Lincoln Marti Charter School (Little Havana Campus) School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lincoln Marti Charter School (Little Havana Campus)

970-984 W FLAGLER ST, Miami, FL 33130

www.lincolnmarticharterschoos.com

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sanchez, Barbara	Principal	Serves as the educational leader who oversees day to day school operations. Establishes a shared perspective for utilizing data-driven choices; oversees the execution of the School Improvement Plan. Maintains open communication with stakeholders about school-oriented academic strategies and encourages collaboration in the school's decision-making process.
Diaz, Marilyn	Assistant Principal	Shares the same Mision and Vision as the Principal. Manages the Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) processes. Identifies students who require additional support, collaborates with educators to develop intervention plans, and tracking progress. Coordinates and oversees standardized testing and assessments. Analyzes assessment data to make informed decisions about curriculum adjustments and instructional improvements.
Forjans, Licety	ELL Compliance Specialist	Oversees ELL district and state compliance. Conducts and monitors ELL testing throughout the year, in addition to holding LEP meetings as deemed necessary for the purpose of extending ESOL services or Exiting students from the ESOL program.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school holds at minimum four EESAC meetings within the school year. The school ensures that all stakeholders involved in the school - decision process which include school administration, teachers, students, parents and community members participate in the development, execution and monitoring of the school improvement plan.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

At the conclusion of every Progress Monitoring Assessment period, the school leadership team will thoroughly analyze the school-wide data. The SIP Mid-year reflection will be developed based on the assessment results and any trending data concerns. Strategies and supplemental programs will be discussed in order to assist students overcome any academic barriers.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	81%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	1%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	16	16	16	4	0	0	3	8	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	7	4	1	3	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	1	6	9	2	2	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	80	36	42	7	18	0	19	21	223
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	80	39	31	4	5	0	12	15	186
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	80	69	30	4	6	0	12	13	214

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	11	3	3	6	1	11	4	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	5	8	2	3	4	1	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	6	6	7	5	3	1	1	0	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	13	30	7	21	23	23	29	33	179
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	31	17	4	7	12	15	21	15	122
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	14	20	7	8	12	14	20	14	109

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	6	6	2	1	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	11	3	3	6	1	11	4	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	5	8	2	3	4	1	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	6	6	7	5	3	1	1	0	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	13	30	7	21	23	23	29	33	179
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	31	17	4	7	12	15	21	15	122
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	14	20	7	8	12	14	20	14	109

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	6	6	2	1	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	68	61	53	70	62	55	61		
ELA Learning Gains				73			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				69			56		
Math Achievement*	90	63	55	91	51	42	70		
Math Learning Gains				93			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				94			52		
Science Achievement*	63	56	52	67	60	54	51		
Social Studies Achievement*	96	77	68	90	68	59	86		
Middle School Acceleration	98	75	70	95	61	51	54		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	59	62	55	46	75	70	63		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	527
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	788
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	1	
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	77			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	48			
ELL	78			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	79			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	79			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	68			90			63	96	98			59
SWD	21			50							2	
ELL	62			91			51	94	97		7	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	70			93			63	95	98		7	61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55			73							4	51
FRL												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	70	73	69	91	93	94	67	90	95			46
SWD	21	41	46	50	82							
ELL	68	73	69	91	94	93	65	89	90			46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	70	73	68	92	93	93	66	90	95			47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67			73								44
FRL	71	74	69	92	93	93	66	90	95			46

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	61	64	56	70	48	52	51	86	54			63
SWD	5	33		24	21							38
ELL	58	66	58	71	50	55	45	85	47			63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	61	64	55	70	49	53	50	86	54			61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												84
FRL	60	63	57	70	48	52	50	85	55			64

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	51%	56%	-5%	54%	-3%
07	2023 - Spring	47%	50%	-3%	47%	0%
08	2023 - Spring	41%	51%	-10%	47%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	58%	4%
06	2023 - Spring	39%	50%	-11%	47%	-8%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	52%	-11%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	89%	58%	31%	54%	35%
07	2023 - Spring	91%	48%	43%	48%	43%
03	2023 - Spring	74%	63%	11%	59%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	64%	20%	61%	23%
08	2023 - Spring	97%	59%	38%	55%	42%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	58%	17%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	53%	40%	13%	44%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	36%	50%	-14%	51%	-15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	56%	42%	50%	48%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	68%	11%	66%	13%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Although the 2022-2023 official assessment achievement results haven't been released as of yet, the school analyzed the internal school wide data obtained from the 2022-2023 assessments. It was concluded that the area with the lowest performance was ELA. Our sixth-grade PM 3 overall data was 51%, the majority of students obtained a level 1/2 in the ELA assessment. The contributing factors are: A High ESOL population, COVID-19 Academic barrier and mostly where in other countries losing even more instruction time.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the 2021 - 2022 school year to the 2022 - 2023 school year was 6th grade ELA. In the 2021-2022 school year we obtained 58% of proficiency and in 2022-2023 we obtained 51% (-7%). This negative could have been due to a high percentage of ELL students in 6th grade with less than 2 years in the country.

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.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to both district and state average was ELA Grades 4 and 6 Progress Monitoring 3. The school: 56% 4th and 51% 6th, state: 57% 4th and 52% 6th and district: 62% 4th and 55% 6th. When compared to the district we were - 6% in 4th and -4% in 6th grade below the Proficiency level and the state -1% for both grade levels. The contributing factors are: the high ESOL population, COVID-19 academic barrier, and many lost learning opportunities while still in their countries.

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

Math always has the highest improvement overall. We continued with our Saturday Academies and the Holiday Break Tutoring. All grade levels 3rd through 8th increased from the previous school year to 22-23. The highest increase was Algebra I with a +39% from last year, 61% to 100%.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The two areas of concern are those students who failed ELA and Math assessments, as well as the low attendance rates for some students.

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

The priorities of the school are:
Increase attendance
Increase ELA scores on assessments
Increase Math scores on assessments
Ensure as many third graders pass their ELA assessment.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As students lack attendance, they miss valuable class time and instruction. It is important that students attend school daily to advance in their academics. Attendance and academics are two interconnected aspects of education that play a crucial role in a student's overall learning and development. Therefore, our area of focus is to increase our overall student attendance average.

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

By October 2023, attendance rates will be below 5% of students being absent.

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

Attendance is monitored daily by: Administration, teachers, the attendance coordinator and registrar. Students reaching specific numbers of days out will have a parent conference with the attendance coordinator to attempt to remedy the issue before being considered for Truancy.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Licety Forjans (939765@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Daily attendance will be monitored within DSIS and the gradebook. Early Intervention: The school will identify students who are struggling with attendance and address the issues early by providing counseling sessions, meetings with parents, or providing additional support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is where the registrar and teachers report the daily attendance. Early Intervention: Implementing evidence-based interventions allows schools to identify attendance issues early and provide timely support to students at risk of chronic absenteeism. Addressing attendance challenges proactively prevents more severe academic issues throughout the school year.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Daily attendance will be monitored by: Administration, teachers, the attendance coordinator and registrar.

Person Responsible: Licety Forjans (939765@dadeschools.net)

By When: Daily and as needed. 08/17/23 - 6/6/24

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We must strengthen our ELA assessment data by assisting ourstudents to improve their scores overall.

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

By PM2, the students will increase their ELA data by 10%. The goal for the 2024 school year is to increase ELA proficiency to 65% on the 2024 F.A.S.T P.M 3 assessment for all grade levels.

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

The data from PM1 and PM2 will be monitored by: the Administration, teachers and the testing coordinator. The administration team will monitor the implementation of the Supplemental programs in the school to support our students meet or surpass Reading grade level expectations. These programs include Imagine Learning (ESOL level 1 students), I - Ready (Reading) and Reading Plus (Reading).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marilyn Diaz (945279@dadeshools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Interventions, RTi and extra tutoring will be provided as needed to students. The school will administer with consistency and fidelity various English Language Arts progress monitoring assessments, which include F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring 1 - 3 and the I - Ready Diagnostic Assessments 1 -3.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

I-Ready is an educational technology program developed. It's designed to support and enhance student learning in the areas of mathematics and English Language Arts (ELA). i-Ready offers a comprehensive set of tools that encompass diagnostic assessments, personalized instruction, and progress monitoring. The program is widely used in schools across the United States and is tailored for students from kindergarten through 12th grade. Progress Monitoring: Teachers and administrators can track students' progress over time. They can see how students are advancing, identify areas of concern, and make informed instructional decisions based on data provided by the program.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Student's data must be closely supervised to implement intervention as needed. The administration will monitor the data obtained throughout the school year. Administrative-teacher data chats will be conducted at the conclusion of each assessment. Interventions will be provided to qualifying students.

Person Responsible: Marilyn Diaz (945279@dadeshools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan is developed and reviewed within the school year with stakeholders during EESAC meetings. The SIP is also shared with parents during the Title I Annual Meeting. The School Improvement Plan is accessible to the Public on our school's website: https://lincoln-marticharters.com/general-program-flc/
The SIP is also available at the request of the public in our school's reception.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The Family Engagement Plan with parents during the Title I Annual Meeting. The Family Engagement Plan is accessible to the Public on our school's website: https://lincoln-marticharters.com/pfep-flc/
The SIP is also available at the request of the public in our school's reception.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Our school's commitment to student excellence is underscored by our systematic approach to acceleration courses. Determined by performance benchmarks, acceleration pathways are established for math, science, language, and literature. The school's utmost goal is to expand the offerings of High school credits to our middle school students.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes