Wabasso School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Wabasso School

8895 N US HIGHWAY 1, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschool.org

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Kohlstedt

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19:
School Grades History	2017-18: 2016-17: 2015-16: 2014-15: 2013-14:
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Indian River County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To Serve All Students with Excellence!

Provide the school's vision statement

To educate, inspire, and empower our students to succeed in school and community through academic achievement and development of independent living, communication, and social skills in a safe environment.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kohlstedt, Chris	Principal	Oversee and evaluate the daily functions at Wabasso School
Rowe, Kelley	Teacher, ESE	Teach job-skills, daily living skills, assist with school processes and ensure safety for students.
Caldara, Joann	Other	Assist teacher with lessons, student management and transitions.
Crain, Redina	Other	Assist teacher with lessons, student management and transitions.
Halverson, Bridget	Other	Teacher Exceptional Ed Vision
Lugones, Vanessa	Teacher, ESE	Develop lessons, student management, assessments.
Schneller, Jennifer	Other	Speech and Language - assist with school functions and covers classrooms when additional support is needed.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	1	2	1	5	9	9	9	7	7	7	22	79
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4	4	3	4	4	12	39
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	2	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	3	3	2	1	2	0	19
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	1	1	1	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	5	0	0	1	1	13

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	0	2	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	5	2	4	1	0	21

(Grade Level columns: K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12)

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	1	3	8	7	9	5	5	5	10	55

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	72%	61%	0%	68%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	60%	59%	0%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	53%	54%	0%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	70%	62%	0%	69%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	62%	59%	0%	72%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	52%	0%	71%	52%
Science Achievement	0%	67%	56%	0%	74%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	90%	78%	0%	89%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	9 (0)	9 (0)	9 (0)	7 (0)	7 (0)	7 (0)	22 (0)	79 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	12 (0)	39 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)

(Grade Level (prior year reported) columns: K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	19 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	60%	-60%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	61%	-61%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
09	2019	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	51%	-51%	53%	-53%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	0%	64%	-64%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	64%	-64%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	57%	-57%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	53%	-53%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	47%	-47%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	49%	-49%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	50%	-50%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	64%	-64%	67%	-67%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	64%	-64%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	70%	-70%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	58%	-58%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
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	258
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

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

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

Proficiency of Black/African American students was our lowest performing subgroup. There were 20 students in this subgroup and only 8 took the FSA. Each of the students in

this subgroup who took ELA and/or Math scored a level 1 Achievement. The remainder of the students in this subgroup take alternate assessments.

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

Due to the composition of this school, we do not have enough students in any subgroup to calculate a comparable score.

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

Due to the composition of this school, we do not have enough students in any subgroup to calculate a comparable score.

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

Due to the composition of this school, we do not have enough students in any subgroup to calculate a comparable score.

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

Attendance is a concern for some of our students. In order to adequately utilize every teaching opportunity, students need to be in our presence. If they are not at school or if they are tardy, they are missing opportunities.

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

1. Improve Independent Functioning for all students
2. Increase Intervention strategies and provide Training related to behavior de-escalation to reduce Code Calls
3. Collect multiple data sources to guide instruction and determine data-based placements
4. Increase the performance of our African American students
5. Increase student attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Independent Functioning
Rationale	All of the students on our campuses have Individual Education Plans and the majority of those plans include goals for independent functioning and/or similar goals/ skills to move toward a least restrictive environment.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The school plans to increase the independent functioning of all students through teamwork, collaboration, individual goals for students and a unified system of support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Documentation of independent functioning will be reflected in the student's classroom records as well as recorded in the child's IEP.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher's keep anecdotal records as well as formal records.
Action Step	
Description	1. Plan for individual student needs 2. Deliver instruction with engaging practice 3. Monitor for effectiveness 4. Keep record of progress 5. Differentiation of instruction for Black/African American students
Person Responsible	Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

#2	
Title	De-escalation
Rationale	To provide an environment suitable for learning and to teach de-escalation strategies to students for their social-emotional well-being and safety of all.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease the number of physical restraints due to "Crisis" or unsafe physical aggression.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue to train staff in the use of PCM (Professional Crisis Management) techniques for verbal de-escalation and appropriate, safe restraint (if necessary).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	PCM is utilized as an approved, certified method of deescalation training which provides strategies on how to verbally deescalate students and (if needed) use an individual and team approach to physical restraint which is non-threatening and helps keep the student and those around and involved with the crisis safe.

Action Step	
Description	1. Schedule training for re-certification for those who will expire in 2019 or who have lapsed recently. 2. Provide initial PCM certification to Principal and Behavior intervention Specialist 3. Provide Train the Trainer opportunity for current Behavior Tech as a resident trainer on campus. 4. Provide initial PCM certification to remainder of untrained faculty and staff for sustainability. 5.
Person Responsible	Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Data collection will occur bi-weekly with data meetings for FSA, FSAA and "Non-tested" groups to ensure continued progress.
Subgroup data for African American students will be isolated to determine strategies for closing the gap.
Attendance will be addressed through phone calls home, newsletters, website, marque' posting, incentives for attending.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

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

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

*SAC membership-improved attendance at meetings
*Parent attendance at IEP Meetings
*Increased daily communication through teacher/parent notebooks
Created a quarterly newsletter
Updating information and building an active website
Using school messenger to conduct parent calls providing information and reminders

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

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

The school's "School Psychologist" provides efficacious leadership in modeling proper form and technique in ensuring student esteem and well-being at all times. Moreover, students are enrolled in social-personal skills coursework, thereby receiving daily instruction in this critical area. In addition, teachers will receive training in Sanford Harmony, an approved social-emotional program.

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

Wabasso uses a multidisciplinary approach to teaching. Since we do not have "inclusion" opportunities on our campus, our goal is to transition students to their Least Restrictive Environment when they are ready to do so successfully. We monitor their progress and then conduct meetings with the receiving school to ensure a smooth transition. If we are receiving incoming students, we meet with the outgoing school, identify the student's current needs and plan to receive that student on our campus.

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

As the principal of an ESE special education center school, it is necessary to identify the schools overall needs (instructional, curricular, behavioral, facility, etc) and re-align all resources to meet the school year goals and expectations. With the federal, state and local funding, classrooms are staffed to meet the student needs and to maintain a safe and

secure environment. Instructional resources are aligned with state adoption materials. With our unique needs, it is critical to identify additional research-based resources to teach and reinforce skill acquisition.

The school administrator, support staff, teachers and district personnel will meet to discuss needs, acquisition of resources, professional development needs and implementation of plans or projects. Data analysis along with the student Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) determines most of the school's essential needs..

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

Attention is given to student readiness, intellectual level, and skill set prior to recommendations via the Transition portion of the IEP for students beginning at age 14 and continuing through age 21. Some students participating in our Transition Model will be instructed within the community for a portion of their day to build employability skills. Many students will participate in community-based instruction activities building daily living and independent functioning skills.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Independent Functioning				$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: De-escalation				$3,896.77
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	100-Salaries	0131 - Wabasso School	Title, I Part A		$2,259.69
			Notes: Deescalation- Professional Crisis Management- recertification for 5 employees.			
	5100	700-Other Expenses	0131 - Wabasso School	Title, I Part A		$1,637.08
			Notes: Deescalation- Professional Crisis Management -Train the Trainer- 1 employee			
					Total:	**$4,546.77**