

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Lincoln Marti Charter School (Little Havana Campus)



2022-23 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>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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: 8/20/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	1%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (82%) 2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (81%)
<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>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Lincoln Marti Charter School (Little Havana Campus)

970-984 W FLAGLER ST, Miami, FL 33130

www.lincolnmarticharterschoos.com

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>1%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>81%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sanchez, Barbara	Principal	
Diaz, Marilyn	Assistant Principal	
Forjans, Licety	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Ruiz, Yindira	School Counselor	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 8/20/2015, Barbara Sanchez

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

15

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

30

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

680

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

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

5

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	84	86	77	71	67	60	77	78	93	0	0	0	0	693
Attendance below 90 percent	0	14	11	3	3	6	1	11	4	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	5	8	2	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	6	6	7	5	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	13	30	7	21	23	23	29	33	0	0	0	0	179
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	31	17	4	7	12	15	21	15	0	0	0	0	122
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	14	20	7	8	12	14	20	14	0	0	0	0	109

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 9/6/2022

**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	87	72	80	76	60	65	71	66	42	0	0	0	0	619
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	10	9	11	7	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	2	3	5	7	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	4	4	17	20	11	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	22	12	15	27	20	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	24	17	6	12	11	13	0	0	0	0	83
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	0	4	8	11	24	16	16	17	16	0	0	0	0	112

**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	

**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	87	72	80	76	60	65	71	66	42	0	0	0	0	619
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	10	9	11	7	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	2	3	5	7	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	4	4	17	20	11	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	22	12	15	27	20	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	24	17	6	12	11	13	0	0	0	0	83
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	0	4	8	11	24	16	16	17	16	0	0	0	0	112

**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	

**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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	70%	62%	55%				64%	63%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	73%						70%	61%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69%						64%	57%	54%
Math Achievement	91%	51%	42%				91%	67%	62%
Math Learning Gains	93%						87%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	94%						88%	56%	52%
Science Achievement	67%	60%	54%				59%	56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	90%	68%	59%				96%	80%	78%

**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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	68%	64%	4%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
06	2022					
	2019	51%	58%	-7%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
07	2022					
	2019	49%	56%	-7%	52%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2022					
	2019	44%	60%	-16%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	80%	67%	13%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	86%	69%	17%	64%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2022					
	2019	82%	65%	17%	60%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
06	2022					
	2019	76%	58%	18%	55%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
07	2022					
	2019	91%	53%	38%	54%	37%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
08	2022					
	2019	79%	40%	39%	46%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	46%	53%	-7%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	51%	43%	8%	48%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	79%	73%	6%	71%	8%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	98%	63%	35%	61%	37%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	21	41	46	50	82						
ELL	68	73	69	91	94	93	65	89	90		
HSP	70	73	68	92	93	93	66	90	95		
WHT	67			73							
FRL	71	74	69	92	93	93	66	90	95		
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	5	33		24	21						
ELL	58	66	58	71	50	55	45	85	47		
HSP	61	64	55	70	49	53	50	86	54		
WHT											
FRL	60	63	57	70	48	52	50	85	55		
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		

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
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	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	788
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	78
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
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
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	79
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	79
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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?**

There is a general improvement across all grade levels and subjects tested from the 2020 - 2021 to 2021 - 2022 school year.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

There is always a need for improvement in ELA, as most of our students are ESOL students.

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

As our students are mostly ESOL, this is why this area is targeted with the use of ESOL services and tutoring.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Math has shown the most improvement based on the 2022 data.

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

Math is a universal language and even though the students are mostly ESOL, they understand numbers better.

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

Tutoring and Intensive math courses will be offered to make sure this data increases.

**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.**

I-Ready training, as well as classroom management training, are some of the Professional Developments that have or that will be conducted this school year.

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

This year we will continue with our tutoring camps to help us make sure the students keep progressing.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

After analyzing the data, the lowest area and area of concern is in ELA. This is due to the fact that many of our students are ESOL and just arriving in the country as well.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the school year, the students scores will increase by 10% from the previous year to this year.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This progression will be monitored with the use of Progress Monitoring and I-Ready Diagnostics throughout the year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Marilyn Diaz (945279@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The evidence being used will be all the data available per student per testing window.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

By giving Progress Monitoring and I-Ready Diagnostics, we can track the students progress and make changes to their programs as needed.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Data from the students' will be analyzed by the teacher after every testing window. Tutoring and Rtl will be implemented along the way as needed.

**Person Responsible**

Marilyn Diaz (945279@dadeschools.net)

**RAISE**

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

In Kinder we had a 68% pass rate of ELA. Where we ran into difficulty was in 1st grade that had a pass rate of 40% and 2nd had a pass rate of 36%. All this was based off the SAT 2022 data.

**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

In 3rd grade we had a pass rate of 56%. In 4th grade we had a pass rate of 55%. In 5th grade we had a pass rate of 70%. This was all based on the data from the 2022 FSA Reading Test.

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By the end of the school year, all students in Kinder - 2nd grade will increase their test scores by 10%.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By the end of the school year, all students in 3rd - 5th grade will increase their test scores by 10%.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.



The data will be monitored by the teachers, each time there is a Progress Monitoring or I-Ready Diagnostic. Each student will also know their progress by filling out their student data chats. Teachers will turn in their analyzed data to administration.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Diaz, Marilyn, 945279@dadeschools.net

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The evidence of the students practice will come from the different forms of testing: Progress Monitoring and I-Ready. They all align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

We have used I-Ready in the past and it has helped improve students. With each diagnosis, we can monitor the students' growth.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Progress monitoring 1 given, data analyzed and recorded I-Ready 1 given, data analyzed and recorded Students given the help or additional programs needed Repeat the same for Window 2 and then 3	Diaz, Marilyn, 945279@dadeschools.net

### 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

#### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Lincoln-Marti Charter School Little Havana 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.

Since our school is a Title I school we conduct physical and/or remotely 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 school culture and environment.

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, thus the school's data (both academically and incident wise) during the last 5 school years reflect that the school has high expectations from every student as the school has earned various recognitions based on statewide data, including being a high performing school.