

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Lincoln Marti Schools (International Campus)



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>19</b> |

# 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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 3%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><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 |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (78%)<br>2017-18: A (71%)<br>2016-17: B (60%)<br>2015-16: D (40%)      |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>19</b> |

## Lincoln Marti Schools (International Campus)

103 E LUCY ST, Florida City, FL 33034

www.lincolnmarticharterschoos.com

### School Demographics

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

### 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**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 3%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><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 |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (78%)<br>2017-18: A (71%)<br>2016-17: B (60%)<br>2015-16: D (40%)      |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

**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  |       |

**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  |       |
| 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  |       |

**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 |