LINCOLN-MARTI CHARTER SCHOOL LITTLE HAVANA

2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. 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

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Sanchez, Barbara

bsanchez@dadeschools.net

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Diaz, Marilyn

945279@dadeschools.net

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Shares the same Mission 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.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Reyes, Katherine

947766@dadeschools.net

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Shares the same Mission and Vision as the Principal with a focused responsibility on enhancing reading achievement across all grade levels. This includes analyzing student reading data to identify trends and areas for growth, collaborating with instructional staff to develop and implement effective reading strategies, and supporting professional development aligned with literacy goals. Ensures alignment between classroom instruction and curriculum standards, monitors progress through regular assessments, and helps foster a culture of literacy throughout the school community.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Forjans, Licety

939765@dadeschools.net

Position Title
ELL Compliance Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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.

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

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

The school conducts a minimum of four EESAC meetings annually. These meetings are integral to the school's decision-making process, ensuring that all stakeholders—comprising school administration, teachers, students, parents, and community members—actively engage in shaping, executing, and monitoring the school improvement plan. This collaborative approach fosters a comprehensive and inclusive environment, driving continuous improvement and excellence in education.

3. 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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

At the end of each Progress Monitoring Assessment period, the school leadership team will conduct a thorough analysis of the school-wide data. Based on the assessment results and any emerging data trends, they will develop the SIP Mid-Year Reflection. During this process, the team will identify and discuss strategies and supplemental programs designed to help students overcome any academic challenges they may face. This ensures that targeted interventions are implemented to address specific areas of need, promoting academic success for all students. After each Progress Monitoring Assessment period, the leadership team will present the analyzed data and Mid-Year Reflection to all stakeholders, including school leaders, teachers, students, parents, and community members. These stakeholders will be invited to provide feedback and suggest changes based on their perspectives and experiences.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	**ACTIVE**
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	**COMBINATION** **KG-8**
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	**K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION**
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	**NO**
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	**61.9%**
CHARTER SCHOOL	**YES**
RAISE SCHOOL	**NO**
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	**N/A**
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	**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.*	**2024-25: A** **2023-24: A** **2022-23: A** **2021-22: A** **2020-21:**

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 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	
School Enrollment	82	74	75	80	63	72	76	62	84	668
Absent 10% or more school days	0	17	10	1	5	3	4	3	3	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	8	4	8	1	4	1	1	1	28
Course failure in Math	0	3	5	3	8	3	2	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	20	22	30	28	22	131
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	6	11	1	6	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	0	10	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	3	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	10

Current Year 2025-26

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	23	15	10	11	13	12	5	11	100

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	0	0	0	9	0	0	2	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last 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 school days		9	8	1	6	8	5	4	7	48
One or more suspensions										0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		1		3	3	4	1			12
Course failure in Math		4	1	5	8	1		1		20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				27	28	29	34	46	30	194
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				12	11	11	9	16		59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)		18	36	12						66
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)		10	3	22	8					43

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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	1	68	70	5	17	20	22	24	23	250

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	1	2		5				1		9
Students retained two or more times							2		1	3

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

> Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	66	67	61	69	65	58	68	61	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	52	65	62	58	63	59	53	58	56
ELA Learning Gains	69	66	61	71	64	59			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	70	58	55	68	58	54			
Math Achievement*	93	69	62	90	68	59	90	63	55
Math Learning Gains	88	65	60	80	66	61			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	90	59	53	83	63	56			
Science Achievement	61	62	57	65	60	54	63	56	52
Social Studies Achievement*	94	82	74	93	79	72	96	77	68
Graduation Rate		81	72		78	71		76	74
Middle School Acceleration	98	79	75	98	77	71	98	75	70
College and Career Acceleration		75	56		76	54		73	53
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	56	64	61	62	64	59	71	62	55

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	76%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	837
Total Components for the FPPI	11
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
76%	76%	75%	79%	61%		78%

* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

** Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

	2024-25 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%**
English Language Learners	74%	No		
Hispanic Students	76%	No		
White Students	68%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	78%	No		

D. 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.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	66%	52%	69%	70%	93%	88%	90%	61%	94%	98%			56%
English Language Learners	60%	48%	66%	71%	93%	89%	92%	55%	91%	98%			56%
Hispanic Students	65%	45%	69%	71%	94%	91%	92%	60%	94%	98%			55%
White Students	70%	58%	64%		89%	75%		60%					61%
Economically Disadvantaged Students	70%	57%	73%	79%	90%	86%	83%	74%	88%	100%			63%

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	69%	58%	71%	68%	90%	80%	83%	65%	93%	98%			62%
Students With Disabilities	50%		67%		42%	50%							
English Language Learners	62%	59%	70%	68%	91%	81%	82%	56%	92%	97%			62%
Hispanic Students	69%	59%	70%	68%	92%	81%	84%	66%	93%	98%			62%
White Students	68%	57%	70%		85%	70%							61%
Economically Disadvantaged Students	71%	48%	71%	70%	91%	76%	86%	68%	92%	97%			65%

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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%	53%			90%			63%	96%	98%			71%
Students With Disabilities	21%				50%								
English Language Learners	62%	45%			91%			51%	94%	97%			59%
Hispanic Students	70%	58%			93%			63%	95%	98%			61%
White Students	55%	45%			73%								51%

E. 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.

				2024-25 SPRING		
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	41%	60%	-19%	57%	-16%
ELA	4	46%	59%	-13%	56%	-10%
ELA	5	58%	60%	-2%	56%	2%
ELA	6	52%	62%	-10%	60%	-8%
ELA	7	47%	62%	-15%	57%	-10%
ELA	8	44%	60%	-16%	55%	-11%
Math	3	76%	69%	7%	63%	13%
Math	4	81%	68%	13%	62%	19%
Math	5	72%	62%	10%	57%	15%
Math	6	87%	64%	23%	60%	27%
Math	7	80%	54%	26%	50%	30%
Math	8	85%	60%	25%	57%	28%
Science	5	49%	56%	-7%	55%	-6%
Science	8	49%	46%	3%	49%	0%
Civics		82%	74%	8%	71%	11%
Algebra		98%	59%	39%	54%	44%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

The ELA 7th grade achievement component showed the most improvement, increasing by 16 percentage points compared to the 2024-2025 school year. This significant growth is the result of targeted interventions such as small-group instruction, focused reading comprehension strategies, and increased use of progress monitoring to address student needs. Teachers also implemented data-driven lesson planning and provided additional support for struggling readers, which helped strengthen overall literacy skills and led to the notable improvement in achievement.

Lowest Performance

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

The lowest performing component for our school was third grade ELA achievement, where our results fell below both the district and state averages. Our students achieved a proficiency rate of 41 percent, compared to the district's 60 percent and the state's 57 percent. This indicates that third grade ELA is an area of concern that requires focused intervention and targeted support to help close the achievement gap and ensure our students are performing at or above the expected levels. One factor that may have contributed to the lower third grade ELA achievement is the high population of English Language Learners within the school. Many of these students are still developing foundational language skills, which can impact their reading comprehension, vocabulary, and overall performance on standardized assessments

Greatest Decline

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

The greatest decline was seen in 8th grade ELA achievement, which dropped from 57% to 44%. Several factors may have contributed to this decline, including challenges with student engagement, gaps in reading comprehension, and the transition into more rigorous middle school standards. Additionally, some students may still be struggling to recover from earlier learning losses, and English Language Learners in particular may have faced difficulties with the increased complexity of academic vocabulary and texts at this grade level. These factors combined likely impacted overall

performance and will require targeted supports moving forward.

Greatest Gap

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 greatest gap when compared to the state average was in 3rd grade ELA achievement, where the school scored 41% while the state average was 57%, a difference of 16 percentage points. This gap can be attributed in part to the high population of English Language Learners, who are still developing foundational literacy and language skills, which impacts their reading comprehension and overall performance on assessments. A trend seen in the data is that early grade ELA achievement continues to be an area of concern, highlighting the need for stronger foundational reading instruction and additional language development support to close this gap.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

The areas of concern identified are the high number of students in grades K-8 scoring a Level 1 on the ELA FAST assessment and the significant number of students who were absent 10% or more days of school.

Highest Priorities

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

The highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming year are to improve overall ELA achievement, reduce the gap between the school's ELA performance and the state average, improve Science achievement levels, strengthen early literacy in the primary grades, and reduce absenteeism to ensure students have consistent access to instruction and learning opportunities.

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

An area of focus for the upcoming school year will be closing the ELA achievement gap between the school and state averages. In the 2024-2025 school year, the school's ELA performance fell below the state average, highlighting the need for targeted instruction and interventions.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Prior year data shows that the school's overall ELA achievement was 41%, compared to the state average of 57%, resulting in a 16 percentage point gap. The specific measurable outcome for the upcoming school year is to increase ELA proficiency to at least 50%, reducing the gap with the state average and ensuring measurable growth.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

This Area of Focus will be monitored through a combination of benchmark assessments, classroom-level progress monitoring, and teacher data reviews. Teachers will regularly track student performance on formative and summative assessments, identify students who are not meeting grade-level expectations, and adjust instruction accordingly. Grade-level teams will meet monthly to review progress, analyze trends, and plan targeted interventions. Ongoing monitoring will allow the school to provide timely support, ensure fidelity of instruction, and measure the impact of interventions, ultimately helping to increase ELA proficiency and close the achievement gap with the state average.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Katherine Reyes

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
To close the ELA achievement gap, the school will implement i-Ready Reading and Read 180 programs.

Rationale:
i-Ready provides personalized instruction targeting students' specific reading skill gaps, while Read 180 offers small-group support to improve fluency, comprehension, and writing. Together, these programs allow teachers to monitor progress and provide targeted interventions, helping students increase ELA proficiency and close the gap with the state average.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Assign/ Implement lessons and monitor progress

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Classroom teachers	Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
The school will assign i-Ready lessons and provide Read 180 small-group instruction, with targeted teacher interventions based on student data. Progress will be tracked through i-Ready reports, Read 180 assessments, and monthly data meetings, allowing teachers to adjust instruction and ensure growth toward closing the ELA achievement gap.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Another area of focus for the upcoming school year will be improving science achievement levels in 5th and 8th grades, where for the past couple of school years the average has been around 50% proficiency. This indicates that half of the students are not meeting grade-level expectations,

highlighting the need for targeted interventions and strengthened instruction.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

The specific measurable outcome for the upcoming school year is to increase science proficiency to at least 60 percent in both grades.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Progress will be monitored through benchmark assessments, classroom formative assessments, and teacher data reviews to ensure students are making gains toward meeting grade-level expectations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Barbara Sanchez, Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The school will implement hands-on, inquiry-based science instruction combined with targeted small-group support. Students will engage in experiments, observations, and problem-solving activities to reinforce key science concepts, while teachers will monitor understanding through formative assessments and classroom observations. Instruction will be adjusted as needed to address learning gaps and ensure that students make measurable gains in science proficiency.

Rationale:

Prior year data showing only 50 percent proficiency in 5th and 8th grade indicates that many students are not mastering key concepts through traditional instruction alone. By providing interactive, student-centered learning and focused support for those struggling, the school can strengthen understanding, address learning gaps, and increase overall science achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Implement hands-on, inquiry-based lessons

Person Monitoring:
Science Teachers

By When/Frequency:
Daily during science instruction

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Students will engage in experiments, observations, and problem-solving activities to reinforce key science concepts.

Action Step #2
Review science data in grade-level meetings

Person Monitoring:
Administration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Teachers and instructional leaders will analyze progress and plan interventions to ensure students are meeting grade-level expectations.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small-group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

No Answer Entered

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

No Answer Entered

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

No Answer Entered

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored

for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:
Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Person Monitoring: **By When/Frequency:**

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Retentions

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

The area of focus for the upcoming school year will be reducing the number of students retained in 3rd grade. In the 2024-2025 school year, 17 students were identified as at risk for retention, and 10 students were ultimately retained. This focus is critical because retention in 3rd grade can have long-term effects on student confidence, engagement, and future academic success, particularly in reading and foundational literacy skills. The need for this focus was identified through prior year data, which highlighted that a significant number of students were not meeting grade-level expectations.

Measurable Outcome
Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

For 3rd grade, the prior year data showed that 17 students were identified as at risk for retention, with 10 students ultimately retained. The specific measurable outcome for the upcoming school year is to reduce the number of retained students to fewer than 5.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

This Area of Focus will be monitored through regular progress monitoring assessments, benchmark testing, and teacher observations to track students' mastery of grade-level literacy skills. Data from interventions will be reviewed to identify students who need additional support or adjustments to instruction. Ongoing monitoring will allow teachers to provide timely, targeted interventions, address learning gaps before they widen, and ensure that at-risk students are on track to meet grade-level expectations. The administrative team will meet regularly with teachers to monitor 3rd grade students' progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Katherine Reyes- Assistant Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:
Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
To reduce 3rd grade retention, the school will implement i-Ready as a key evidence-based intervention to support literacy growth. i-Ready provides personalized instruction in reading, targeting students' specific skill gaps in phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension. Students will complete assigned lessons and diagnostic assessments, allowing teachers to monitor progress in real time. The intervention will be supplemented with small-group guided reading and targeted teacher support for students who need additional assistance. Progress will be monitored through i-Ready reports, benchmark assessments, and weekly data reviews, ensuring students are on track to meet grade-level expectations and achieve the measurable outcome of reducing the number of students retained in 3rd grade.

Rationale:
The rationale for using i-Ready as an intervention is that it is a research-based program designed to provide personalized instruction that meets each student at their individual skill level. Data from the 2024-2025 school year showed that a significant number of 3rd grade students were not meeting grade-level expectations, resulting in a high retention rate. By using i-Ready, teachers can identify specific areas where students are struggling, deliver targeted instruction, and monitor growth in real time. This approach allows for timely interventions, supports students in mastering foundational literacy skills, and directly addresses the critical need to reduce retention and improve overall ELA achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:
Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3

action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Assign and Monitor i-Ready Lessons

Person Monitoring:
3rd Grade ELA Teachers

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Teachers will assign individualized i-Ready reading lessons to all at-risk 3rd grade students, ensuring they complete the lessons on a consistent schedule. Progress will be monitored weekly through i-Ready reports to track skill growth and mastery.

Action Step #2
Provide Targeted Small-Group Support

Person Monitoring:
3rd Grade ELA Teachers

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Based on i-Ready diagnostic data, teachers will pull small groups of students who need additional support to provide focused instruction on specific literacy skills. Adjustments to instruction will be made regularly based on student progress and assessment data.

Action Step #3
Review of iReady data by Administration

Person Monitoring:
Katherine Reyes- Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:
Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
The school administration will review i-Ready data with grade-level teachers to monitor student progress, ensure fidelity of implementation, and provide additional support or resources to teachers as needed to help students meet grade-level expectations and reduce 3rd grade retention.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods
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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.
No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders
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 Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).
No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program
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 II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).
No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed
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 this Act, 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) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections

1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSIor CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.	**No**

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00