

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

The Charter School At Waterstone



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	11
Title I Requirements	13
Budget to Support Goals	15

The Charter School At Waterstone

855 WATERSTONE WAY, Homestead, FL 33033

www.charterschoolatwaterstone.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	94%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	B	C	C	A*

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://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.

The Charter School at Waterstone exists as a K-5 International Learning Environment, which develops adaptive and active learners who embrace the exploration of other cultures as well as their own ancestral heritage through the utilization of art, music, and literature to excel and achieve academic heights.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Charter School at Waterstone will provide a safe learning environment to promote academic and social excellence by preparing students to become honorable and responsible individuals, as well as adaptive and active learners. Students will utilize the exploration of other cultures and their own ancestral heritage to achieve their fullest personal and academic potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Rodriguez, Rebecca	Principal
Manjarres, Sherrie	Teacher, K-12
Pagan, Lori	Teacher, K-12
Vecin, Adriana	Teacher, K-12
Morales, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12
Fajardo, Kristen	Teacher, K-12
Ward, Debra	Instructional Coach
Valdes, Jaclyn	Teacher, ESE
Lanuza, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12
Rodriguez, Tracy	Dean

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Tier 1(Leadership Team)

Dr. Rebecca Valdes- Principal, will schedule and facilitate regular Rtl meetings, ensure attendance of team members, ensure follow up of action steps, allocate resources; In addition to the school administrator(s) the school's Leadership Team will include the following members who will carry out SIP planning and MTSS problem solving.

TBD - Assistant Principal, oversees the instructional coaches. Reviews data, lesson plans and grade

books. Assists teachers and coaches with the core instructional program.

Tracy Rodriguez- Dean of Students, follows the Miami-Dade County Student Code of Conduct and monitors student behavior referrals throughout the school building.

Ethel Velez- Instructional Math Coach, assists teachers during Mathematics planning sessions, provides resources to the teachers, and models appropriate Mathmatics teaching.

Lori Pagan- Lead Teacher, serves as a mentor to new 1st grade teachers and makes sure the grade level adheres to all procedures, policies, and deadlines through the use of weekly grade level meetings.

Oraimis Goizueta- Lead Teacher, serves as a mentor to new 2nd grade teachers and makes sure the grade level adheres to all procedures, policies, and deadlines through the use of weekly grade level meetings.

Vanessa Morales- Lead Teacher, serves as a mentor to new 3rd grade teachers and makes sure the grade level adheres to all procedures, policies, and deadlines through the use of weekly grade level meetings.

Sherrie Manjarres- Lead Teacher, serves as a mentor to new 4th grade teachers and makes sure the grade level adheres to all procedures, policies, and deadlines through the use of weekly grade level meetings.

Adriana Vecin- Lead Teacher, serves as a mentor to new 5th grade teachers and makes sure the grade level adheres to all procedures, policies, and deadlines through the use of weekly grade level meetings.

Jaclyn Valdes-Program Specialist, assist all teachers and paraprofessionals with providing the required intervention for designated students and with referring students for the Rtl and SST processes.

Kristen Fajardo- Science Department Chair, assists teachers during Science planning sessions, provides resources to the teachers, and models appropriate Science teaching.

In addition to Tier 1 problem solving, the Leadership Team members will meet on a monthly basis to review consensus, infrastructure, and implementation of building level MTSS.

Tier 2

The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Program Specialist will conduct regular meetings to evaluate intervention efforts for students by subject, grade, intervention, or other logical organization. In addition to those selected other teachers will be involved when needed to provide information or revise efforts.

Tier 3 SST

The Principal, Assistant Principal, Program Specialist and parent/guardian make up the Tier 3 SST Problem Solving Team.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	1	7	2	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	12	8	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	17	31	8	92	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	3	16	10	51	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150

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	6	3	8	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	1	8	6	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

Date this data was collected

Friday 9/14/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	11	15	23	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	8	3	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	29	39	0	12	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	14	14	2	9	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	15	23	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	8	3	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	29	39	0	12	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	14	14	2	9	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The data component that performed the lowest on the 2018 Math FSA were the 4th grade bottom quartile students. Only 37% of this group of students made learning gains from the 2017 Math FSA.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was the 4th grade ELA proficiency level. As 3rd graders, 63% of the students scored proficient on the 2017 ELA FSA but as 4th graders, 57% of the students scored proficient on the 2018 ELA FSA.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average was the Lowest 25% in Math. The state average for this component was 52% and our school average earned was 49%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component that showed the greatest improvement from the prior year was the 5th grade Math proficiency level. As 4th graders, 55% of the students scored proficient on the 2017 Math FSA but as 5th graders, 62% of the students scored proficient on the 2018 Math FSA.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Despite the fact of having my strongest Math and Science teachers on the 5th grade team, we adopted a new Math curriculum which requires the students to use higher order thinking skills in order to apply their learned Math skills through the use of real world problem solving.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	62%	60%	60%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	61%	57%	52%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	57%	52%	34%	53%	49%
Math Achievement	60%	65%	61%	57%	59%	56%
Math Learning Gains	64%	61%	58%	39%	57%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	55%	52%	26%	49%	48%
Science Achievement	61%	57%	57%	55%	53%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	79%	77%	0%	71%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	1 (11)	7 (15)	2 (23)	13 (16)	12 (11)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	35 (76)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	3 (6)	12 (8)	8 (3)	15 (12)	24 (10)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	62 (39)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	17 (29)	31 (39)	8 (0)	92 (12)	101 (79)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	249 (159)

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	2018	61%	61%	0%	57%	4%
	2017	63%	58%	5%	58%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	57%	60%	-3%	56%	1%
	2017	58%	57%	1%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2018	59%	59%	0%	55%	4%
	2017	59%	54%	5%	53%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
07	2018					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	57%	67%	-10%	62%	-5%
	2017	56%	65%	-9%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	57%	68%	-11%	62%	-5%
	2017	56%	68%	-12%	64%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2018	62%	66%	-4%	61%	1%
	2017	44%	60%	-16%	57%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
07	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	60%	56%	4%	55%	5%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

Subgroup Data

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
SWD	22	44	55	30	44		50				
ELL	48	55	57	47	58	49	25				
BLK	51	39		52	63	50	32				
HSP	59	57	51	60	63	49	62				
WHT	67	72		67	68		90				
FRL	57	57	54	57	64	53	55				
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
SWD	26	58		42	67						
ELL	51	51	56	47	41	37	18				
ASN	100			90							
BLK	52	56		41	34	43	35				

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
HSP	60	54	47	52	46	39	54				
WHT	72	89		63	64		74				
FRL	56	56	49	48	45	41	50				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Increase student achievement by improving core instruction in all content areas
Rationale	All teachers will be provided with ongoing professional development, monitoring and support for effective implementation and instruction of the core curriculum. Instructional leaders and teachers will work together to review data in order to monitor the quality and effectiveness of core instruction. All teachers and instructional leaders will work together to identify students (based on data) not responding to core instruction in Reading, Writing, Math and Science.
Intended Outcome	In order for core instruction to be effectively incorporated in , teachers need ongoing training and support, along with monitoring, in order to ensure fidelity and effectiveness in implementation and execution of instruction. In order to measure the quality and effectiveness of core instruction in all content areas, ongoing progress monitoring and data collection must be used and adjustments made to instruction, when needed, in order to maximize student achievement and growth. All teachers and instructional leaders will work together to identify the resources and interventions needed in addition to core instruction for those students not responding to core instruction.
Point Person	Rebecca Rodriguez (rmvaldes@dadeschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	Weekly Lesson Plan Checks conducted by the Assistant Principal and Principal. Classroom Walk Throughs from Instructional Coaches, Assistant Principal and Principals. Informal and Formal Evaluations from Instructional Coaches, Assistant Principal and Principal Completion of Progress Monitoring Plan (PMP) forms by the teachers. Instructional Coach, Assistant Principal and Principals will monitor completion and quarterly updates of the PMP forms and weekly grade book checks monitoring increase/decrease in student grades. Implementation of teachers utilizing a Formative Assessment Model that identifies evidence of student learning. Observance by coaches and administration of the implementation of the Formative Assessment Model. Observations and Classroom Walk-throughs, lesson plan reviews, instructional modeling and data chats
Person Responsible	Debra Ward (dward@charterschoolatwaterstone.com)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	

Description	Weekly Data Analysis by Instructional Coaches, Assistant Principal and Principal and monthly MTSS, and LLT Meetings will take place in order to monitor effectiveness of using higher order thinking skills in the classroom. Specific instructional strategies provided by Instructional Coach and Administration. Implementation of professional development topics and strategies as observed in Walk Throughs, Informal and Formal Observations by Instructional Coach, Assistant Principal and Principals. Collect and review OPM data from the core curriculum as well as district and state assessments.
Person Responsible	Rebecca Rodriguez (rmvaldes@dadeschools.net)

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, Â§ 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.

The Charter School at Waterstone builds positive relationships with families in various ways. The following describes The Charter School at Waterstone's efforts to communicate with parents and keep them informed: Monthly newsletter posted on both the school website and school Facebook page, Parent Resource Center and Kiosk located in the main office, posts on school's Facebook page regarding original and engaging student activities in class and after school, requirement of 10 volunteer hours per family, after school community events such as talent shows, science fairs, etc., PTSO, ads and articles in the local community newspaper, business partnerships, Career Week, PowerSchools teacher web pages are maintained weekly, PowerSchools gradebooks are updated weekly, progress reports/report cards are sent home each quarter, and parents are invited to attend Progress Monitoring Plan (PMP) meetings.

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 Charter School at Waterstone implements character education and school-wide positive behavior support. The students who demonstrate a need for support are referred to the Dean of Students for the implementation of daily behavior management plans and daily communication between the school and the home. The Dean of Students serves as the student's mentor and as the liaison between the school and the home. The Charter School at Waterstone offers an after school sports program where students in grades K-5 can participate in basketball, soccer, and/or tennis. Additionally, all students who have counseling documented on their Individualized Education Plans receive the services they need from a certified counselor who visits the school and meets with the students. Finally, the school offers many

after school clubs such as the Key Club, Fairchild Garden Club, Band/Drum Line, Dance, Cheerleading, and a variety of sports that are available to students in grades K-5 to participate in and help raise awareness of community service opportunities.

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

The Charter School at Waterstone follows appropriate protocol when enrolling and registering new students. All students must complete an application and are placed in a lottery. Our lottery is public and parents are welcome to come to the school and witness the student names chosen from the lottery data base. Students who are chosen are then contacted and invited to various registration sessions that the school holds in house. Additionally, we offer school tours throughout the school day during designated days of the week, we advertise in the local newspaper, and we honor sibling and military preference.

The Charter School at Waterstone's feeder pattern middle school hosts parent/student information nights for students to attend and learn more about their future school. Additionally, 5th grade students at The Charter School at Waterstone visit the feeder pattern middle school during a field trip where they can become introduced to the new school that they will be attending and take a tour.

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.

The MTSS Leadership Team use the Tier 1 Problem Solving process to set Tier 1 goals, and monitors academic and behavioral data to evaluate progress towards those goals at least three times per year by: holding regular team meetings where problem solving is the sole focus, using the four step problem solving process as the basis for goal setting, planning, and program evaluation during all team meetings that focus on increasing student achievement or behavioral success, determining how we will know if students have made expected levels of progress towards proficiency, respond when grades, subject areas, classes, or individual students have not shown a positive response. We will respond by using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model by reviewing data through data chats with teachers and coaches and adjusting instruction based on needs, responding when students are demonstrating a positive response or have met proficiency by raising goals or providing enrichment respectively, gather and analyze data at all Tiers to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by group or individual student diagnostic and progress monitoring assessment, ensure that students in need of intervention are actually receiving appropriate supplemental Tier 2 intervention, and gather ongoing progress monitoring (OPM) for all interventions and analyze that data using the Tier 2 problem solving process after each OPM.

Tier 2

The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support. Tier 2 meetings occur regularly (monthly) to: review OPM data for intervention groups to evaluate group and individual student response, support interventions where there is not an overall positive group response, and select students for SST Tier 3 intervention.

The school improvement plan (SIP) summarizes the school's academic and behavioral goals for the year and describes the school's plan to meet those goals. The specific supports and actions needed implement the SIP strategies are closely examined, planned, and monitored on the MTSS Tier 1 worksheets completed three times per year. The MTSS Problem-Solving process is used to first carry

out, monitor, and adjust if necessary, the supports that are defined in the SIP. Annual goals are translated into progress monitoring (3 times per year) and ongoing progress monitoring measures (monthly) that can reliably track progress on a schedule based on student need across Tiers.

Tier 2 supports are provided to students who haven't met proficiency or who are at risk of not meeting proficiency.

Finally, MTSS End of Year Tier 1 problem solving evaluates the SIP efforts and dictates strategies for the next year's SIP. At this time, previous years trend data across grade levels is used to examine impact grades for support focus or prevention/early intervention efforts.

While the SIP plan does not focus on the primary (untested) grades, the MTSS leadership team extends the intent of the SIP to kindergarten, first, and second grades as they contribute extensively to later grades performance and student engagement.

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

N/A

Part V: Budget	
Total:	\$0.00