Waterset Charter School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Waterset Charter School

6540 KNOWLEDGE LN, Apollo Beach, FL 33572

[no web address on file]

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.

Our mission is to develop decisive leaders by providing a culture of social emotional learning wherein students gain independent and interdependent skills that create collaborative opportunities for students to be innovative and engaged.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Waterset Charter School is committed to creating a learning environment that empowers all students to be confident, responsible, and reflective leaders who aspire to the values of inquiry, innovation, and impact!

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
McBane, Chad	Principal	Serve as Educational Leader of the School Serve as a Chief Administrator of the School Supervise and Develops Staff; Cultivate leadership in others Communicate with Stakeholders Shape the vision of success for all students within the CSUSA framework Lead the team, including all stakeholders, on a journey to sustainable success through long-term planning with ongoing monitoring, support and measurable milestones. Create a climate conducive to student success Improve teacher practice through ongoing observations, coaching, and feedback and support Manage people, data, and processes with the goal of school improvement Follow Professional Standards for Educational Leaders
Bruni, Kerry	Assistant Principal	The assistant principals evaluate and provide feedback to faculty about their instructional practices. She works closely with the principal and instructional coaches to evaluate and support all students identified by the Early Warning System, plus lower quartile achievers in reading and math, and develop academic and social/emotional support plans for struggling students to ensure nobody slips through the gaps. She also helps provide curriculum resources for all teachers, and for ensuring alignment between state standards and instructional practices. She is in charge of the building when principal is off campus.

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.

WCS holds monthly Parent-Teacher Cooperative (PTC) meetings that provide an open environment for communication. Our PTC reviews the data of stakeholders experiences, needs and preferences, and looks at resources that can help the community reach specified goals. PTC is our main avenue to inform and share feedback with families.

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))

Monitoring the success of the SIP on student achievement includes the tracking of regular assessments and progress throughout the school year. Teacher feedback and observations provides insight into the plan's effectiveness in the classroom. Data analysis of test scores and attendance rates help to gauge improvement, particularly for our students of greatest need. Additionally, surveys and feedback from students, parents, and staff can offer valuable perspectives on the plan's impact. Regular PTC meetings and reviews with stakeholders can ensure adjustments are made as needed to achieve desired outcomes.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	36%
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) 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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: C
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	33	23	28	34	27	22	27	23	29	246
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	8	7	7	6	23	13	71
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	13	3	3	29	15	16	26	45	3	153
Course failure in Math	5	7	3	37	10	27	29	43	3	164
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	28	30	26	28	17	163
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	39	37	20	16	13	150
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	19	21	38	34	28	30	26	28	17	241

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	1	8	3	10	26	11	12	21	25	117

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	2	3	1	5	7	6	6	9	14	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3

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
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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 school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	55	51	53	57	51	55	60		
ELA Learning Gains				51			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			37		
Math Achievement*	57	50	55	54	41	42	51		
Math Learning Gains				53			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			40		
Science Achievement*	60	48	52	53	48	54	46		
Social Studies Achievement*	82	65	68	88	57	59	85		
Middle School Acceleration	76	70	70	74	51	51	67		
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress	61	52	55	73	73	70	43		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	589
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	23	Yes	2	2
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	57			
BLK	49			
HSP	58			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	71			

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%
FRL	53			

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	28	Yes	1	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	50			
BLK	42			
HSP	55			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	51			

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	55			57			60	82	76			61
SWD	24			31			10				4	
ELL	41			42			48	71			5	57
AMI												
ASN	57			57							2	
BLK	43			43			43	72	70		6	
HSP	50			51			52	73	75		7	58
MUL	59			64			80	100	67		5	

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
PAC												
WHT	63			66			69	88	82		6	
FRL	47			46			49	69	68		7	58

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	51	42	54	53	44	53	88	74			73
SWD	19	35	29	17	47	39	13					
ELL	43	40	36	39	50	50	33					73
AMI												
ASN	50			50								
BLK	39	41	32	35	46	33	24	87				
HSP	55	48	35	47	52	44	45	80	68			75
MUL	59	46	40	62	59	40	71	80				
PAC												
WHT	65	56	52	63	55	52	65	96	77			
FRL	47	47	43	43	46	41	39	85	55			67

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	60	56	37	51	39	40	46	85	67			43
SWD	20	37	28	24	24	25	25	50				
ELL	45	47	37	41	41	39	17					43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	49	49	36	34	38	39	33	71	50			
HSP	53	54	33	43	40	44	36	76	70			43
MUL	67	45		60	32		45	100	64			
PAC												
WHT	67	62	44	59	39	38	54	92	71			
FRL	54	57	42	44	39	32	42	92	64			40

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	54%	53%	1%	54%	0%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	47%	8%	47%	8%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	44%	15%	47%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	54%	9%	58%	5%
06	2023 - Spring	56%	47%	9%	47%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	46%	2%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
07	2023 - Spring	64%	36%	28%	48%	16%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	55%	3%	59%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	59%	-2%	61%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	63%	57%	6%	55%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	53%	-3%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	56%	41%	15%	44%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	47%	3%	51%	-1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	55%	23%	50%	28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	49%	51%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	62%	35%	63%	34%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	64%	19%	66%	17%

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.

SWD Science demonstrated the lowest performance on testing during the 21-22 school year. Deficiencies in vocabulary and language deficits contributed to the low performance. Lack of hands on activities and available accommodations during Covid learning exasperated the gap in achievement.

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

The data point that demonstrated the greatest decline was the learning gains of students qualifying for FRL in language arts. There are several factors that could contribute to the decline. One factor surrounds the accuracy of reporting during the Covid year. At a time when all were receiving free/ reduced lunches, many families did not fill out the paperwork. This made it difficult to identify the correct students and subgroup.

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.

Waterset scored consistently above state averages.

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

The most significant increase in our students learning gains were found in Math. Action steps included the adoption of more interactive and student centered teaching approach. Teachers incorporated hands-

on activities, real-world-problem solving exercises, and Socratic method discussions into their lessons. This was a shift from compliance of students to engagement of students. WCS also recognizes the importance of personalized learning. Formative assessments were used to address learning gaps. This provided tailored small group instruction, targeting specific standards. Tutoring funds were also used to ensure no student was left behind. Tutors pushed into the classroom providing support for both students and instructors.

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

Proficiency in language arts is our area of concern. ELA skills are fundamental for effective communication. Proficient language skills enable students to express their thoughts and ideas clearly, fostering successful interaction with peers, teachers, and future colleagues. Language skills are also closely linked to critical thinking and analytical abilities, while cultivating creativity and self-expression. These skills are transferable to other subjects and are invaluable for making informed decisions in everyday life.

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

*Intentional focus on leadership opportunities for staff and students.
*Intentional focus on literacy and the Science of Reading.
*Intentional focus on stakeholder wellness.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Staff loyalty will be addressed through an intentional focus on strong minds and good hearts. Staff wellness is an important component to have strong satisfaction amongst our stakeholders.

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

Each year Waterset issues a Fall and Spring stakeholder survey. During the Spring of 21-22, our staff survey questions in the loyalty category scored at a 63% strongly agree rate. The goal for Spring 23-24 is to obtain a strongly agree percentage of 66% or greater on staff survey.

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

Staff surveys are administered in the Fall and the Spring. Our Fall survey data will drive our process of improvement and inform us regarding the success of our wellness initiatives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kerry Bruni (kerry.bruni@hcps.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.)

Professional Learning Communities can strengthen staff loyalty by fostering an environment of collaboration, growth, and support. When educators are given the opportunity to engage in meaningful discussions, share ideas, and work together to improve teaching practices, they feel valued and invested in their professional development. The shared purpose and sense of community enhances their job satisfaction and commitment to the school. The collaborative nature of PLCs allows teachers to address challenges collectively, leading to a sense of unity and camaraderie among staff members.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Staff loyalty is reinforced as educators feel supported, empowered, and connected within the schools community.

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.

Administering Fall and Spring Surveys to Staff, ensuring 100% staff participation.

Person Responsible: Chad McBane (chad.mcbane@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Fall in November and Spring in March

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).

Waterset Charter School utilizes feedback from stakeholder surveys and solicits input through our Parent-Teacher Collaborative.