

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Lincoln Marti Schools (International Campus)



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Lincoln Marti Schools (International Campus)

103 E LUCY ST, Florida City, FL 33034

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.

Lincoln-Marti Charter School International 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.

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.
Llorente, Marielys	Assistant Principal	Shares the same Mision and Vision as the Principal. Manages the Response to Intervention (Rtl) 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.
Morales, Johanna	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.
Cruz, Liana	Teacher, K-12	Lead Mathematics Teacher. EESAC Chairperson.
Gonzalezpardo, Aixa	Teacher, K-12	Lead ELA Teacher.

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	97%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	3%
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)	English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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	1	9	4	2	1	3	0	2	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	6	12	4	4	4	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	7	4	1	2	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	20	24	12	1	3	0	3	5	0	69

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	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	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	4	2	6	9	6	5	5	1	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	1	4	6	6	1	2	4	2	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	5	4	1	2	3	4	4	1	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	1	8	6	1	2	0	2	23

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	3	2	4	5	3	4	8	2	31

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	4	2	6	9	6	5	5	1	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	1	4	6	6	1	2	4	2	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	5	4	1	2	3	4	4	1	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	1	8	6	1	2	0	2	23

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	3	2	4	5	3	4	8	2	31

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	11
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*	61	61	53	68	62	55	72		
ELA Learning Gains				71			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				76			78		
Math Achievement*	68	63	55	79	51	42	66		
Math Learning Gains				79			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			37		
Science Achievement*	66	56	52	79	60	54	52		
Social Studies Achievement*	62	77	68	94	68	59	76		
Middle School Acceleration	92	75	70	94	61	51	58		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	51	62	55	50	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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	428
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	759
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
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				
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	62			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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%
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				
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	72			
HSP	79			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	76			

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	61			68			66	62	92			51
SWD												
ELL	54			72			53	40			6	51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	68			42							2	
HSP	59			72			69	56	100		7	53
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT												
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	68	71	76	79	79	69	79	94	94			50
SWD												
ELL	56	70	82	83	85	80	57					50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	81	64		69	73							
HSP	66	72	86	80	80	81	78	100	91			54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	68	70	76	79	79	69	80	94	94			50

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	72	69	78	66	35	37	52	76	58			63
SWD												
ELL	65	69	67	63	38	30	38					63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	71			64								
HSP	71	71	81	66	34	41	50	78	58			65
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	72	69	78	67	35	37	52	76	58			63

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	55%	56%	-1%	54%	1%
07	2023 - Spring	61%	50%	11%	47%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	100%	51%	49%	47%	53%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	58%	-13%	58%	-13%
06	2023 - Spring	62%	50%	12%	47%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	28%	52%	-24%	50%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	72%	58%	14%	54%	18%
07	2023 - Spring	72%	48%	24%	48%	24%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	63%	-5%	59%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	64%	-19%	61%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	58%	-3%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	80%	40%	40%	44%	36%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	50%	-2%	51%	-3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	56%	35%	50%	41%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	68%	-10%	66%	-8%

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 third-grade PM 3 overall data was 26%, the majority of students obtained a level 1/2 in the ELA assessment. The contributing factors are: COVID-19 Academic barrier: these third-grade students were in kindergarten when the schools closed due to COVID-19. In addition, this grade level had the highest percentage of ELL levels 1-4 students with 62% of students classified as ELLs.

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 Social Science. In the 2021-2022 school year we obtained 94% of proficiency and in 2022-2023 we obtained 64% (-30%). This negative could have been due to a high percentage of ELL students in 7th grade with less than 2 years in the country, another factor was that students who were not Proficient in the ELA assessment struggled as well with the Civics EOC assessment.

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 Grade 3 Progress Monitoring 3. The school: 26%, district: 51% and state: 50%. When compared to the district we were - 25% below the Proficiency level and the state -24%. The contributing factors are: COVID-19 academic barrier: these third-grade students were in kindergarten when the schools closed due to COVID-19. In addition, this grade level had the highest percentage of ELL levels 1-4 students with 62% of students classified as ELLs.

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

Overall, the 2022-2023 data reflects that our school decreased in all areas. The data that maintained within the same range of Proficiency was Middle School Acceleration 93% (-1%) from 94% during the 2022-2023 school year.

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

According to the EWS data, the 2 areas of concern are the number of levels 1 in ELA and Mathematics. A total of 36 students obtained a level 1 on the F.A.S.T English Language Arts Progress Monitoring 3 Assessment and 20 students obtained a level 1 on the F.A.S.T. Mathematics Progress Monitoring 3 Assessment.

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

1. Increase English Language Arts Proficiency.
2. Increase Science Proficiency.
3. Increase Social Science Proficiency.
4. Increase Mathematics Proficiency
5. Increase overall student attendance.

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.

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.

The school will increase its percent of student attendance by 3%. From the reported 89.50% to 92.50%.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus (attendance) will be monitored through leadership team meetings on a bi-weekly basis. In addition, teachers will continue to review the attendance bulletin on a daily basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

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.

Recognize and Reward Attendance: The school will implement attendance rewards programs where students with good attendance are acknowledged and rewarded.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for implementing evidence-based interventions to improve student attendance is grounded in the understanding that regular attendance is a fundamental pillar of academic success and overall student well-being. Evidence-based interventions are approaches that have been proven effective through research and data analysis.

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.

Review and monitor attendance data during leadership meetings.

Conduct parent workshops on the importance of positive attendance trends and student academic achievement.

Person Responsible: Barbara Sanchez (bsanchez@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/17/23 - 6/6/24

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

The 2023 -2024 Area of Focus is Science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our 2022-2023 SIP goal was to obtain 65% or higher, our school didn't meet the SIP goal as we obtained 64% Science Proficiency on the 2023 SSA. Therefore, our goal is to increase the Science Proficiency levels on the 2024 SSA to 70%.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be academically monitored throughout the different District wide assessments. These include Baseline, Topic Assessments, and Science Mid-Year Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Barbara Sanchez (bsanchez@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.)

Ongoing progress monitoring through the different assessments. Students will be exposed to more hands on experiments in addition to virtual experiments through GIZMOS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our goal is to obtain 70% or higher on the SSA.

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.

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: Marielys Llorente (928560@dadeschools.net)

By When: 5/31/24

#3. 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.

The Academic Area of Focus is English Language Arts.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our school is projecting 60% of ELA Proficiency which is -8% in comparison to the previous school year (68%). 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.

Monitoring:

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

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:

Barbara Sanchez (bsanchez@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.)

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 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.

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.

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: Marielys Llorente (928560@dadeschools.net)

By When: 5/30/24

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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.

Another 2023 -2024 Area of Focus is Social Science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our Social Science scores on the Civics EOC decreased by -30% from 94% to 64%. Our goal is to be able to obtain 70% of Proficiency on the 2024 Civics EOC.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be academically monitored throughout the different District wide assessments. These include Topic Assessments and the Social Science Mid-Year Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Barbara Sanchez (bsanchez@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.)

Edgenuity, will be utilized as a supplemental program to support the core instruction in Social Science (Civics).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Edgenuity will assess student understanding and progress in this subject. Teachers will monitor student performance and use the data to adjust instruction and provide targeted support.

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.

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: Marielys Llorente (928560@dadeschools.net)

By When: 5/30/24

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/pfep-int/>

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/general-program-int/>

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: Science	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$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