

Wakulla Institute School



Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Wakulla Institute

126 HIGH DR, Crawfordville, FL 32327

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

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Wakulla Institute is committed to the success of all students, teachers, staff, and our school system. Students will succeed through rigorous and appropriate academic and social/behavioral interventions that are individualized and differentiated while focusing on the Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards.

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
Jarvis, Tyler	Teacher, K-12	
Lafferty, Danni	Teacher, ESE	
Weaver, Nick	Principal	
Pichard, Jessica		
Tillman, Susan		

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.

School Advisory Council is composed of stakeholders from the community, parents, students, and teachers. Input is gathered during scheduled quarterly meetings where the council discusses strengths and weaknesses of the school, suggestions on improvement, and how to increase communication between stakeholders.

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))

Hold quarterly meetings to go over the most current and relative data from : STAR Reading, FAST PM Reading, Pathways Student progress monitoring, student PBS (Benjamins count), WEST forms on IEPs, Edgenuity progress monitoring.

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 KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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)	White Students (WHT)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	19	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	14	
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	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	0	0	0	0	7	8	15

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	9

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	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	7	12	36	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	20	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	33	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	33	
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	2	

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	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	9	15	44

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	19

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	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	7	12	22	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	15	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	21	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	22	
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		

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	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	9	15	29

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	12

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*	0	38	53		43	55			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	0	32	55		41	42			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*		33	52		32	54			
Social Studies Achievement*		77	68		38	59			
Middle School Acceleration			70		27	51			
Graduation Rate			74	91	36	50	50		
College and Career Acceleration			53	30	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	0
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	0
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	48
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	121
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	91

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL				

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	0			0								
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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										91	30	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										100	30	
FRL												

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										50		
SWD												
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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
10	2023 - Spring	10%	55%	-45%	50%	-40%
07	2023 - Spring	0%	53%	-53%	47%	-47%
08	2023 - Spring	*	64%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	7%	59%	-52%	48%	-41%
06	2023 - Spring	*	56%	*	47%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	70%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	64%	*	48%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	53%	*	55%	*

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	45%	*	44%	*

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	53%	*	50%	*

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	62%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	76%	*	63%	*

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

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	76%	*	63%	*

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.

ELA is still the area in the greatest need of improvement with 0% proficiency from FAST PM1 to FAST PM 3. This data was from 2022-23 FSA scores. Our fluid, transient student population is often in the

lowest quartile on state assessments and have often failed or are failing in at least one academic subject. Additionally, they are living with one parent/relative, are more than likely involved in the legal system and are living with significant socioeconomic disadvantages when they are placed with Wakulla Institute (WI).

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

Graduation rate decline from 91% to 67%. Our fluid, transient student population is often in the lowest quartile on state assessments and have often failed or are failing in at least one academic subject. Additionally, they are living with one parent/relative, are more than likely involved in the legal system and are living with significant socioeconomic disadvantages when they are placed with Wakulla Institute (WI).

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.

ELA is still the area in the greatest need of improvement with 0% proficiency from FAST PM1 to FAST PM 3. This data was from 2022-23 FSA scores. Our fluid, transient student population is often in the lowest quartile on state assessments and have often failed or are failing in at least one academic subject. Additionally, they are living with one parent/relative, are more than likely involved in the legal system and are living with significant socioeconomic disadvantages when they are placed with Wakulla Institute (WI).

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

After reviewing all school data there was a decline in all areas.

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

Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment and student attendance.

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

1. Discipline/Reduce number of referrals
2. Increase student participation on Statewide Assessments/EOC
3. Graduation Rate
4. Retaining Teachers
5. Student Attendance

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

Our fluid, transient student population is often in the lowest quartile on state assessments and have often failed or are failing in at least one academic subject. Additionally, they are living with one parent/relative, are more than likely involved in the legal system and are living with significant socioeconomic disadvantages when they are placed with Wakulla Institute (WI). For the reasons stated above WI is targeting proficiency on the new FAST Reading Assessment for our student population.

Measurable Outcome:

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

30% of 3-10 WI students will show learning gains on FAST Reading PM1 to PM 3.

Monitoring:

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

Using progress monitoring tools that include, but are not limited to: STAR assessments, Freckle, the FAST PM 1, 2 and 3 Assessments, and teacher made assessments the students will be monitored on at least a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Pichard (jessica.mckenzie-pichard@wcsb.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.)

When a student is enrolled in WI, all the available data is reviewed by the administration. An individualized schedule is written, if needed a Response to Intervention plan is written and reviewed based on the students area(s) of need. IEP's or 504 plans are reviewed and scheduled for an amendment, and meeting with the parent/guardian to address the needs of the student. Almost every student that attends WI is scheduled in a Peer Counseling course, with a small group setting and a caring, dedicated staff member as a mentor. All students enrolled with a level one or two are enrolled in Intensive courses for the subject area. Individualized remediation is set up for each student and tracked over the course of the nine weeks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Every student is an individual and is treated as such. All student data (academic, behavioral, legal, economic and social) is reviewed to create the best possible successful situation at Wakulla Institute for the individual

student. Because of the unique situations our students come to us from, a static formula for success is not possible. Finding an in-depth, tailored plan for each student has the potential for a much more positive educational outcome, in the long term. Based on productivity in our credit recovery program and the return rate data as part of our exiting criteria, this strategy has shown to be much more successful than a one size fits all approach.

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.

Collect all data on potential students, specifically academic, behavioral, and attendance data.

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.tillman@wcsb.us)

By When:

Develop an individualized and needs-specific plan for that student through the RtI/MTSS, ESE, or 504 processes.

Person Responsible: Jessica Pichard (jessica.mckenzie-pichard@wcsb.us)

By When:

Implement standards-aligned curriculum.

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.tillman@wcsb.us)

By When:

Progress monitor and track data of student growth.

Person Responsible: Jessica Pichard (jessica.mckenzie-pichard@wcsb.us)

By When:

Re-evaluate and/or amend student plan when needed.

Person Responsible: Jessica Pichard (jessica.mckenzie-pichard@wcsb.us)

By When:

Provide long term success monitoring for students who exit the program and return to their home school.

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.tillman@wcsb.us)

By When:

#2. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation

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.

Wakulla Institute needs to increase the rate of graduation. Institute is an alternate school whose student population comes from disciplinary and academic placement from the district. This fluid, transient student population is in the lowest quartile in one or more assessment areas. These students have failed or are failing in at least one academic subject. They often are living with only one parent/relative, are more than likely involved in the legal system, and they experience significant socioeconomic disadvantages due to these overwhelming circumstances. Several of the middle and high school students, age 16 or older, who are recommended or placed at Wakulla Institute sometimes choose to withdraw and pursue a Graduation Equivalency Degree (GED) instead of pursuing a high school diploma.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Wakulla Institute will maintain a high graduation rate of 60% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

WI will:

- *Have students meet with a mentor weekly to help students have a connection at the schools.
- *Have students' progress monitor themselves weekly.
- *Staff meets weekly to discuss student progress and needs.
- *Monthly Rtl team meetings to discuss students.
- *Follow student-designed individualized curriculum programs to help students stay on track.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Tillman (susan.tillman@wcsb.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.)

Students receive individualized goal setting, career mapping and short- and long-term success monitoring while in our program. Mentors meet with students on the WI campus weekly and visit them and track social, emotional and academic needs through weekly check-in visits for their entire first nine weeks of return to the mainstream school system. Student data is used to determine the best program fit for success when they enroll at Wakulla Institute.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who have a long-term educationally goal-oriented plans show higher proclivity to overcome adversity compared to those who simply attend school because they are required. Understanding the outcome of graduation from high school and skill development to increase career opportunities is built into the curriculum at WI. Research has shown that long- and short-term goal setting helps students reach milestones of success that they previously were not aware of as an option for them.

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.

Intake meeting with students and parents with an individualized plan created to exit the program with long term goals established.

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.tillman@wcsb.us)

By When:

Exit criteria for academics, behavior, and attendance that requires students to meet minimal goal-oriented benchmarks before return to the mainstream school system.

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.tillman@wcsb.us)

By When:

College and vocational career mapping for each student as part of the educational curriculum and exiting strategy.

Person Responsible: Jessica Pichard (jessica.mckenzie-pichard@wcsb.us)

By When:

Weekly meeting with mentors at WI to create short term goals

Person Responsible: Tyler Jarvis (tyler.jarvis@wcsb.us)

By When:

Weekly student driven personal progress monitoring

Person Responsible: Tyler Jarvis (tyler.jarvis@wcsb.us)

By When:

Long term success monitoring at home school site by mentors who visit students weekly.

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.tillman@wcsb.us)

By When:

Advocating by mentors, once students return to their home schools, and meetings with guidance, teachers, or administrators at their new school site if students are struggling in any area.

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.tillman@wcsb.us)

By When:

#3. 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.

Wakulla Institute (WI) Wakulla Institute is an alternate school. The majority of the student population is placed here for disciplinary or academic interventions. The fluid, transient student population is in the lowest quartile in one or more assessment areas. These students have failed or are failing in at least one academic subject. They often are living with only one parent/relative, are more than likely involved in the legal system and they experience significant socioeconomic disadvantages due to these overwhelming circumstances will foster a positive student learning environment for all students attending our school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At least 70% of eligible students placed at WI will return to their home school by the end of the 2023-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline records, attendance records, progress reports and report cards, Edgenuity progress reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Tillman (susan.tillman@wcsb.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.)

Students receive individualized goal setting, career mapping and short- and long-term success monitoring while in our program. Mentors meet with students on the WI campus weekly and visit them and track social, emotional and academic needs through weekly check-in visits for their entire first nine weeks of return to the mainstream school system. Student data is used to determine the best program fit for success when they enroll at Wakulla Institute.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who have a long-term educationally goal-oriented plans show higher proclivity to overcome adversity compared to those who simply attend school because they are required. Understanding the outcome of graduation from high school and skill development to increase career opportunities is built into the curriculum at WI. Research has shown that long- and short-term goal setting helps students reach milestones of success that they previously were not aware of as an option for them.

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.

Passing courses (at incoming grade level)

Person Responsible: Jessica Pichard (jessica.mckenzie-pichard@wcsb.us)

By When:

Have no major referrals requiring out of school suspension and 2 or less minor referrals.

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.tillman@wcsb.us)

By When:

Attendance of 85% or higher.

Person Responsible: Tyler Jarvis (tyler.jarvis@wcsb.us)

By When: No outside legal issues that would continue placement.

No description entered

Person Responsible: Nick Weaver (nicholas.weaver@wcsb.us)

By When:

Weekly student driven personal progress monitoring

Person Responsible: Tyler Jarvis (tyler.jarvis@wcsb.us)

By When:

Long term success monitoring at home school site by mentors who visit students weekly.

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.tillman@wcsb.us)

By When:

Advocating by mentors, once students return to their home schools, and meetings with guidance, teachers, or administrators at their new school site if students are struggling in any area.

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.tillman@wcsb.us)

By When:

#4. 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.

The Graduation Deferment Program is a program developed for qualified students with Individualized Educational Plans that have meet graduation requirements but need continued support until the age of 22 so they can learn how to live independently.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At least 70% of students in the Graduation Deferment Program will achieve 1 or more goal on their IEP.

Monitoring:

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

Teacher developed checklist and IEP progress reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danni Lafferty (danni.lafferty@wcsb.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.)

Social skills developments, hands on learning, visual aids and checklists, repeated practice on skills, positive reinforcement to reach goal, immediate feedback, and redirection.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Graduation Deferment Program is a program developed for qualified students with Individualized Educational Plans that have meet graduation requirements but need continued support until the age of 22 so they can learn how to live independently.

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.

Students will participate in Legacy Cafe which allows practice for individual student goals including community-based instruction for shopping for ingredients.

Person Responsible: Danni Lafferty (danni.lafferty@wcsb.us)

By When:

Students are required to measure and prep necessary ingredients to assemble preboarded meals.

Person Responsible: Danni Lafferty (danni.lafferty@wcsb.us)

By When:

Deliver meals to all Wakulla school employees.

Person Responsible: Danni Lafferty (danni.lafferty@wcsb.us)

By When:

Students clean used materials and prepping area to prepare for the next Legacy Day.

Person Responsible: Danni Lafferty (danni.lafferty@wcsb.us)

By When: