
Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Wabasso School

8895 N US HIGHWAY 1, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschool.org

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Kohlstedt

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | <i>[Data Not Available]</i> |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| 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 to maximize their full potential!

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|--------------|--|
| Kohlstedt, Chris | Principal | School leader. Evaluates school functions, builds teamwork. Clearly communicates and monitors school expectations. Welcomes and assesses input from peers, colleagues, faculty, staff and community and implements best practice procedures on our campus. Advocates for and promotes the Wabasso community. Student centered. Models appropriate behaviors and puts students first. |
| Fregel, Bry | Teacher, ESE | This teacher has served as an administrator on duty at Wabasso in previous years and has an historical knowledge of the programs that have taken place on the campus as well as respected professional relationships with the staff. She puts students first. |
| Neely, Lauren | Other | This FSA track teacher is positively influential on the campus and promotes best practice within the classroom and on campus. She puts students first. |
| Schneller, Jennifer | Other | This Speech and Language Pathologist knows every student on campus as she provides therapy to almost every one of them. She was also a previous administrator so she brings a unique perspective to our team and understands the administrative role/perspective. She is a sounding board for new and old ideas based on results she has encountered. She puts students first. |
| Hartmann, Alyssa | Teacher, ESE | This FSAA track teacher is a developing leader and an aspiring administrator. She serves the school in multiple capacities from strong instructional leader to department chair and she also leads several committees effectively. She is a staunch child advocate and puts students first. |
| Cooper, Clarence | Other | This Behavior Analyst leads our Behavior Technicians through weekly meetings regarding student behavior data. He adjusts practice to meet the needs of our students while encouraging teamwork and collaboration as well as staff development through Professional Crisis Management practices. He puts students first. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/21/2020, Christopher Kohlstedt

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

0

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

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

11

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | <i>[Data Not Available]</i> |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 21 | 62 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 21 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| | 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 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 11 | 44 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/25/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

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 |

Prior Year - Updated

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

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

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 |

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% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 0% | 60% | 59% | 0% | 63% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 53% | 54% | 0% | 62% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 0% | 70% | 62% | 0% | 70% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 0% | 62% | 59% | 0% | 66% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 51% | 52% | 0% | 56% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 0% | 67% | 56% | 0% | 62% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 0% | 90% | 78% | 0% | 85% | 75% |

| 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 | | |
| | (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.

| 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% | | | | |
| 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% |
| 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |

ESSA Data

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 43 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| 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.

African American subgroup performed below the 41% mark (35%). We need to purposely target the instruction provided to our African American students and support progress toward outcomes.

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

Though Wabasso's data cohorts are too small to calibrate comparative data, we are aware that our academic performance for FSA tested students has been stagnant, primarily holding at Level 1 in ELA and Math for those (10 students) tested. Factors for the 17/18 to 18/19 data could have been that the students are EBD students whose behavioral struggles tend to be a barrier. We have also identified that Standards-based instruction and a potential lack of differentiation may have been present at the time of this instruction. Therefore, both factors have been considered in this SIP as "Areas of Focus" for the 2020-2021 school year.

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.

This information is difficult to determine because the cohort numbers are too small and the data is now 2 years old.

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

Again, the data and cohorts are too small as well as out-dated. We have developed a practice in the last year of looking more critically at the needs of each student, their IEP goals and their need to receive standards aligned instruction with differentiated lessons/delivery.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our Areas of Focus for the 2020-2021 school year relate to standards-based instruction, Differentiation and a social-emotional component for behaviors as well as an additional focus on the utilization of a human resource to deliver student-specific skills in the form of a "special" and in support of independent functioning.

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

1. To provide instruction to students that meet their current levels of independence and access.
2. To increase student attendance for all students.
3. Align instruction around the Florida Standards for FSA and ULS (FSAA) students.
4. Successfully transition students to less restrictive environments with supporting documentation
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: There are evident gaps in the academic performance of our students. To increase the probability of closing gaps, standards-aligned instruction will be the starting point and should guide the instructional delivery.

Measurable Outcome: If our teachers use standards-aligned instruction with fidelity, we should see an increase in performance outcomes for our students on Formal Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: A USC, Scholar Commons study was conducted to determine the impact of standards-based instruction on achievement levels of students with moderate to severe intellectual disabilities and found that standards based instruction for all students maintains a comparable standard level of expectation and achievement regardless of ability. Allowing students access with differentiation leads to overall positive outcomes as compared to students who did not receive standards based instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Standardized instructional practice allows for all students to access the same content, minimizing the opportunity for gaps and maximizing the content specific instruction needed to stay aligned with their peers.

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct a PD on standards based instruction from deconstruction to implementation so that teachers are aware of the intent of the standards and how to develop lessons that reach that intent. September 23rd.

Person Responsible: Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Administration will walk through classrooms weekly to monitor implementation of standards-based instruction after bi-weekly review of lesson plans and data chats to ensure goals and objectives relating to instructional planning and delivery are being met.

Person Responsible: Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Walk through data will be used to determine next steps in the cycle.

Person Responsible: Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Wabasso is a separate day school with the majority of the students having EBD as a primary or secondary exceptionality, indicating the need for additional, focused behavior management techniques and social emotional support.

Measurable Outcome: With the implementation of a structured social-emotional program like Sanford Harmony and a scheduled period of the day to implement, student's Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) should show an increase in appropriate behavior.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Clarence Cooper (clarence.cooper@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of the Sanford Harmony. Sanford Harmony components found to have positive impact on children's peer relations when compared to control groups not using Sanford Harmony..

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By assigning the first 15 minutes of the day to focus on "Well-being", the students and staff begin by experiencing something positive to start the day. Whether that be a positive word or gesture from someone else or being able to talk about a pending issue, it is a moment for support to set the tone for the day. Though the utilization of Sanford Harmony is encouraged, there are a variety of programs and strategies available and though the allotted time is the first 15 minutes of the day, this practice should take place frequently throughout the duration of every day.

Action Steps to Implement

Add designated time to each classrooms schedule. Teachers were given a schedule with the 1st 15 minutes blocked for the implementation of a Social Emotional activity or lesson such as Sanford Harmony to bring the class together through the utilization and modeling of appropriate meet and greet, feeling expressions, targeted areas for class unification and other appropriate social skills.

Person Responsible Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Provide training and resources to those who do not have prior training or needed resources.

Person Responsible Clarence Cooper (clarence.cooper@indianriverschools.org)

Monitor outcomes through behavioral data (Behavior Intervention Plan)

Person Responsible Clarence Cooper (clarence.cooper@indianriverschools.org)

Utilize data outcomes to determine additional support or professional development for sustainable outcomes.

Person Responsible Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Each of the students at Wabasso is on an IEP. Each IEP specifies the individual students needs. Therefore, with multiple students in each class requiring a unique level of instruction, differentiation becomes a critical component in their learning plan. Using differentiated, standards-based instruction, students will receive content aligned to the Florida Standards at a pace and level that is appropriate for the individual learner.

Measurable Outcome: During data chats we should see an increase in student performance data regardless of the track (FSA/FSAA) they are on.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Lawrence-Brown (2004) confirms that differentiated instruction can enable students with a wide range of abilities—from gifted students to those with mild or even severe disabilities—to receive an appropriate education in inclusive classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Some students are served through ULS and some are served through traditionally means but each can access standards based instruction if the content is differentiated to maximize the students highest level of access to the standard/concept/skill being taught.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be engaged in Professional development specifically addressing the practice of differentiation.

Person Responsible Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Administration will frequently monitor the lesson delivery in each classroom, specifically identifying parts of the lesson that were differentiated to meet the need of each student in every classroom. This will also be reviewed and discussed at the bi-weekly data chats for the 3 different areas of instruction (FSA/FSAA/ Non-tested).

Person Responsible Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Additional support will be provided in areas of need once the monitoring data is collected and reviewed.

Person Responsible Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Each of the students at Wabasso School have an Individual Education Plan that guides the instructional practice around their needs both academically, socially, behaviorally. Our focus in this area is to provide a unique opportunity to focus on each student's personal needs, relating to independent skills through the utilization of human resources.

Measurable Outcome: In collaboration with the classroom teacher, the teacher of this elective will help to expedite the achievement of each students goals in the area of independence and daily living skills by providing a "double dose" of skills in a small group setting designed specifically to meet each child's needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teaching and Learning Resources(NYU)-Independent study refers to the range of instructional methods which are purposefully provided to foster the development of individual student initiative, self-reliance, and self-improvement. Independent study can also include learning in partnership with another individual or as part of a small group. It is important that the instructor make sure that learners have the necessary skills in order to accomplish the task. Independent study is very flexible. It can be used as the major instructional strategy with the whole class, in combination with other strategies, or it can be used with one or more individuals while another strategy is used with the rest of the class.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Isolating a pre-determined, specific skill for a specific individual twice a week for 30 minutes each session should potentially meet the achievement of an anticipated goal in 2/3 the amount of time it would take without it.

Action Steps to Implement

Redesigned the Job Coach responsibilities to include all students school wide in a rotational process that addresses each students specific needs ranging from advanced to complex in groups no larger than 4.

Person Responsible Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Get buy in from the leadership team.

Person Responsible Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Communicate with Wabasso Team and get their buy-in.

Person Responsible Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct survey to identify the skills that the teacher and job coach can collaborate and focus on.

Person Responsible Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Determine logistics. Schedule that allows for the rotation without interrupting pre-scheduled academics and support services. Space for the facilitation.

Person Responsible Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Implement the plan

Person Responsible Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Monitor for effectiveness and determine next steps based on acceleration of goal obtainment.

Person Responsible Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Transitioning students to a less restrictive environment will also be a secondary focus. We are following the Least Restrictive Environment protocol as well as determining research based criteria that identify when students are most likely "Ready"/"Prepared" for a transition. We continue to discuss what Wabasso's actions will be to support a successful transition.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

We hire skilled, compassionate teammates to ensure the continuity and expectations of the school. We provide quality instruction that focus on the needs of each student and their IEP. We collaborate frequently at all levels to ensure that our practice is clearly defined and accountability is shared by each member of the team. Wabasso participates with multiple community partners ranging from Charter School to local organizations. We are visible in the community and host an annual 5K as a fundraiser for the school. We have traditionally hosted and arts and craft fair, created meals for the school and district offices. We communicate with our families and encourage feedback regarding the services that we provide to their children and families. Wabasso utilizes available resources to support school initiatives and to outreach our skills via PD to others who may benefit from reciprocated discussion and professional practice. We share a common goal and interest which is to serve ALL students with excellence.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |