

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

The Charter School At Waterstone School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

The Charter School At Waterstone

855 WATERSTONE WAY, Homestead, FL 33033

www.charterschoolatwaterstone.com

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of the Charter School at Waterstone, in partnership with students, family and community, is to provide a safe school environment that allows us to develop curious individuals who are active and engaged learners in an ever-changing world by challenging all students as they travel along their personalized pathway.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Barrios, Kelli	Principal	
Vecin, Adrianna	Assistant Principal	
Febus, Talia	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We involve stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) via our EESAC Committee meetings. At these meeting all required committee member (which include the leadership team) analyze our data in terms of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. We then discuss what the school's academic goals should be for the coming year, develop a SMART goal, and align said goal to an action plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored via data analysis through, iReady, FAST, And STAR assessments as well as regular progress monitoring through iReady and intervention. The school will revise the plan for all students after each administration of FAST and iReady as well as every 6 weeks for those students with the greatest achievement gap as they undergo the RTI process.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	96%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	80%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	4	26	23	20	15	8	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	4	5	5	0	0	0	17
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	5	6	16	22	8	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	8	6	13	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	12	9	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	9	8	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	19	12	9	0	0	0	41

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	5	4	20	14	12	0	0	0	60

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	12	8	4	12	3	1	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	5

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	16	20	2	13	16	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	2	6	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	3	6	3	3	3	7	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	3	10	35	4	52	64	0	0	0	168
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	6	30	42	4	59	83	0	0	0	224
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	10	35	4	52	64	0	0	0	168

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	9	27	3	39	51	0	0	0	134

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	4	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	16	20	2	13	16	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	2	6	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	3	6	3	3	3	7	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	3	10	35	4	52	64	0	0	0	168
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	6	30	42	4	59	83	0	0	0	224
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	10	35	4	52	64	0	0	0	168

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	9	27	3	39	51	0	0	0	134

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	4	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	67	61	53	57	62	55	55		
ELA Learning Gains				58			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			24		
Math Achievement*	64	63	55	50	51	42	43		
Math Learning Gains				58			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			37		
Science Achievement*	61	56	52	56	60	54	56		
Social Studies Achievement*		77	68		68	59			
Middle School Acceleration		75	70		61	51			
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	68	62	55	50	75	70	56		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	333
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	2	
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	45			
HSP	68			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	66			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	1	1
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	52			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	67			64			61					68
SWD	32			37							2	
ELL	65			64			63				5	68
AMI												
ASN	92			100							2	
BLK	51			44			42				4	
HSP	67			65			61				5	68
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	77			68							2	
FRL	65			63			60				5	70

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	57	58	44	50	58	54	56					50
SWD	18	24	18	25	33		10					
ELL	54	63	42	43	54	57	49					50
AMI												
ASN	91			91								

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	40	41		39	39		29					
HSP	57	60	46	50	60	59	59					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67			38								
FRL	54	58	47	46	56	54	49					51

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	55	46	24	43	47	37	56					56
SWD	34	50		26	64		64					
ELL	45	32	18	38	43	36	49					56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	23		23	15		15					
HSP	56	49	31	45	52	43	61					55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48	42		33	33		46					
FRL	52	46	33	39	43	32	53					57

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
05	2023 - Spring	61%	56%	5%	54%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	58%	12%	58%	12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	52%	18%	50%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	77%	63%	14%	59%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	64%	14%	61%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	58%	-11%	55%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	50%	8%	51%	7%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

While our overall school performance was exceptional, our SWD subgroup continues to underperform in both ELA and Math. The biggest contributing factor this low percentage is the extremely small number of students in 3rd-5th that are classified as SWD. In grade levels, as they pertain to the data in this plan, only had 16 students total that fell under the SWD category. Therefore, less than a handful of students can severely alter the category's performance achievement.

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

None of the data components showed a decline. In contrast, every component showed great improvement.

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 only subgroup that was below the district and state average was 5th grade math at 47% proficiency. This was due to learning gaps incurred during the pandemic that were still being filled. While that cohort themselves showed great improvement (43% proficiency in 2022 to 47% in 2023) they were still below the district and state.

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

The data component which showed the most improvement was our Math achievement. It increased by 18% in 2023. (50% in 2022 to 68% in 2023)

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Reflecting on the EWS data, we believe attendance is our biggest area of concern

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

1. Increase ELA achievement for SWD
2. Increase Math achievement for SWD.
3. Increase Science achievement.
4. Increase attendance rate

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based off progress monitoring and 2023 state assessments, the data component which demonstrate the greatest need for improvement is achievement in ELA and Math for SWD. While our Federal Index Points did in this category did increase by 13, this is still our lowest sub group and lower than what our expectation is.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD will demonstrate an increase in achievement in both Reading and Math by 7%

Monitoring:

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

We will be tracking these students through the MTSS data, progress monitoring assessments, ESE teacher input/logs, schoolwide iReady assessments administered three times a year, and FAST assessment data for AP1 and AP2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adriana Vecin (avecin@charterschoolatwaterstone.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

homogeneous instructional grouping of students based on deficiency of reading skills ranging from foundational to comprehension as reported on iReady diagnostic assessment and coupled with intervention resources from the iReady Florida Teacher Tool-Box which matches the students' personalized instruction plan

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy will allow us to make sure we are targeting the specific need of each student by 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our Area of Focus as it pertains to positive culture and environment that we will be focusing on this year is specifically relates to the early warning system in terms of student attendance. We currently have 96 students whose attendance last school year fell below 90% which is roughly 10% of our student body.

Measurable Outcome:

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

throughout the 2022-2023 school year we will decrease the number of students whose attendance falls below 90% by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome on a monthly basis via meetings with administration and the attendance committee where reports will be pulled and analyzed. Administration will then follow up with warning letters and phone calls to the guardians of students who have excessive absences and/or tardies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Talia Febus (tfibus@charterk12.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- student recognition for attendance
- class attendance goals with incentives
- strengthening our attendance committee
- adding more warnings than the required ones and mandatory conferences for parents whose children are in danger of becoming truant and/or have excessive tardies

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies will incentivize students to want to come to school thereby pushing their parents to bring them to school on time. Additional letters, phone calls, and mandatory conferences regarding possible truancy will deter parents from not bringing the students to school for menial reasons.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Due to the fact that second lowest performing category is our African American/Black student subgroup in ELA and Math (both at 49%), and despite our 10% increase, it is still an area of critical need. All other performing categories are at 50% or higher therefore drawing continuous concern to the achievement of the African American/Black student subgroup.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in the American/Black student subgroup will demonstrate an increase in achievement in both ELA and Math of 5%.

Monitoring:

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

We will be tracking these students through the intervention data, progress monitoring assessments, schoolwide iReady assessments administered three times a year, and FAST assessment data for AP1 and AP2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adrianna Vecin (937310@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

homogeneous instructional grouping of students based on deficiency of reading skills ranging from foundational to comprehension as reported on iReady diagnostic assessment and coupled with intervention resources from the iReady Florida Teacher Tool-Box which matches the students' personalized instruction plan.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This intervention strategy will allow us to make sure we are targeting the specific need of each student by 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Upon analyzing our schoolwide data, School improvement funding allocations are reviewed by administration and the leadership team in order to make sure targeted resources (whether it be curriculum or personnel) are acquired for our most vulnerable areas.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The methods for dissemination of this SIP, and SWP to stakeholders are as follows: our school website (www.charterschoolatwaterstone.com), mass parent email via our schoolwide parent communication platform SwiftReach, and our EESAC Committee meetings.

The protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated will be on a quarterly basis via EESAC Committee meetings and sharing the minutes of said meeting with all stakeholders via SwiftReach.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school's webpage where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available is www.charterschoolatwaterstone.com

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 school plays, science fairs, etc., PTSO, ads and articles in the local

community newspaper, business partnerships, Career Week, MS Teams teacher 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 and Data information nights. Parents and teachers also communicate directly through Clever messaging.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The Charter School at Waterstone plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum through the utilization of quality instructional curriculum, research based learning strategies in all content areas, continuous professional development for our teachers (specifically on how to set and maintain high expectations), and regular feedback from administration as demonstrated through consistent classroom walkthroughs.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The Charter School at Waterstone is a Title I school, which is part of the National School Lunch Program and this year will be providing free breakfast and lunch for all students. We also partner with the children's trust to offer parent academies in multiple languages over zoom that offer guidance on how parents can support students at home. We also refer families in financial distress to the UP-START program as needed throughout the school year.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A