# Lincoln Marti Schools (International Campus)



# 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Lincoln Marti Schools (International Campus)

### 103 E LUCY ST, Florida City, FL 33034

### www.lincolnmarticharterschoos.com

## Demographics

## Principal: Barbara Sanchez

Start Date for this Principal: 8/5/2013

| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
|---|---|
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Combination School<br>KG-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2018-19 Economically**<br>**Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 3% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (78%)<br><br>2017-18: A (71%)<br><br>2016-17: B (60%)<br><br>2015-16: D (40%)<br><br>2014-15: C (48%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here. | |

## School Board Approval

N/A

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

# Lincoln Marti Schools (International Campus)

### 103 E LUCY ST, Florida City, FL 33034

### www.lincolnmarticharterschoos.com

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2018-19 Title I School** | **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Combination School KG-8 | Yes | 95% |

| **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 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | A | A | B | D |

## School Board Approval

N/A

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Lincoln-Marti Charter School International Campus mission is to provide the best quality education and instill in our students values that will make them better citizens, better workers and better human beings.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

At Lincoln-Marti we believe that the quality of any nation, state, city, community and family must be judged by the preparation and advancement of the individuals who comprise them.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Llorente, Marielys | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal will ensure attendance of all members and ensure consistency of follow-up action steps; RtI implementation monitoring for compliance. She will participate in the MTSS/RtI problem solving process. |
| Cruz, Liana | Teacher, K-12 | Mathematics lead teacher will monitor the students' data and monitor their progress, attend regular meetings, carry out SIP Planning with the focus on Mathematics. |
| Gonzalez, Maribel | Teacher, K-12 | Social Science Teacher; will monitor the students' data and monitor their progress, attend regular meetings, carry out SIP Planning with the focus on Social Science. |
| Laing, Monepha | Teacher, K-12 | Reading Lead Teacher; responsible for the implementation of the school's comprehensive core and supplemental reading programs. Disaggregating and analyzing students' data to monitor strengths and weaknesses. Participate in the MTSS/RtI problem solving meetings. |
| Sanchez, Barbara | Principal | The principal will schedule and facilitate regular MTSS/RtI meetings, ensure consistency of follow-up action steps and allocate resources. |
| Ruiz, Yindira | School Counselor | The counselor will carry out SIP planning with a focus on the social and behavioral needs aspect of the school operation, RtI implementation and monitoring, periodically monitor the students' ongoing progress. Participate in the MTSS/RtI problem solving meetings. |
| Hernandez, Victoria | Other | School Interventionist, will provide the interventions for the students in the MTSS/RtI Tiers 2 and 3. She will work cohesively with the administration and school psychologist in order to monitor and analyze data to adjust interventions as necessary. |
| Mason, Jacqueline | Teacher, K-12 | Teacher; will monitor the students' data and monitor their progress, attend regular meetings, carry out SIP Planning with the focus on Science. |

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 45 | 55 | 35 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 26 | 21 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 307 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 3 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |

**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 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

**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 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/29/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|---|---|
| Attendance below 90 percent | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | | |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|---|---|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 81% | 63% | 61% | 51% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 79% | 61% | 59% | 61% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 77% | 57% | 54% | 75% | 55% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 92% | 67% | 62% | 70% | 62% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 77% | 63% | 59% | 70% | 60% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 79% | 56% | 52% | 61% | 52% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 65% | 56% | 56% | 35% | 53% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 85% | 80% | 78% | 0% | 75% | 75% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | | Total |
| | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | |
| Number of students enrolled | 45 (0) | 55 (0) | 35 (0) | 31 (0) | 32 (0) | 33 (0) | 26 (0) | 21 (0) | 29 (0) | 307 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 () | 0 () | 2 () | 1 () | 0 () | 3 () | 1 () | 0 () | 0 () | 8 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 2 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 5 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 3 () | 7 (0) | 16 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 3 (0) | 1 (0) | 2 (0) | 3 (0) | 35 (0) |

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

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 79% | 60% | 19% | 58% | 21% |
| | 2018 | 65% | 61% | 4% | 57% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 57% | 64% | -7% | 58% | -1% |
| | 2018 | 56% | 60% | -4% | 56% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 74% | 60% | 14% | 56% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 59% | -7% | 55% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 22% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 18% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 78% | 58% | 20% | 54% | 24% |
| | 2018 | 74% | 53% | 21% | 52% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 26% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 84% | 56% | 28% | 52% | 32% |
| | 2018 | 63% | 54% | 9% | 51% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 21% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 77% | 60% | 17% | 56% | 21% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 14% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 85% | 67% | 18% | 62% | 23% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 67% | 11% | 62% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 97% | 69% | 28% | 64% | 33% |
| | 2018 | 70% | 68% | 2% | 62% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 27% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 19% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 88% | 65% | 23% | 60% | 28% |
| | 2018 | 65% | 66% | -1% | 61% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 23% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 18% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 89% | 58% | 31% | 55% | 34% |
| | 2018 | 84% | 56% | 28% | 52% | 32% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 24% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 88% | 53% | 35% | 54% | 34% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 52% | 26% | 54% | 24% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 73% | 40% | 33% | 46% | 27% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -5% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 67% | 53% | 14% | 53% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 55% | 56% | -1% | 55% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 59% | 43% | 16% | 48% | 11% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| **CIVICS EOC** | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 76% | 73% | 3% | 71% | 5% |
| 2018 | 88% | 72% | 16% | 71% | 17% |
| Compare | | -12% | | | |
| **HISTORY EOC** | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| **ALGEBRA EOC** | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 63% | 37% | 61% | 39% |
| 2018 | | | | | |

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

## Subgroup Data

### 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ELL | 74 | 76 | 77 | 89 | 74 | 78 | 52 | 75 | | | |
| BLK | 83 | | | 92 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 82 | 80 | 77 | 93 | 78 | 79 | 65 | 85 | 69 | | |
| FRL | 81 | 80 | 77 | 92 | 77 | 81 | 64 | 85 | 67 | | |

### 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ELL | 61 | 57 | 52 | 80 | 78 | 61 | | | | | |
| BLK | 67 | 67 | | 73 | 50 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 71 | 69 | 58 | 86 | 81 | 61 | 61 | 85 | | | |
| FRL | 69 | 70 | 64 | 84 | 77 | 67 | 60 | 86 | | | |

### 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ELL | 38 | 59 | 72 | 57 | 66 | 71 | 19 | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 52 | 63 | 78 | 71 | 70 | 62 | 36 | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 61 | 75 | 70 | 70 | 61 | 35 | | | | |

## ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 76 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 53 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 757 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 72 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Native American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Asian Students** | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 88 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 76 |
| 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 | |
|---|---|
| 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 76 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

## Analysis

**Data Reflection**
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our 2018-2019 overall scores outperformed the previous year's data. Our main goal now is to maintain or surpass last year's achievement and learning gain results. As of now the lowest performance area was Science with 65% of proficiency in grades 5 and 8.

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

For the 2018-2019 there was no regression in comparison to the 2017-2018 school year. The only slight decline was in Social Studies Achievement (Civics) as we achieved 85% proficiency in 2018-2019 and 88% in 2017-2018 (-3%).

**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.**

When comparing our school's data to the state's average we achieved 30 points higher than the state average in the Math achievement component. Our school achieved 92% of proficiency and the state achieved 62% proficiency (30+ points).

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

Our school demonstrated the most improvement from 2018 to 2019 in the following components: ELA Lowest 25th Percentile 2018- 54%, 2019- 77% (+16 points) and Math Lowest 25th Percentile.2018- 61%, 2019- 79% (+18 points). Our school provided ongoing support to all students in the different Tiers. We continuously assessed students through I-READY, we monitored the usage of supplemental online programs on a weekly basis: I-READY (Math/Reading), Reading Plus and IXL

(Mathematics). The school offered numerous tutoring camps and additional learning opportunities to re-mediate tested benchmarks: Extended learning tutoring, Winter Break Camp, Saturday Academy Tutoring and Spring Break Camps.

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

1. Attendance below 90 percent
2. Level 1 on statewide assessment

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

1. Maintaining / increasing proficiency levels
2. Maintaining / increasing learning gains
3. Increase Science Achievement levels

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Increase proficiency levels in Science and overall Math Learning Gains. |
| **Rationale** | Data results indicate that there were no learning gains made in Math, although our proficiency levels were significantly higher than in the 2018-2019 school year. Additionally, although Science proficiency increased as well, our goal is to have a 5% increase by the 2019-2020 school year. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | The outcome will be a 5% increase in proficiency in Science and 5% increase in math learning gains. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Marielys Llorente (928560@dadeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Students will engage in more hands-on activities in order to build on science concepts. Science teachers will also assign Gizmos activities that are aligned to the standards in order to ensure content mastery.

To increase overall math learning gains, students will receive tutoring and interventions in order to support and enhance content knowledge. Additionally, they will use supplemental educational programs such as I-Ready, and IXL. Teachers will use Bell Ringers activities from the state Item Specifications. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | These educational programs have greatly impacted the overall academic success of the students in the area of Science and Math. |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | 1. Purchase I-Ready and IXL licenses for student use.
2. Provide math teachers with Professional Development activities for the use of I-Ready and IXL instructional programs.
3. Provide science teachers with Professional Development activities on the scientific inquiry based approach and on the Gizmos program.
4. Teachers will assign I-Ready, IXL, and Gizmos lessons.
5. Teachers will utilize student data from the I-Ready, IXL, and Gizmos programs to adjust and determine the effectiveness of instruction. |
| **Person Responsible** | Marielys Llorente (928560@dadeschools.net) |

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

# Part IV: Title I Requirements

**Additional Title I Requirements**
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

The school will conduct monthly parent meetings in order to help families help their children succeed academically. These meetings will be conducted during flexible hours in order to accommodate the different needs of the families.

**PFEP Link**
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

In order to ensure that the social-emotional needs of all students are being met by providing counseling services when necessary.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

The school provides students with guidance advisement in order to keep them informed about the academic requirements that they must meet for promotion.The school counselor and administration will also monitor the students' GPA as they enter 9th grade.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

In order to meet the needs of all students and maximize student outcome, the school utilizes the resources and instructional material recommended by the district.These resources have proven to be effective throughout the years.An inventory of instructional materials is created and ordered by the school administration. Quantities are also ordered according to student enrollment.Using these resources, students are provided with intensive interventions and tutoring in order to overcome academic barriers.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

Since our school is a K-8th center, we offer Middle School Acceleration courses to our 8th graders in order for them to start accumulating High School credits.

# Part V: Budget

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

<table>
<tr><td>1</td><td>III.A.</td><td colspan="4"><b>Areas of Focus: Increase proficiency levels in Science and overall Math Learning Gains.</b></td><td><b>$46,567.23</b></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Function</td><td>Object</td><td>Budget Focus</td><td>Funding Source</td><td>FTE</td><td>2019-20</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>519-Technology-Related Supplies</td><td>5043 - Lincoln Marti Schools (International Campus)</td><td>Title, I Part A</td><td></td><td>$31,367.00</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="7"><i>Notes: These funds will be utilized to purchase the Supplemental Software programs that will support the students' academic needs. These programs are: Edgenuity, Reading Plus and I-READY</i></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>520-Textbooks</td><td>5043 - Lincoln Marti Schools (International Campus)</td><td>Title, I Part A</td><td></td><td>$15,200.23</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="7"><i>Notes: These funds will be utilized to purchase Supplemental materials that will support the students' academic needs. These materials include: Curriculum associate books (I-READY) and Triumph Learning materials.</i></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="right"><b>Total:</b></td><td><b>$46,567.23</b></td></tr>
</table>