
Table of Contents

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

Lincoln Marti Charter School (Hialeah Campus)

3500 W 84TH ST, Hialeah, FL 33018

www.lincolnmarticharterschoos.com

Demographics

Principal: Barbara Sanchez

Start Date for this Principal: 8/9/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
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)	4%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Lincoln Marti Charter School (Hialeah Campus)

3500 W 84TH ST, Hialeah, FL 33018

www.lincolnmarticharterschoos.com

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-12</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>91%</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>98%</p>

School Grades History

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

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 Hialeah 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 humans.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Lincoln-Marti Charter School Hialeah Campus 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
Siboret, Yaimy	Principal	The principal will schedule and facilitate regular leadership and RTI meetings, ensure attendance of team members, ensure follow-up of action steps, allocate resources.
Garcia, Mirelis	Assistant Principal	Attend regular meetings, carry out SIP planning with a focus on the functional aspect of the school, RTI implementation and compliance and participate in the MTSS problem solving.
Fontela, Yamel	Teacher, K-12	Attend regular meetings, carry out SIP planning with a focus on the social and behavioral needs aspect of the school operation, RTI implementation and compliance, and participate in the MTSS problem solving.
Pol, Marlen	Teacher, K-12	Attend regular meetings, carry out SIP planning with a focus on the academic progress of the students, needs of the teachers including mentoring and guidance, and participate in the MTSS problem solving process.
Ruiz, Yindira	School Counselor	Attend regular meetings, carry out SIP planning with a focus on the social and behavioral needs aspect of the school operation, RTI implementation and compliance, and participate in the MTSS problem solving process.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/9/2014, 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

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
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)	4%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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	9	19	20	23	25	23	21	26	34	22	19	14	13	268
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	0	0	5	6	12	9	11	3	4	8	60
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	6	7	12	14	12	0	0	7	58
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	9	10	10	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	0	0	5	6	12	9	11	3	4	6	58

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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	19	19	23	28	27	24	32	33	34	21	14	14	12	300
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	1	1	4	3	9	4	8	8	3	8	6	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	0	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	8	14	16	15	21	12	6	13	10	117

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	1	2	3	8	9	9	10	6	0	8	6	62
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	----

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	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	19	19	23	28	27	24	32	33	34	21	14	14	12	300
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	1	1	4	3	9	4	8	8	3	8	6	57
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	0	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	9
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	8	14	16	15	21	12	6	13	10	117
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	---	----	----	-----

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	1	2	3	8	9	9	10	6	0	8	6	62
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	----

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	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	57%	63%	61%	44%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	61%	59%	45%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	57%	54%	50%	55%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	57%	67%	62%	49%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%	63%	59%	45%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	56%	52%	41%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	37%	56%	56%	44%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	80%	78%	53%	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	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	57%	60%	-3%	58%	-1%
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	64%	5%	58%	11%
	2018	72%	60%	12%	56%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				
05	2019	58%	60%	-2%	56%	2%
	2018	53%	59%	-6%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
06	2019	50%	58%	-8%	54%	-4%
	2018	48%	53%	-5%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
07	2019	47%	56%	-9%	52%	-5%
	2018	37%	54%	-17%	51%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
	2018	44%	59%	-15%	58%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
09	2019	28%	55%	-27%	55%	-27%
	2018	9%	54%	-45%	53%	-44%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
10	2019	25%	53%	-28%	53%	-28%
	2018	25%	54%	-29%	53%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	67%	-4%	62%	1%
	2018	56%	67%	-11%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	69%	-28%	64%	-23%
	2018	91%	68%	23%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-50%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2019	81%	65%	16%	60%	21%
	2018	76%	66%	10%	61%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
06	2019	70%	58%	12%	55%	15%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
07	2019	33%	53%	-20%	54%	-21%
	2018	15%	52%	-37%	54%	-39%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
08	2019	38%	40%	-2%	46%	-8%
	2018	22%	38%	-16%	45%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	53%	-1%	53%	-1%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	13%	43%	-30%	48%	-35%
	2018	20%	44%	-24%	50%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	27%	68%	-41%	67%	-40%
2018	29%	65%	-36%	65%	-36%
Compare		-2%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	73%	-9%	71%	-7%
2018	63%	72%	-9%	71%	-8%
Compare		1%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	70%	-70%
2018	30%	67%	-37%	68%	-38%
Compare		-30%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	63%	-4%	61%	-2%
2018	33%	59%	-26%	62%	-29%
Compare		26%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	21%	54%	-33%	57%	-36%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Compare		21%			

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	33	55		15	30						
ELL	50	52	57	54	55	65	33	57	64		

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
BLK	56	67		50	38						
HSP	57	54	48	57	57	59	38	65	65		
FRL	56	53	50	55	59	56	37	68	63		
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
SWD	7	36		8	30						
ELL	36	53	52	47	52	47	25	53			
BLK	25	65		29	44						
HSP	55	64	62	57	59	53	50	65	91		
FRL	49	60	52	48	56	47	38	53			
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
SWD	14	33		15	18						
ELL	38	45	44	45	44	48	36				
BLK	11	41		22	40						
HSP	48	46	48	52	45	45	47	53	55		
FRL	44	44	53	47	44	43	46	50	55		

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	56
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	557
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	54
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	53
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	55
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	55
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.

Data analysis reveals that ELA learning gains (decrease of 6 pts) and Science achievement (decrease of 8 pts) are among the lowest in comparison to the previous year's data. Lack of reading foundational/comprehension and analytical skills are impacting students ability to read and comprehend grade-level text. Students have exhibited difficulty reading with the sufficient accuracy and fluency need to support comprehension of text both in reading and science.

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

The greatest decline was demonstrated in Science in comparison to the previous year's data. A total of an 8% decrease in percentage points in grade 5 and 8th. Overall, when compared to prior years, the Science data has been significantly low when compared at the District and State level. Students have demonstrated difficulty understanding the basic science concepts and analytical skills necessary to incorporate the scientific inquiry-based approach.

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 for the 2018-2019 school year, the greatest gap when compared to the state average was in Science grades 5 and 8. The state at 56% and our school at 37%, there was a total difference of 19% when compared to the state. As explained before, students have demonstrated difficulty understanding the basic science concepts and analytical skills necessary to incorporate the scientific inquiry-based approach.

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

ELA achievement in 2018-51%, 2019-57% (an increase of 6 pts) Math lowest 25th percentile 2018-51%, 2019-58% (an increase of 7 pts) and Social Studies 2018-63%, 2019-68% (an increase of 5 pts). Our school provided ongoing support to all students through differentiated instruction and interventions. Continuous usage and monitoring of the following online programs: iReady Math and Reading, Reading Plus, Edgenuity, and iCivics. Ongoing benchmark assessments were utilized to monitor student progress. In addition, the school offered extended learning day tutoring, Winter Break tutoring, Saturday Academy tutoring and Spring Break Camp tutoring.

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

Attendance below 90 percent= students
 Level 1 on a statewide assessment= students

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

1. Increasing proficiency levels in ELA and Math
2. Increasing learning gains
3. Increasing Science achievement levels in grades 5 and 8
4. Increasing Social Studies achievement levels in grades 7 (Civics) and 11 (U.S. History)
5. Decreasing the number of students with attendance below 90 percent

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Lincoln-Marti Charter Hialeah Campus instructional goal for the 2019-2020 school year is to increase academic achievement by improving core instruction in ELA and Science.

Measurable Outcome: The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is an overall increase in student performance and achievement in ELA and Science.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Yaimy Siboret (yjfernandez@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be exposed to the foundational reading skills. They will be trained to read complex text through the application of close reading strategies. In additions, students will be exposed to grade-level academic vocabulary through the use of Marzano's vocabulary. Expose students to a variety of mathematical concepts that will build a strong foundation of conceptual understanding, procedural skills, and fluency as well as application. Students will use a variety of science concepts and skills involving the scientific method. The students will be required to plan, monitor, analyze, and observe while documenting the scientific process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increase reading fluency/comprehension and knowledge of academic vocabulary. Increase student writing skills; enabling students to produce clear and coherent writing that provides supporting evidence from literary and informational text. Students will be engaged in interactive activities and strategies that promote deeper levels of thinking (close reading) and include SQR, RAFT, and Paraphrasing in order for them to develop critical thinking, problem-solving and analytical skills. Expose students to Science concepts that include the scientific inquiry-based approach in addition to writing skills that will allow students to documents their findings.

Action Steps to Implement

Continuous data monitoring of informal/formal assessments. Baseline, mid-year and end-of year assessments.

Person Responsible Yaimy Siboret (yjfernandez@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The remaining schoolwide improvement priorities will be addressed as follows: attendance below 90 percent/level 1 on statewide assessment; the leadership team and truancy team will meet regularly to discuss possible cases of students with 3 or more unexcused absences, the school counselor and administration will meet with parents and hopefully decrease or eliminate absences. In the event unexcused absences continue the truancy procedures will be followed. Parental workshops will be offered to parents, informing them of the importance of student attendance, how they can support from home, homelearning support, testing updates and other important and resourceful information. Extended learning day tutoring, Winter Break tutoring, Saturday Academy tutoring and Spring Break Camp tutoring will continue to be offered to support struggling students.

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.

The School Advisory Council (SAC) at Lincoln-Marti Charter Hialeah Campus is composed of parents, teachers, administrators, support staff and representatives of the school community that are actively involved to support student academic achievement. The school holds monthly meetings and workshops where the parents are invited to take part, voice their opinions and learn ways in which they can help their children from home to succeed academically. Input from parents and stakeholders is also taken into account to manage important school decisions. They are informed of school events, assessment dates, and monthly meetings through letters, flyers, brochures, and Blackboard Connect messages provided in multiple languages.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

	Total: \$0.00
--	----------------------