

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Charter High School Of The Americas (Florida City



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	15

Charter High School Of The Americas (Florida City Campus)

103 EAST LUCY ST, Florida City, FL 33034

www.lincolnmartischarterschools.com

Demographics

Principal: Barbara Sanchez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	15

Charter High School Of The Americas (Florida City Campus)

103 EAST LUCY ST, Florida City, FL 33034

www.lincolnmartischarterschools.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)
High School 9-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Charter High School of the Americas (FI City) is to provide a challenging curriculum in which academic excellence, character development and individual growth are nurtured in a safe and positive environment that includes the active participation of students, teachers, parents and community stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Charter High School of the Americas 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
Sanchez, Barbara	Principal	Principal will schedule and facilitate regular MTSS/Rtl meetings, ensure consistency of follow-up action steps and allocate resources.
Groso, Alexandra	Teacher, K-12	ESOL Coordinator; will monitor that all students are receiving ESOL interventions; attend regular meetings, carry out SIP planning with the focus on the ELL subgroup. Participate in the MTSS/Rtl problem solving meetings.
Llorente, Marielys	Assistant Principal	Will ensure attendance of all members and ensure consistency of follow-up action steps; Rtl implementation monitoring for compliance. Participate in the MTSS/Rtl problem solving process.
Ruiz, Yindira	School Counselor	Will carry out SIP planning with a focus on the social and behavioral needs aspect of the school operation, Rtl implementation and monitoring, periodically monitor the students' ongoing progress. Participate in the MTSS/Rtl problem solving meetings.
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.
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.
Mason, Jacqueline		Teacher; will monitor the students' data and monitor their progress, attend regular meetings, carry out SIP planning with the focus on Science.
Hernandez, Victoria	Other	School Interventionist, will provide the interventions for the students in the MTSS/Rtl 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.
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/Rtl problem solving meetings.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	7
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	1	0	0	0	1

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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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)

7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/16/2019

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	0%	59%	56%	0%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	54%	51%	0%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	48%	42%	0%	45%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	54%	51%	0%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	48%	0%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	45%	0%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	68%	68%	0%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	76%	73%	0%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	7 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	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)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (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 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
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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
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
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

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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	

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.

The lowest performance on the 2018-2019 statewide assessments was English Language Arts. Two out of the seven students enrolled in ninth grade obtained a level 1 or 2 on the ELA 2019

administration when they were in 8th grade. The school wasn't in operation during the 2018-2019 school year.

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

The school wasn't in operation during the 2018-2019 school year.

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 school wasn't in operation during the 2018-2019 school year.

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

The school wasn't in operation during the 2018-2019 school year.

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

Level 1 on the statewide assessment

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

1. Ensure students in Grade 9 pass their FSA ELA.
2. Ensure students in Grade 9 pass their FSA EOC Algebra 1 in order to meet their Mathematics Graduation requirement.
3. Ensure students maintain a GPA of 2.0 or higher

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	English Language Arts
Rationale	The lowest performance on the 2018-2019 statewide assessments was English Language Arts. Two out of the seven students enrolled in ninth grade obtained a level 1 or 2 on the ELA 2019 administration when they were in 8th grade. The school wasn't in operation during the 2018-2019 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The school plans to ensure all 7 students pass their 9th Grade FSA ELA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Barbara Sanchez (bsanchez@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students will be provided intensive reading tutoring and interventions in order to address areas of academic deficiencies. Additionally, the students will use the Reading Plus and Edgenuity programs in order to build academic knowledge.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The use of the Reading Plus and Edgenuity programs in conjunction with intensive tutorings have proven to be successful as evidence by student assessment results throughout the years.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The school will purchase Reading Plus and Edgenuity educational programs to be used by students.. 2. Teachers will receive training on the usage of the Readig Plus and Edgenuity programs. 3. Intervention groups will be created by benchmarks according to the different areas of student needs in ELA. 4. Students will be assessed periodically in order to keep track of their progress. 5. Teachers will utilize Reading Plus, Edgenuity, and class assessment results in order to adjust and determine the effectiveness of instruction.
Person Responsible	Barbara Sanchez (bsanchez@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.

Our school is currently not a Title I school.

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.

Our school is currently not a Title I school.

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

Our school is currently not a Title I school.

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.

Our school is currently not a Title I school.

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

Our school is currently not a Title I school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English Language Arts	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00