The Charter School At Waterstone

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
2020-21 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%)
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	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

The Charter School At Waterstone

855 WATERSTONE WAY, Homestead, FL 33033

www.charterschoolatwaterstone.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	75%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	96%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Baggs, Donna	Principal	
Vecin, Adriana	Dean	
Barrios, Kelli	Assistant Principal	

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.*
39

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.*
19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
56

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,037

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	194	172	181	157	173	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1034
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	14	1	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	5	4	2	3	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	1	2	3	1	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	7	14	36	3	68	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	12	30	44	3	102	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	282
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	14	36	3	68	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201

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	9	10	20	3	66	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173

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	17	16	6	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/28/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				60%	63%	61%	59%	62%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	61%	59%	56%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	57%	54%	53%	57%	52%
Math Achievement				58%	67%	62%	60%	65%	61%
Math Learning Gains				58%	63%	59%	64%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	56%	52%	49%	55%	52%
Science Achievement				51%	56%	56%	61%	57%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					80%	78%		79%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	61%	60%	1%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	64%	-4%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	67%	-8%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	69%	-16%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	65%	-5%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	53%	-3%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Progress monitoring tools used for students at The Charter School at Waterstone MSID #1010:
All students in grades Kindergarten through second were tested using the Fountas and Pinnell reading level assessment. This test was utilized in the fall, winter and spring for reading levels. Math scores stem from Easy CBM.
Grades three, four and five were evaluated using the FAIR assessment for reading and the math was assessed with APM/Cambium assessments. Third grade did not take FAIR in the spring due to FSA testing.
Data is unavailable at the time of this report for the economically disadvantage.

Science data was calculated using comprehensive full length science assessments built on Performance Matters.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3.4	5.2	7.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	.03	.04	.06
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59	80	85
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	.02	.05	.07
	English Language Learners	.03	.04	.03
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12.8		7.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	.01	.02	.01
	English Language Learners	.05	.06	.06
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	.54	.70	.66
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	.01	.02	.01
	English Language Learners	.04	.06	.10

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	.39	.46	.49
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	.01	.01	.01
	English Language Learners	.22	.22	.21
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	.05	.14	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	.08	N/A
	English Language Learners	0	0	n/a

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	.27	.28	.32
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	.06	.09	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	.06	.08	N/A
	English Language Learners	.06	0	N/A

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	.30	.36	.40
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	.01
	English Language Learners	0	.08	.15
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	.07	.16	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	.19	n/a
	English Language Learners	.09	0	n/a
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	.51	.57	.61
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	.01	0
	English Language Learners	.44	.49	.47
Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	34	50		26	64		64				
ELL	45	32	18	38	43	36	49				
BLK	42	23		23	15		15				
HSP	56	49	31	45	52	43	61				
WHT	48	42		33	33		46				
FRL	52	46	33	39	43	32	53				
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				

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	364
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	24
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Across all subgroups, both Math and Reading proficiency dropped in the 2021 school year

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

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.

According to our most recent data, Math across all subgroups in 3rd - 5th continues to be the component demonstrating the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

In 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. In 2020-2021, the ongoing pandemic, virtual classes, and constant quarantine added to the already existing issues.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

In 2021, 5th grade Science scores showed the most improvement, with a 5% increase from 2019.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Contributing factors to this improvement are having the teachers who exclusively teach Science to 3 groups of students instead of Math/Science to 2 groups of students and the adoption of the supplemental curriculum, J&J Educational Bootcamp

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

Strategic intervention of foundational math and reading skills will need to be implemented in order to effectively target and close achievement gaps along with weekly progress monitoring to address successes and hardships. We have brought on an additional Tier 3 Interventionist to assist in accomplishing this task. We have also implemented SuccessMaker, an Adaptive Progress Monitoring platform that will meet each student at his/her level and provide tailored instruction which will also assist in closing the achievement gaps in both Reading and Math,

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

Teachers and interventionists will attend training on best practices for intervention using SuccessMaker, tracking progress, and contingency plans when the intervention is not working.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services that will be implemented in order to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond include having our science teachers explicitly incorporate Reading comprehension strategies in their Science classes as well as utilizing the supplemental resources with efficacy.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The rationale for choosing instructional practice specifically relating to differentiation as an area of focus is due to the fact that our most significant decrease in ELA was that of learning gains among our bottom 25%. This category dropped. This component dropped 33% from 2019 to 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	Our school plans to achieve a goal of having 40% (from 24%) of students in the bottom 25% making a learning gain in ELA.
Monitoring:	Our bottom 5% will be monitored through our school wide data tracker in which we have color coded our bottom 25% students and will be tracking their summative assessments every 5 weeks in their general education ELA class as well as their intervention progress through SuccessMaker.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Adriana Vecin (avecin@charterschoolatwaterstone.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	homogeneous grouping of students based on deficiency of reading skills ranging from foundational to comprehension coupled with intervention resources from the iReady Florida Teacher Tool-Box.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy will allow us to make sure we are targeting the specific need of each student y placing them in groups with students who have the same deficiencies. This will also ensure that the instruction is not above any of the students' levels thereby defeating the purpose of the targeted intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We had no major discipline incidents in the 2012-2022 school year. Consequently, we have no data on the SafeSchoolsforAlex site.

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.

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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

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.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00