

School District of Indian River County

Wabasso School



2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	17

Wabasso School

8895 N US HIGHWAY 1, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschool.org

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Kohlstedt

Start Date for this Principal: 8/7/2019

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	ESE
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2021-22 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 Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Unsatisfactory 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Commendable 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: No Rating
DJJ Accountability Rating	2022-23: No Rating

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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.

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

Wabasso School is a special education center school serving students ages 5-22. To meet the unique needs of our students, we offer four program models: intensive, integrated, behavioral, and a transition program. Our dedicated staff provides instruction that positively impacts student achievement, communication skills, social, emotional, and behavioral growth. Within a safe and supportive learning environment children develop their academic and independent living skills to meet post-secondary goals and successful community integration.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kohlstedt, Chris	Principal	Responsible for the continued improvement of all school functions including adult and student performance.
Hartmann, Alyssa	Teacher, ESE	Teacher on Assignment
To support the Principal and the school to continuously improve school functions, policies and procedures.		
Shepard, Dustin	Teacher, ESE	Adaptive PE
Serves on the Leadership team and as an Adaptive PE teacher with a responsibility to model expectations for adults and students and to engage in conversations and activities to promote the school initiatives, processes and procedures for continuous school improvement.		
Fregel, Bry	Behavior Specialist	
Serves on the Leadership team and as a lead Behavior Technician with a responsibility to model expectations for adults and students and to engage in conversations and activities to promote the school initiatives, processes and procedures for continuous school improvement.		
Schneller, Jennifer	Other	Speech and Language Pathologist
Serves on the Leadership team and as a Speech and Language Pathologist with a responsibility to model expectations for adults and students and to engage in conversations and activities to promote the school initiatives, processes and procedures for continuous school improvement.		

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

N/A

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/7/2019, Christopher Kohlstedt

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

44

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

11

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

11

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

0

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

11

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

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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	1	1	0	3	0	2	3	4	3	5	6	4	12	44
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	1	1	0	0	3	11
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	1	0	3	0	2	3	4	3	5	6	4	12	44

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/16/2022

2021-22 - Updated

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement		67%	57%					72%	61%
ELA Learning Gains		55%	55%					60%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile		49%	46%					53%	54%
Math Achievement		66%	55%					70%	62%
Math Learning Gains		57%	60%					62%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile		46%	56%					51%	52%
Science Achievement		62%	51%					67%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		84%	72%					90%	78%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	60%	-60%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	61%	-61%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	64%	-64%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	64%	-64%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	55%	-55%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	47%	-47%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	49%	-49%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	64%	-64%	67%	-67%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	69%	-69%	71%	-71%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	64%	-64%	70%	-70%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	58%	-58%	61%	-61%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	29	28		18	16						
WHT				20							
FRL	36	33		27	8						

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	38		25	45		18				
WHT	30										
FRL	27	40		36	60						

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

ESSA Data Review

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	23
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	91
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
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	20
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	26
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

Attendance was an area of focus and calls were made home after two consecutive absences. "Learning to Live" was an area of focus and though we made great strides, we were restricted by COVID conditions, so travel off campus was not feasible.

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

Student attendance increased. This year we added additional family engagement opportunities and student awards so that families are more actively engaged and more willing to engage their children in school, more consistently. Learning to Live- No more COVID restrictions but the transportation van has not been operational and is currently in for service but when it comes out, CBI (Community Based Instruction) will increase.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Academics success for all students continues to be an area focus. Training in ULS was one of the biggest barriers, so we had everyone trained in the Unique Learning Systems (ULS) platform. Additionally, we have increased lesson plan submission and review to a weekly requirement. Administration is now trying to improve monitoring of the instruction. There is only one Administrator and managing all aspects of the school's function, including receiving new students and assisting with behaviors has slowed the process of monitoring instruction.

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

The trend has been poor planning and too many breaks during instruction, decreasing student engagement, and increasing behaviors. This is why lesson planning and monitoring instruction continue to be areas of focus.

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

Weekly collaborative planning is in place to ensure lesson plans are developed, submitted, and then reviewed by administration. Data chats have been scheduled in alignment with each performance measure to ensure students are being assessed and monitoring for their learning. Administration is providing feedback after walkthroughs and through evaluation meetings.

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

The first PD was to train all of our ULS users in the ULS system so that we had a baseline. Each person knows how to use the platform. Collection and review of lesson plans ensure that discussion is being conducted related to the utilization of the system. Informal and formal walkthroughs are a monitoring measure and data chats after each scheduled assessment measures growth or regression and allow for forward-moving dialogue.

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

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

The focus on Academics was selected due to the number of students requiring instruction through ULS Unique Learning Systems and the limited training and implementation of ULS in the 2021-2022 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of our classrooms requiring direction through ULS will be using the ULS curriculum.

Monitoring:

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

100% of our ULS teachers were required to attend ULS training so that they would first, understand the operation and management of the system. Next, there is a weekly collection of ULS lesson plans to ensure planning for instruction is taking place. Finally, walkthrough observations are conducted to monitor the use of the ULS system and alignment with the lesson plan.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Collection and review of lesson plans as well as data chat documentation with ULS Benchmark data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

If lessons include ULS delivery and Benchmark data measures success utilizing ULS lessons then increased engagement in the lessons should generate increased levels of success on Benchmark scores.

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.

Every teacher was trained in the utilization of the ULS system and the functionality of both the lessons, the differentiation opportunities, and the assessment piece.

Person Responsible

Alyssa Hartmann (alyssa.hartmann@indianriverschools.org)

Lesson Plans are collected and reviewed weekly to determine planning using the ULS program.

Person Responsible

Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Data chats are conducted after every ULS assessment to determine levels of engagement through performance scores on ULS Benchmarks.

Person Responsible

Chris Kohlstedt (christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

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

All students' progress is monitored through data chats. 7 out of 9 classrooms use ULS as their primary form of access instruction.

#2. Other specifically relating to Culture and Climate

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our school has had very limited parent/family involvement over the past few years. Some of that was due to COVID but most of that was a historical practice. With new leadership and a change in expectation it was determined that providing opportunities for families to be involved in school events/activities needed to be a priority.

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

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

100% of our families will attend at least one school-based event or opportunity in the 2022-2023 school year.

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

Sign-in sheets at every event will document the presence of our families throughout the year. It will also help us identify the families preferred activities or events for the following year.

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

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

If more opportunities are available to families, creating the likelihood of increased participation increases with every added activity/event.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

If more opportunities are available to families, creating the likelihood of increased participation increases with every added activity/event.

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.

Create a yearlong calendar, in advance, of all of the school's activities/events and share it with all of the families.

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

Utilize multiple forms of communication, in advance, to inform families of upcoming events (School Messenger, Facebook, School Website, Marquee, Twitter, Planners, Newsletters, Flyers)

Person Responsible Alyssa Hartmann (alyssa.hartmann@indianriverschools.org)

Extend the thinking around planning a creative, fun, interactive, and student-based event/activity so that families are more likely not only to attend but to spread the word and invite other families.

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

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

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

Parent Engagement

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

We are using a sign-in sheet at every event to monitor who has shown up. We are also monitoring the number at each event compared with the interest level for future events. If we notice that there is a larger number of families attending when we have food versus no food, we can deduct that food is a positive variable. If we include student samples or student-generated work versus no student evidence, we can determine whether that is a factor for participation.

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

We continually promote activities through a variety of platforms including School Messenger, Newsletters, Website Post, Marke', Twitter, Facebook, student planners, and flyers. At times, after an event, we communicate a thank you for attending. We have used Powerpoint as a primary delivery system to share goals and objectives with parents during our events when applicable.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Sign-in sheets are collected and reviewed and parents/families not in attendance are expected to be called by the classroom teacher, letting them know they were missed.

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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Create and share a calendar of family engagement opportunities for the year.	Kohlstedt, Chris, christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org
Communicate, in advance, the upcoming events via marques, newsletters, calls home, and social media.	Hartmann, Alyssa, alyssa.hartmann@indianriverschools.org
Share the school's SIP goals with stakeholders so they are aware that we are pushing for increased family participation.	Kohlstedt, Chris, christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org
Document participation at every event to keep track of who was present and who was not which helps us thank those present and target those who were not at future events.	Hartmann, Alyssa, alyssa.hartmann@indianriverschools.org
Discuss the benefits and shortcomings of our events so that we can improve upon our practice with each additional event.	Kohlstedt, Chris, christopher.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org