

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Lincoln Marti Schools (International Campus)



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

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: 8/12/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	3%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: D (40%)
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.

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	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Lincoln Marti Schools (International Campus)

103 E LUCY ST, Florida City, FL 33034

www.lincolnmarticharterschoos.com

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>96%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>96%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	B

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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; Rtl implementation monitoring for compliance. She will participate in the MTSS/Rtl 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/Rtl problem solving meetings.
Sanchez, Barbara	Principal	The principal will schedule and facilitate regular MTSS/Rtl 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, Rtl implementation and monitoring, periodically monitor the students' ongoing progress. Participate in the MTSS/Rtl problem solving meetings.
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.
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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/12/2013, Barbara Sanchez

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	3%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: D (40%)
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 .	

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	15	40	47	23	31	34	25	26	17	0	0	0	0	258
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	6	0	0	5	7	5	2	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	5	0	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	7

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	4	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/14/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	0

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	
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	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	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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	76

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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 (2017-2018). 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?

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Increase proficiency levels in Science for the 2020-2021 SSA assessment. Data results indicate that although Science proficiency increased in the 2018-2019 SSA, our goal is to have a 5% increase by the 2020-2021 school year.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome will be a 5% increase in proficiency in Science.

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. In addition, Science Topic assessments provided by the school district will be administered to measure student's proficiency in the tested domains. Moreover, the teachers and students will use resources from Floridastudents.org.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Gizmos is an educational programs which has impacted the overall academic success of the students in the area of Science. Floridastudents.org also help prepare students for all tested parts on the Science SSA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide science teachers with Professional Development activities on the scientific inquiry based approach and on the Gizmos program.
2. Teachers will assign Gizmos lessons on a weekly basis based on topics covered in class.
3. Teachers will utilize student data from the I-Ready, IXL, and Gizmos programs to adjust and determine the effectiveness of instruction.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase overall Mathematics learning gains for the 2020-2021 FSA Mathematics Assessments. Data results indicate that although Mathematics proficiency increased in the 2018-2019 FSA, our goal is to have a 5% overall learning gains increase by the 2020-2021 school year.

Measurable Outcome: 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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marielys Llorente (928560@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The outcome will be a 5% increase in overall Mathematics learning gains.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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 IReady, and IXL. Teachers will use Bell Ringers activities from the state Item Specifications.

Action Steps to Implement

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. Teachers will assign I-Ready lessons and diagnostic tests and IXL 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

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Monitoring school-wide data and conducting student data chats to determine action plans based on their academic progress and data results.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

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. The school strongly believes on the importance of maintaining academic success is by consistently having ongoing communication with all stakeholders when it comes to school-wide data and school improvement strategies. Our utmost goal is to ensure all students are provided with a challenging education which will prepare them to be successful in the real world.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00