

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Lincoln Marti Charter School (Hialeah Campus)



2021-22 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	24
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	26

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: 5/13/2014

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	4%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	24
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Lincoln Marti Charter School (Hialeah Campus)

3500 W 84TH ST, Hialeah, FL 33018

www.lincolnmarticharterschoos.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	Yes	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	98%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Siboret, Yaimy	Principal	Oversee the school's day-to-day operations, including handling disciplinary matters, conducting classroom observations, managing a budget, and hiring teachers and other personnel. Develops and monitors the SIP. Logistics, schedules, teacher and staff evaluations, and public relations are also major responsibilities.
Garcia, Mirelis	Assistant Principal	Supports in the principal overseeing all functions of the school, including handling discipline matters and leading schoolwide instruction through classroom walkthroughs, feedback, and professional development. Assists the principal in developing and monitoring the implementation of the SIP.
Pol, Marlen	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher: provides academic support to teachers. Assists the administration in bi-weekly leadership team meeting topics and development of the agenda.
Fontela, Yamel	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher: provides academic support to teachers. Assists the administration in bi-weekly leadership team meeting topics and development of the agenda.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 5/13/2014, 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

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

263

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	23	15	22	16	18	26	17	24	24	19	16	16	7	243
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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	3	1	1	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	1	0	9	1	9	10	6	17	15	12	0	12	5	97
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	1	1	3	1	11	15	2	18	13	10	15	12	2	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	0	1	1	7	9	2	17	13	8	3	9	2	73

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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
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 9/7/2021

2020-21 - 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	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		

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				57%	63%	61%	51%	62%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	61%	59%	62%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	57%	54%	63%	57%	52%
Math Achievement				57%	67%	62%	54%	65%	61%
Math Learning Gains				56%	63%	59%	57%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	56%	52%	51%	55%	52%
Science Achievement				37%	56%	56%	45%	57%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				68%	80%	78%	63%	79%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	57%	60%	-3%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	64%	5%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
06	2021					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	50%	58%	-8%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
07	2021					
	2019	47%	56%	-9%	52%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2021					
	2019	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
09	2021					
	2019	28%	55%	-27%	55%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
10	2021					
	2019	25%	53%	-28%	53%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	63%	67%	-4%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	41%	69%	-28%	64%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	65%	16%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
06	2021					
	2019	70%	58%	12%	55%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
07	2021					
	2019	33%	53%	-20%	54%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
08	2021					
	2019	38%	40%	-2%	46%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	52%	53%	-1%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	13%	43%	-30%	48%	-35%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	27%	68%	-41%	67%	-40%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	64%	73%	-9%	71%	-7%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	71%	-71%	70%	-70%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	59%	63%	-4%	61%	-2%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	21%	54%	-33%	57%	-36%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Progress monitoring tools include Adaptive Progress Monitoring (APM), Baseline, Mid-Year Assessments, and iReady diagnostic assessment.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47%	40%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	40%	29%
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42%	40%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%	40%	57%
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	43%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	43%	43%
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30%	29%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	29%	35%
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33%	48%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	33%	48%	45%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14%	26%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	14%	26%	33%
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24%	52%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	24%	52%	50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	33%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	20%	33%	33%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39%	36%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39%	36%	55%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	52%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	52%	68%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50%		41%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	28%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	28%	47%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	40%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	40%	37%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	32%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34%	32%	46%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30%	47%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	47%	33%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52%		41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52%		41%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	26%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	26%	33%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15%	26%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	26%	35%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35%		10%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%		10%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		40%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged		40%	23%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		37%	6%
	Economically Disadvantaged		37%	6%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		41%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged		41%	29%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		37%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged		37%	40%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32%	53%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	53%	30%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		62%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners		63%	43%

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	31	20		23	50						
ELL	44	61	36	43	45	65	16	59	60		
BLK				8	20						
HSP	44	53	34	39	40	60	22	52	41	92	58
FRL	40	48	31	34	38	59	23	48	40		

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		
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			

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	564
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	7
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The trends across grade levels according to the 2020-2021 data were as follows:

The greatest decrease in proficiency was in the area of mathematics, we had a 21% proficiency decrease from the 2019 FSA Mathematics to the 2021 FSA Mathematics. 2019 Proficiency: 57% 2021 Proficiency: 36% The Mathematics learning gains were also greatly affected. Mathematics learning gains were -18% difference- 2019 Mathematics learning gains: 56%. 2021 Mathematics learning gains: 38%.

Reading was another area that was impacted negatively, there was a -16% proficiency decrease from the 2019 FSA ELA to the 2021 data. 2019 Proficiency: 57% 2021 Proficiency: 41% The ELA learning gains were also affected, specifically the lowest 25% proficiency decreased by -21%. 2019 ELA lowest 25% learning gains: 53% 2021 ELA lowest 25% learning gains: 32%.

We also had a decrease in Science proficiency of -15%. 2019 Science Proficiency: 37%, 2021 Science Proficiency: 22%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

According to the latest data we need to increase the overall Mathematics and Reading Proficiency in addition to Mathematics learning gains and Reading lowest 25% Mathematics learning gains.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

One of the major contributing factors last year was the pandemic, our school had over 70% of the students attending school remotely which had a significant impact in the Mathematics and Reading data. The data clearly demonstrates that the students who remained at home (or mostly at home) scored the lowest on the standardized assessments versus the students' who attended school physically.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

There were no areas of improvement based on progress monitoring.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

n/a

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The strategies that need to be implemented are on-going progress monitoring, interventions and small group instruction. Furthermore, now that students are all attending school physically, this will enable the effective implementation of all the necessary strategies in order to ensure that student overcome the learning gaps in Mathematics and Reading.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will receive the adequate training through professional development opportunities that will be offered throughout the school year. The professional development will be tailored to the current data.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services will include Early Bird Tutoring, pull-out interventions, small group instruction, extended learning tutoring and academic camps.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The main area of focus for the 2021-2022 SIP is to Increase Mathematics Proficiency and learning gains on the 2022 FSA Mathematics Assessments. A contributing factors last year was the pandemic, with over 70% of the students attending school remotely which had a significant impact in the Mathematics
Measurable Outcome:	The following are the goals for this school year: increase Mathematics overall proficiency from 36% to 50% and increase Mathematics learning gains from 38% to 45%.
Monitoring:	The school will administer the I-READY Diagnostic assessment during the three administration periods of the school year. Students will be assessed by the grade level mathematics standards using the Standards Mastery assessments in the I-READY program. APM assessments will also be utilized to monitor student progress and tailor instruction based on the students academic needs. Lastly, teachers will be assessing students utilizing the district topic assessments found on Performance matters.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mirelis Garcia (mgmedgar@yahoo.es)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ongoing progress monitoring through the I-READY Program. Consistent assessment of the Mathematics standards through Standards Mastery (I-Ready). District Topic Tests (Performance Matters). APM (Adaptive Progress Monitoring).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	One of the lowest domains on the FSA was Mathematics proficiency and learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

The administration will monitor the usage of the I-Ready program, review Topic Assessment results and APM data. Administrative - teacher data chats will be conducted at the conclusion of each diagnostic assessment. Interventions will be provided to the students.

Person Responsible Mirelis Garcia (mgmedgar@yahoo.es)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Another important area of focus for the 2021-2022 SIP is to increase ELA Proficiency and lowest 25% learning gains on the 2022 FSA ELA Assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	The following are the goals for this school year: increase ELA overall proficiency from 49% to 60% and increase ELA lowest 25% learning gains from 32% to 50%.
Monitoring:	The school will administer the I-READY Diagnostic assessment three times during the year. Students will be assessed by the grade level reading standards using the Standards Mastery assessments in the I-READY program. Lastly, teachers will be assessing students utilizing the district topic assessments found on Performance matters.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mirelis Garcia (mgmedgar@yahoo.es)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ongoing progress monitoring through the I-READY Program. Consistent assessment of the Reading standards through Standards Mastery (I-Ready). District Topic Tests (Performance Matters). Adaptive Progress Monitoring (APM).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The lowest domains on the FSA were ELA proficiency and ELA learning gains in the lowest 25% subgroup.

Action Steps to Implement

The administration will monitor the usage of the I-Ready program. Administrative - teacher data chats will be conducted at the conclusion of each diagnostic assessment. Interventions will be provided to the students.

Person Responsible Mirelis Garcia (mgmedgar@yahoo.es)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

n/a

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.

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 human beings.

The school strongly believes that the main factor on promoting 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.

Lincoln Marti Charter School Hialeah Campus is a Title I school, therefore we conduct physical and/or remote parent / student workshops on a monthly basis focusing on important topics including but not limited to: Accessing the electronic grade book portal, Code of Student conduct, statewide assessments, Reading strategies, Truancy, migrant resources etc.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The leadership team comprised of school principal, assistant principal, counselor and lead teachers will focus on maintaining and enhancing a positive school culture. Our utmost goal is to provide a safe, nurturing and encouraging atmosphere while exposing all students to a rigorous academic curriculum. Students in our school are cognizant that they aren't just a 'number' and know that each of us part of the leadership team have an open door policy for our students. Maintaining ongoing parent communication is vital to the students academic success.

Part V: Budget

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

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