

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

The Charter School At Waterstone



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

The Charter School At Waterstone

855 WATERSTONE WAY, Homestead, FL 33033

www.charterschoolatwaterstone.com

Demographics

Principal: Kelli Barrios

Start Date for this Principal: 6/6/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 80% |
| 2019-20 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%) |
| 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

The Charter School At Waterstone

855 WATERSTONE WAY, Homestead, FL 33033

www.charterschoolatwaterstone.com

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p> | <p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>75%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>95%</p> |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B | B | B | 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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 |
| Barrios, Kelli | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of #1010 and #3027 |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/6/2019, Kelli Barrios

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 80% |
| 2019-20 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%) |
| 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 . | |

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 | 175 | 197 | 173 | 191 | 178 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1078 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |

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 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/4/2020

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 | 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 |

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 | 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 |

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 | |
| | (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 | 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% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 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 | | | | | |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 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 |
| 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 | 52 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 57 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 |
| 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 | 65 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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.

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?

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and 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.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2021, 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 (945734@dadeschools.net)

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 Steps to Implement

1. Identify the lowest quartile.
2. Utilize Performance Matters for Quarterly Benchmark Assessments (Data Chats,)
3. Departmentalization and classroom support provided for intervention

Person Responsible: Donna Baggs (945734@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The school FSA ELA data for Spring of 2019 shows stagnant achievement scores from 2018 to 2019.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2021, 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 Steps to Implement

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.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The school FSA Fifth Grade Science data for Spring of 2019 shows a 10% points drop in achievement scores from 2018 to 2019.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2021, 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 Steps to Implement

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.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The Leadership team will be keeping meeting regularly to discuss the progress of the Level 1 students from 2019 and the retained students. These meeting will be done with the admin team, parents, and teachers. We will also be making sure push in support is available for the classes who have these students as well as additional pull out support should they need it.

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.

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, School calendar of activities and events posted on the school website, 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.

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 and Assistant Principal serves as the student's mentor and as the liaison between the school and the home. 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. When in regular session, 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. 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. The school will also be adapting some of the clubs to the new virtual setting while virtual learning remains in effect.

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

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

| | | | |
|---|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | \$0.00 |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| | Total: \$0.00 |
|--|-----------------------------|