

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

The Charter School At Waterstone



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 17 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

The Charter School At Waterstone

855 WATERSTONE WAY, Homestead, FL 33033

www.charterschoolatwaterstone.com

Demographics

Principal: Kelli Barrios

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School KG-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 80% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (46%) 2014-15: A (63%) |
| 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 | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

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 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.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 17 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

The Charter School At Waterstone

855 WATERSTONE WAY, Homestead, FL 33033

www.charterschoolatwaterstone.com

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 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 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B | B | C | C |

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 | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------|---------------------|--|
| Baggs, Donna | Principal | Principal of The Charter School at Waterstone and the Advantage Academy of Math and Science Charter School at Waterstone |
| Vecin, Adriana | Dean | Dean of Curriculum and Instruction |
| Ward, Debra | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of #1010 and #3027 |
| Barrios, Kelli | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of #1010 and #3027 |

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 | 187 | 199 | 194 | 167 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 938 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 28 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |

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 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 40 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 |

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 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 23 | 18 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

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

52

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|---|----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | |
| 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 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 | 3 | 16 | 10 | 51 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |

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 |
| 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 | |
| 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 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 | 3 | 16 | 10 | 51 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |

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 | 60% | 63% | 61% | 61% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 61% | 61% | 59% | 58% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 57% | 57% | 54% | 51% | 55% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 58% | 67% | 62% | 52% | 62% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 58% | 63% | 59% | 47% | 60% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 56% | 52% | 39% | 52% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 51% | 56% | 56% | 54% | 53% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 0% | 80% | 78% | 0% | 75% | 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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 (0) | 187 (0) | 199 (0) | 194 (0) | 167 (0) | 191 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 938 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 (0) | 4 (1) | 3 (7) | 2 (2) | 8 (13) | 8 (12) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 25 (35) |
| 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) | 4 (3) | 1 (12) | 8 (8) | 7 (15) | 18 (24) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 38 (62) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (17) | 0 (31) | 11 (8) | 28 (92) | 50 (101) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 89 (249) |

Grade Level Data

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

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 61% | 60% | 1% | 58% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 61% | 0% | 57% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 60% | 64% | -4% | 58% | 2% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 60% | -3% | 56% | 1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 59% | 60% | -1% | 56% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 59% | 0% | 55% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -59% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 59% | 67% | -8% | 62% | -3% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 67% | -10% | 62% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 53% | 69% | -16% | 64% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 68% | -11% | 62% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 60% | 65% | -5% | 60% | 0% |
| | 2018 | 62% | 66% | -4% | 61% | 1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 50% | 53% | -3% | 53% | -3% |
| | 2018 | 60% | 56% | 4% | 55% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -60% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 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 |
| SWD | 35 | 48 | 65 | 27 | 59 | 67 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 55 | 49 | 40 | 52 | 51 | 41 | 47 | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | 68 | | 43 | 52 | | 44 | | | | |
| HSP | 60 | 59 | 54 | 59 | 58 | 46 | 50 | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | 68 | | 68 | 64 | | 58 | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 58 | 55 | 55 | 56 | 43 | 48 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| HSP | 60 | 54 | 47 | 52 | 46 | 39 | 54 | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 89 | | 63 | 64 | | 74 | | | | |
| FRL | 56 | 56 | 49 | 48 | 45 | 41 | 50 | | | | |

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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 72 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 461 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 45 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 51 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 52 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 57 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |

| White Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - White Students | 65 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 55 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

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.

Our 4th Grade Math FSA scores showed the lowest performance in 2018-2019. Contributing factors that led to this were teacher complacency, lack of ongoing professional development, and lack of follow through with data tracking and analysis

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

The data component which showed the greatest decline from 17-18 to 18-19 was again 4th grade Math according to FSA Data. Contributing factors that led to this were teacher complacency, lack of ongoing professional development, and lack of follow through with data tracking and analysis.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 4th grade Math bottom 25%. Contributing factors that led to this were teacher complacency, lack of ongoing professional development, and lack of follow through with data tracking and analysis

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

4th Grade ELA showed the most improvement in terms of same grade comparison. Contributing factors that led to this were increased data tracking that targeted specific standards that were low across all the different classes so that teachers could focus on their individual class needs.

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

The number of Level 1 students on the statewide assessment as well as the number of retained students are our potential areas of concern.

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

1. increase Math achievement and bottom quartile learning gains by 5%
2. increase Science scores by 15%
3. Increase ELA learning gains in 4th and 5th by 5%
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|---|--|
| #1 | |
| Title | Lowest Quartile Math Achievement |
| Rationale | The school data shows the largest achievement gap between our lowest quartile math achievement and the Statewide average at 8% below the State average. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By June 2019, the lowest quartile students will increase their FSA achievement by 5% points to a 49% achievement level in mathematics achievement. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Donna Baggs (dbaggs@charterschoolatwaterstone.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Moby Max, Envisions Black Box intervention, FL Ready, and Explore Learning Gizmos will be used in teacher small groups, intervention groups, extended learning opportunity (ELO afterschool tutoring), and through technology use and adjusting grouping as needed through continuous ongoing data tracking. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | The rationale for this is to support learning gains in our lowest quartile through planned instruction tailored to individual student needs based on progress monitoring of student data in data chats held as grade level teams with Instructional Coaches and Administration. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the lowest quartile. 2. Utilize Performance Matters for Quarterly Benchmark Assessments (Data Chats,) 3. Departmentalization and classroom support provided for intervention 4. 5. |
| Person Responsible | [no one identified] |

| | |
|---|--|
| #2 | |
| Title | ELA Achievement |
| Rationale | The school FSA ELA data for Spring of 2019 shows stagnant achievement scores from 2018 to 2019. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By June 2019, third through fifth grade students will increase their FSA achievement by 5% points to a 65% achievement level in ELA achievement. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Donna Baggs (945734@dadeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Moby Max, Wonderworks Intervention, FL Ready, and Vocabulary.com will be used in teacher small groups, intervention groups, extended learning opportunity (ELO afterschool tutoring), and Core Connections Writing Training (PD) through technology use and adjusting grouping as needed through continuous ongoing data tracking. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | The rationale for this is to support learning gains in ELA for 3rd through 5th grades through planned instruction tailored to individual student needs based on progress monitoring of student data in data chats held as grade level teams with Instructional Coaches and Administration. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify students in need of reteach and remediation 2. Schedule Core Connection Writing Training for the 2019 - 2020 school year (4 trainings). 3. Utilize Performance Matters for Quarterly Benchmark Assessments (Data Chats,) 4. Departmentalization and classroom support provided for intervention and push in support provided by Interventionists, Instructional Coach, and Specials area teachers. 5. |
| Person Responsible | Donna Baggs (945734@dadeschools.net) |

| | |
|---|---|
| #3 | |
| Title | Fifth Grade Science Achievement |
| Rationale | The school FSA Fifth Grade Science data for Spring of 2019 shows a 10% points drop in achievement scores from 2018 to 2019. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By June 2019, fifth grade students will increase their FSA achievement by 15% points to a 66% achievement level in science achievement. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Donna Baggs (945734@dadeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Moby Max, Gizmos, differentiated science centers/station rotations, and hands-on instruction from Elevate will be used in teacher small groups, technology use, and adjusting grouping as needed through continuous ongoing data tracking. Gizmos will be used in 3rd - 4th grade to support future 5th grade students with fair game standards. Science 4 Us will help build background knowledge in grade K - 2. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | The rationale for this is to support students in K - 5, in order for 5th grade students taking the NGSSS Science assessment to have strong background knowledge. Fifth grade students will also practice 5th grade standards and fair game standards through planned instruction tailored to individual student needs based on progress monitoring of student data in data chats held as grade level teams with Instructional Coaches and Administration. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify available science resources for science instruction. 2. Implement science station/center rotations for instruction in 5th grade science classrooms 3. Utilize Performance Matters for Quarterly Benchmark Assessments (Data Chats) 4. Departmentalization and classroom support provided by push in support provided by Instructional Coach. 5. |
| Person Responsible | Donna Baggs (945734@dadeschools.net) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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 Team use the Tier 1 Problem Solving process to set goals, monitors academic and behavioral data, evaluate ongoing progress by: using four step problem solving process for goal setting, planning, and program evaluation to focus on increasing student achievement or behavioral success, determining if students have made expected levels of progress, respond to individual students that have not shown a positive response; reviewing through data chats with teachers/coaches, adjusting instruction based on needs, responding when students are demonstrating a positive response, gather and analyze data at all Tiers to determine PD for faculty, ensure that students in need of intervention receive Tier 2 intervention with fidelity, gather ongoing progress monitoring (OPM) for all interventions and analyze that data using the Tier 2 problem solving process after each OPM.

Tier 2 consists of interventions provided in addition to core instruction/behavioral supports to targeted students who have been identified for Tier 2. Meetings occur monthly to: review OPM data for intervention groups to evaluate group and individual response, adjust interventions as needed by student 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. Tier 2 supports are provided to students who haven't met or are at-risk of proficiency not meeting proficiency.

MTSS End of Year Tier 1 problem solving evaluates the SIP efforts, dictates strategies for the next year’s SIP. Previous years trend data across grade levels is used to examine and plan for supporting students in need.

While the SIP plan does not focus on the 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.

Relating curriculum to real-world uses/careers (STEAM/STEM), Career Week, goal setting, community partnerships with Miami-Dade Community College and Everglades Preparatory, clubs that support specials interests (yearbook, STEAM, Sewing, Athletics, Arts, etc.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Lowest Quartile Math Achievement | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA Achievement | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Fifth Grade Science Achievement | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |