the focus of instruction to help improve student achievement. Based on student data and input from classroom teachers, adjustments will be made to the SIP, if necessary.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	16%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	11	8	9	13	5	5	9	5	6	71
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	2	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	7	5	4	3	2	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	7	6	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	4	4	22

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	4	2	0	1	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	4

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	13	13	4	8	5	10	4	7	5	69
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	12
Course failure in ELA	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	7
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	3	3	1	5	6	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	2	11	9	5	4	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	1	7	3	7	4	6	3	34

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	0	3	0	2	3	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	1	1	7

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	13	13	4	8	5	10	4	7	5	69
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	12
Course failure in ELA	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	7
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	3	3	1	5	6	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	2	11	9	5	4	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	1	7	3	7	4	6	3	34

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	0	3	0	2	3	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	1	1	7

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	42	38	53	48	43	55	43		
ELA Learning Gains				57			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			64		
Math Achievement*	33	32	55	34	41	42	41		
Math Learning Gains				42			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			64		
Science Achievement*	31	33	52	36	32	54	41		
Social Studies Achievement*	77	77	68	73	38	59	31		
Middle School Acceleration			70	20	27	51			
Graduation Rate			74		36	50			
College and Career Acceleration			53		59	70			
ELP Progress			55		20	70			

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	196
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	13	Yes	4	4
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	10	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	34	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	23	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	42			33			31	77				
SWD	11			18			10				3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	10										1	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	45			33			32	90			5	
FRL	38			29			21	73			5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	48	57	50	34	42	50	36	73	20			
SWD	27	36		9	18							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49	55	45	36	41	45	35	73	20			
FRL	53	64	36	33	45	60	44					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	43	50	64	41	60	64	41	31				
SWD	24	62		25	46							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	45	53	70	43	63	64	43	31				
FRL	44	52		32	55		39	36				

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
05	2023 - Spring	42%	59%	-17%	54%	-12%
07	2023 - Spring	41%	53%	-12%	47%	-6%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	64%	-14%	47%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	61%	-11%	58%	-8%
06	2023 - Spring	55%	56%	-1%	47%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	12%	55%	-43%	50%	-38%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	50%	70%	-20%	54%	-4%
07	2023 - Spring	56%	64%	-8%	48%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	12%	61%	-49%	59%	-47%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	59%	-20%	61%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	53%	-3%	55%	-5%
05	2023 - Spring	21%	64%	-43%	55%	-34%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	43%	45%	-2%	44%	-1%
05	2023 - Spring	21%	57%	-36%	51%	-30%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	71%	-2%	66%	3%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 data component showing the lowest performance was Math and ELA for our ESSA Subgroup of Students with Disabilities (SWD). Our students in that subgroup had a Federal Index percentage of 23%, which is well below the 41% cut-off. The noticeable trends in our data are that 45.5% of SWD scored an achievement level of 1 and 27.3% at level 2 in ELA, while 45.5% at level 1 and 45.5% at level 2 in Math. Our SWD are low achieving in in both Math and ELA, highlighting their deficiencies in reading. Contributing factors to that low performance include the widening learning gap due to increased reading deficiencies in students of all grade levels and an increased need for specialized time learning the basics of reading.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year is, again, Math and ELA in our SWD subgroup. Contributing factors to that low performance include the widening learning gap due to increased reading deficiencies in students of all grade levels and an increased need for specialized time learning the basics of reading.

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.

Math and Science were the data components with the greatest gaps when compared to the state average. The factors contributing to those gaps include the learning gap and reading deficiencies previously discussed, as well as the number of students testing in those components for our school. COAST has drastically fewer students testing in our grade levels than other, much larger, schools. Therefore, any students not scoring an achievement level of 3 or more are easily identified and look drastically worse than schools with higher sample sizes of students.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was ELA. The new actions our school took to improve this area are continuing to have two full-time RtI instructors, an increased focus on literacy in all subjects and the implementation of W.O.R.D. Wednesday. Our literacy focus for reading helped because the students were able to apply the strategies they learned to read and comprehend the reading material in all subjects. Providing more time for teachers to focus on the components of reading helped students become more confident in their ability to read. W.O.R.D. Wednesday gave our students an opportunity to read independently for 30-45 uninterrupted minutes each week, giving them more "mileage" and exposure to grade-level specific texts outside of class work.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Two potential concerns for our school going into this school year are the number of students with less than 90% attendance and students scoring a level 1 or 2 in Math.

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

1. Increasing the achievement and learning gains of Students with Disabilities.
2. Decreasing the number of students scoring a level 1 or 2 in Math.
3. Decreasing the number of students with attendance rates below 90%.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

COAST will strive to meet the needs of our SWD subgroup through targeted, individualized interventions. The remediation staff, teachers, ESE coordinator and administrator will work together to analyze data of students in progress monitoring programs such as F.A.S.T., Study Island, Edmentum, and reading interventions as well as analyze student engagement of progress to continuously improve the learning environment necessary for individual students. Teachers, parents and the intervention team will work together to develop and improve an IEP with accommodations that will work to close the academic learning gap for each student. Teachers, parents and the intervention team will work closely to minimize barriers and close gaps to help the student meet their standards-based, grade-level objectives and goals. Increasing the academic performance and engagement of students with disabilities will expand the opportunities of grade-level content exposure available to these students so they can be successful in school and life situations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

COAST will increase the Federal Index for Students with Disabilities to above 45% in 2024.

Monitoring:

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

SWD Proficiency performance will be monitored on a quarterly basis using F.A.S.T. results for K-8th grade students. Targeted students' results will be tracked and individual plans modified as necessary. In addition to our diagnostic results, we will continue our monthly data meetings to review student growth progress within small group instruction and growth progress in our utilized online platforms. Our team of administrators and ESE specialists will collect data from observations, teacher reports and online platforms to review and reset strategies for small-group instruction. These data meetings will also allow our team to identify student academic needs earlier in the process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sydney Bryan (sydney.bryan@coastcharter.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Increased instructional time teachers have with students to build subject-related skills will increase the exposure to grade-level content and academic achievement for our SWDs. Teachers train on how to access student IEPs and how to build routines within the classroom to be sure all student accommodations are being utilized for maximum efficiency. Middle school SWDs scoring a level 1 or 2 on FSA will be in intensive reading using the Read 180 program to close learning gaps. Data Days/Data Chats help teachers provide IEP follow-up and progress monitoring implementation for this Area of Focus. They will also help teachers monitor data for students and modify learning plans within lessons. Teachers and intervention specialists will be sure that accommodations meet the needs of the students, build student understanding of those accommodations and build routines that inspire students to continue using those accommodations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The amount of intentional instructional time we are able to offer students with disabilities in the general classroom will make a positive impact on the students' abilities to learn content at grade level within each

subject. Go Math, Into Math, Amplify, Study Island and Edmentum learning content will provide the standards-based instructional environment necessary for building rigor in the lessons. Administrator feedback and instructional consulting will provide teachers with the skills needed to address students' educational needs. An increase in student engagement and student self-confidence through the use of Kagan strategies will decrease the distractions in the classroom that take away from academic instruction time. Continued monitoring of accommodations and how they are used by the teachers and students will give greater insight into how they are working to close the student learning gaps.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Standards-based instruction using Amplify, Go Math, Into Math, Waggle and Study Island components as teaching tools within the classroom. Instructional consultant, administrator and intervention team will conduct monthly classroom walk-throughs to ensure that standards-based instruction is taking place with the highest level of rigor possible.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey LaChapelle (jeffrey.lachapelle@coastcharter.us)

By When: Monitoring teacher performance will continue throughout the entire school year.

Additional staff added to our ESE team to increase the amount of small group instruction for our students with disabilities. Progress monitoring and hands-on student activities will be increased with the addition of ESE certified staff. We will offer smaller group sizes and more specific standards-based gap closure interventions by offering more available time slots.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey LaChapelle (jeffrey.lachapelle@coastcharter.us)

By When: Beginning of the school year

Kagan strategies and character development strategies will be built into daily routines to increase self-confidence in students as well as promote student engagement.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey LaChapelle (jeffrey.lachapelle@coastcharter.us)

By When: Continuous throughout the school year

Ongoing progress monitoring and data analysis to modify instruction and offer tiers of support to students based on academic performance.

Person Responsible: Sydney Bryan (sydney.bryan@coastcharter.us)

By When: Continuous throughout the school year

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A positive school culture and environment provides supportive and ideal learning conditions for all students, develops trust between students and staff, and fosters respect amongst all stakeholders in the school. Continuously striving to improve the school culture and climate is a necessity and something every student, parent and staff member of COAST can benefit from.

Measurable Outcome:

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

COAST will increase student, parent and staff feedback opportunities from once to at least twice a year so we can address any issues affecting the positive school culture and environment. COAST will also increase our attendance rate by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Twice a year, we will send out a climate survey to staff, students and parents for real-time feedback. We will send it out at the end of Semester 1 and at the end of the school year. Our first climate survey will allow us to get immediate feedback to make adjustments and work through any identified issues before the school year is over. The final climate survey will let us know how our adjustments worked, or if they need to be adjusted again for the coming school year. Both surveys will provide us the data points we need to measure the success of our strategies to increase the positive school culture and environment at COAST.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeffrey LaChapelle (jeffrey.lachapelle@coastcharter.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

COAST has hired a school Guidance Counselor (using the Child Safety Matters curriculum) and appointed a Dean of Discipline. In addition, COAST has limited class transitions for middle school students to special areas, and dropped music from the schedule to focus on art. Finally, we will be using a PBIS system to address behaviors and positivity at our school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Guidance counselors help students access unbiased academic and social/emotional development opportunities. This allows teachers to identify any personal issues a student has before it becomes a problem in class. Additionally, counselors help create an opportunity for students to freely share concerns and address personal problems that could affect their academics. Similarly, our Dean of Discipline will address behaviors that affect students and staff, while also checking in with parents and students about attendance.

Limiting transitions to as few as possible will help reduce the opportunities for our middle school students to exhibit negative behaviors and help build a sense of community within their own grade level. Along with limited transitions, we removed music from the schedule based on student preferences and interest levels. Lastly, we will continue to implement a PBIS system focusing on positives to remind students of their achievements, no matter how small.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

COAST will hire a Guidance Counselor and Dean of Discipline to help address student behaviors before and after they happen at school. Both positions will help students learn social/emotional strategies.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey LaChapelle (jeffrey.lachapelle@coastcharter.us)

By When: Beginning of the school year

Implement the PBIS system at all grade levels, including special areas and with non-instructional staff.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey LaChapelle (jeffrey.lachapelle@coastcharter.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

Adjust the school schedule to remove music from special areas and focus more on art. Also, adjust the school schedule to limit transitions for middle school students (students will have one teacher all day, with the exception of special areas).

Person Responsible: Jeffrey LaChapelle (jeffrey.lachapelle@coastcharter.us)

By When: Beginning of the school year

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

The process for reviewing school improvement funding and resource allocations begins and ends with the COAST School Advisory Council (SAC). Information on funds and resources are listed on the agenda for the SAC meeting and given to all attendees. The agenda is also posted for the public, should they want to attend the meeting. During the SAC meeting, the funds and resources are discussed with all attendees, requiring votes and approvals as needed. Additional funds and resources will be allocated toward training for teachers, with a focus on Students with Disabilities. This training includes implementing strategies like Kagan and PBIS programs.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP, which serves as the schoolwide plan, is accessible to the public in multiple resources and formats. An electronic copy is available on the district website, school website, Florida CIMS, and the Parent and Family Engagement Plan. How to access the SIP is also included in the Annual Title I Night presentation and school newsletters and communications, such as social media. A physical copy of the SIP is available in the front office of each school, along with SAC schedules, agendas and minutes. All documents can be translated, as needed, by the district's Student Services office.

School Improvement & Accountability - <https://www.wakullaschooldistrict.org/departments/specialprograms-assessment/special-programs-and-assessment-menu/school-improvement-and-accountability>

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Each school's School Advisory Council (SAC) and the District Advisory Council (DAC) is composed of parents, district staff members, teachers, and community members. The DAC meets annually to review the Title I grant. At this time, a draft of the LEA Plan is submitted for review and feedback. The DAC must approve the District's Title I LEA Plan, Parent Family Engagement Plan (PFEP), and the process for allocating PFEP funds to schools.

Each school includes the PFEP on their SAC agenda for members to review and provide input into the school-level Parent Family Engagement Plan. During School Advisory Council meetings, parents discuss and approve different types of activities best suited to meet the needs of the school and parents. School Advisory Council meetings, to which all parents are invited, are advertised on district and school websites, school newsletters, and school marquees to ensure parents are informed of the meeting dates and times. SAC meetings are documented by agendas, minutes, and sign-in sheets which reflect input from parents on parent family engagement activities and policies. This documentation is submitted to the Title I office quarterly.

Schools host Title I events to build the capacity of parents to help their children at home. A 'link to learning' is embedded in all Title I activities to assist parents with understanding the state's academic standards.

2023-2024 WCSD Title I, Part A Parent and Family Brochure - <https://resources.finalseite.net/images/v1692381305/wakullaschooldistrictorg/slxstsepxqcuuvccqgqxqg/23-24WCSDDTitleIBrochure6.pdf>

Annual Title I Presentation for parents and Families - <https://www.wakullaschooldistrict.org/departments/special-programs-assessment/special-programs-and-assessment-menu/title-1>

School Parent and Family Engagement Plans - <https://www.wakullaschooldistrict.org/departments/special-programs-assessment/special-programs-and-assessment-menu/parent-and-family-engagement>

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Area of Focus 1

Area of Focus 2

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The LEA provides COAST Charter with allocations for all federal programs to use in coordination with other programs to increase student achievement through school improvement priorities and initiatives.