

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Lincoln Marti Charter School (Little Havana Campus)



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Lincoln Marti Charter School (Little Havana Campus)

970-984 W FLAGLER ST, Miami, FL 33130

www.lincolnmarticharterschoos.com

Demographics

Principal: Barbara Sanchez

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2015

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)	1%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (81%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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	TS&I
* 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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Lincoln Marti Charter School (Little Havana Campus)

970-984 W FLAGLER ST, Miami, FL 33130

www.lincolnmarticharterschoos.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	97%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	87%

School Grades History

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

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
Sanchez, Barbara	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.
Alves, Viviana	Assistant Principal	
Forjans, Licety	Other	
De Paula, Sandra	Instructional Coach	
Ramos, Rita	Teacher, K-12	
Corcho, Ivonne	Teacher, K-12	
Diaz, Marilyn	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/12/2015, 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

40

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)	1%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (81%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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	TS&I
* 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	68	85	69	79	72	73	74	72	66	0	0	0	0	658	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	2	2	0	5	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	14	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	26	20	22	26	0	0	0	0	94	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	8	14	0	0	0	0	42	

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	3	9	1	2	10	8	8	12	0	0	0	0	53	

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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
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

Tuesday 9/15/2020

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	89	76	92	84	72	89	76	72	108	0	0	0	0	758
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	1	20	24	11	23	33	0	0	0	0	112

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	1	4	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	89	76	92	84	72	89	76	72	108	0	0	0	0	758
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	1	20	24	11	23	33	0	0	0	0	112

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	1	4	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	64%	63%	61%	54%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	61%	59%	62%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	57%	54%	60%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	91%	67%	62%	74%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	87%	63%	59%	72%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	88%	56%	52%	65%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	59%	56%	56%	55%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	96%	80%	78%	80%	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	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%
	2018	62%	61%	1%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	64%	4%	58%	10%
	2018	67%	60%	7%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%
	2018	61%	59%	2%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
06	2019	51%	58%	-7%	54%	-3%
	2018	46%	53%	-7%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
07	2019	49%	56%	-7%	52%	-3%
	2018	42%	54%	-12%	51%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	44%	60%	-16%	56%	-12%
	2018	60%	59%	1%	58%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	80%	67%	13%	62%	18%
	2018	87%	67%	20%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	86%	69%	17%	64%	22%
	2018	90%	68%	22%	62%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	82%	65%	17%	60%	22%
	2018	67%	66%	1%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
06	2019	76%	58%	18%	55%	21%
	2018	79%	56%	23%	52%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
07	2019	91%	53%	38%	54%	37%
	2018	79%	52%	27%	54%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
08	2019	79%	40%	39%	46%	33%
	2018	88%	38%	50%	45%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	46%	53%	-7%	53%	-7%
	2018	61%	56%	5%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	51%	43%	8%	48%	3%
	2018	72%	44%	28%	50%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

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	79%	73%	6%	71%	8%
2018	73%	72%	1%	71%	2%
Compare		6%			

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	98%	63%	35%	61%	37%
2018	95%	59%	36%	62%	33%
Compare		3%			
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
SWD	5	38	30	37	54						
ELL	62	70	64	91	86	89	56	93	95		
HSP	64	70	63	91	87	88	59	96	96		
FRL	65	70	64	91	87	89	58	96	96		
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	62	72	78	89	83	95	71	96	100		
BLK	83			92							
HSP	66	70	78	87	82	85	77	96	94		
FRL	66	70	79	87	81	86	81	94	94		
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	45	58	60	75	75	71	45	74	16		
BLK	50	54		70	69						
HSP	54	63	61	74	73	67	55	78	41		
FRL	55	63	64	75	71	64	56	79	43		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	781
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	77
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	78

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	78
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Science Achievement (59%). Despite our school's performance was above the district's by 3 points, the performance was below 70%. One of the factors to this data was that the students did not have sufficient hands-on experiences.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was the ELA lowest 25th percentile with a difference of 14 points. One of the factors that might have contribute in the students' lack of the required academic vocabulary in English to perform on state assessments.

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.

Our school's performance was above the district's in all of the components

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the Math Learning Gains. Our school took the following actions:

1. Intensive after school tutoring (Extended Learning Day).
2. Use of supplemental programs such as i-Ready, Edgenuity, Gizmos, and IXL.
3. Saturday Academy and Early Bird Tutoring.
4. Secondary benchmark calendar to remediate during small group instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

One area of concern is the attendance.

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

1. Increase the Science achievement.
2. Increase the overall performance (ELA & Math) of the SWD subgroup.
3. Increase the school's overall attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	The lack of academic vocabulary hinders the students' ability to comprehend grade level texts. Therefore, students are unable to master grade level standards, and to perform in other subject areas.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	For the 2020-2021 the school plans to achieve a proficiency level of at 70% in English Language Arts State Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Barbara Sanchez (bsanchez@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use Marzano' strategies for teaching vocabulary as well as close reading strategies to help students make inferences and comprehend grade level's texts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We will also use supplemental programs such as i-ready and Reading Plus to increase the students' academic vocabulary. Teachers will use vocabulary word walls to display the words along with their meaning. Considering the population of English Language Learners our school serves, exposing them to Marzano's multiple meaning words will impact their ability to understand complex texts.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The Leadership Team will conduct daily walkthroughs to the classrooms to supervise the instructional practices and provide teachers with feedback. Also, bsweekly meetings will be held to gather and examine the students' data from summative and formative assessments. This data will then be used to guide teachers on the appropriate learning resources. Ultimately, a variety of supplemental programs will be used to enhance the students' comprehension skills by increasing their English vocabulary.

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.

- Our school will take the following actions to ensure all stakeholders are involved:
- 1. Offer monthly meetings and workshops to build the parents' capacity.
 - 2. Hold parent-teacher conferences to discuss the students' academic progress.
 - 3. Have an annual meetings to consult parents the different school improvement strategies in place.
 - 4. Have an EESAC Committee comprised by different stakeholders such as teachers, students, members of the administration, and parents. The EESAC Committee will meet four times a year to participate in the decision making process.

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: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00