

Alachua County Public Schools

Abraham Lincoln Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Abraham Lincoln Middle School

1001 SE 12TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32641

<https://www.sbac.edu/lincoln>

Demographics

Principal: Darin Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Abraham Lincoln Middle School

1001 SE 12TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32641

<https://www.sbac.edu/lincoln>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	77%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	77%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will cultivate excellence in our diverse community of learners through challenging, compassionate, and caring relationships. We will imbue students with rigor, which promotes success in a safe learning-rich environment in order to create opportunities for social and emotional growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In conjunction with the SBAC district vision, we will help develop students who have the knowledge, skills, and personal characteristics to be lifelong learners and independent thinkers. Lincoln strives to raise the academic achievement of all students at all levels.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Strappy, LaTroy	Principal	Oversee the direction of the school in accordance with district initiatives and strategic plan. He provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RTI.
Bell, Ricky	Assistant Principal	He oversees the curricular goals of the school as well as formative and summative assessments. He conducts assessment of RTI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RTI implementation (including job-embedded year-long professional development), and communicates with parents regarding school-based RTI plans and activities. He participates in the weekly student services team meetings where student needs are addressed.
Jones, Marlon	Assistant Principal	Oversee the safety and security of the school along with required trainings. He also oversees student services and building maintenance of the school. He conducts assessment of RTI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RTI implementation (including job-embedded year-long professional development), and communicates with parents regarding school-based RTI plans and activities. He participates in the weekly student services team meetings where student needs are addressed.
Ellerbe, Anteria	Dean	She addresses the campus safety and student discipline. The Lincoln leadership meets weekly to identify and address intervention needs with individual students, grade levels, and also school-wide. Our Students Services Team and Positive Behavior Support Team help to identify our intervention needs and resources. The school-based leadership team will become "trainer" and "coaches" for the school staff and will be responsible for school-wide implementation of RTI. She participates in the weekly student services team meetings where student needs are addressed.
Gano, Jill	School Counselor	Oversee the social/emotional welfare of students. She oversees 504s, IEPs, and EPTs as well interventions and mediations. She coordinates IEPs to make sure they are in accordance with state guidelines. She participates in the weekly student services team meetings where student needs are addressed.
Williams, Mary	School Counselor	Oversee the social/emotional welfare of students. She oversees 504s, IEPs, and EPTs as well interventions and mediations. She also oversees our truancy. She participates in the weekly student services team meetings where student needs are addressed.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	255	233	212	0	0	0	0	700	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	11	5	0	0	0	0	44	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	27	20	0	0	0	0	60	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	11	13	0	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	92	61	0	0	0	0	247	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	32	20	0	0	0	0	92

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	13	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

36

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/15/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	19	14	0	0	0	0	67	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	39	30	0	0	0	0	92	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	21	18	0	0	0	0	70	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	71	63	0	0	0	0	203	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	53	37	0	0	0	0	137	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%	59%	54%	57%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	54%	58%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	41%	47%	33%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	61%	60%	58%	56%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	60%	56%	57%	62%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	46%	51%	38%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	65%	53%	51%	56%	57%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	73%	72%	63%	72%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	255 (0)	233 (0)	212 (0)	700 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	28 (0)	11 (0)	5 (0)	44 (0)
One or more suspensions	13 (0)	27 (0)	20 (0)	60 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	20 (0)	11 (0)	13 (0)	44 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	94 (0)	92 (0)	61 (0)	247 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
06	2019	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
	2018	56%	55%	1%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	59%	54%	5%	52%	7%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	51%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	68%	61%	7%	56%	12%
	2018	56%	61%	-5%	58%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	32%	52%	-20%	55%	-23%
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	62%	59%	3%	54%	8%
	2018	52%	58%	-6%	54%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
08	2019	18%	27%	-9%	46%	-28%
	2018	4%	24%	-20%	45%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	62%	54%	8%	48%	14%
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	50%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	69%	-3%	71%	-5%
2018	69%	69%	0%	71%	-2%
Compare		-3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	56%	37%	61%	32%
2018	81%	60%	21%	62%	19%
Compare		12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	48%	52%	57%	43%
2018	100%	63%	37%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	43	34	20	38	35	18				
ASN	99	86		100	91		100	98	99		
BLK	24	35	33	22	37	31	14	37	61		
HSP	93	78		82	63			100			
MUL	83	71		79	71				91		
WHT	94	81		94	76	45	96	93	94		
FRL	29	40	33	27	39	31	20	41	67		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	12	33	28	11	36	35	10	28			
ASN	98	86		100	94		98	100	99		
BLK	22	35	26	18	30	26	14	42	33		
HSP	77	74		79	79		67		86		
MUL	69	63		69	63		60		83		
WHT	94	80		92	84		83	93	90		
FRL	26	39	28	21	33	26	16	42	38		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	3	25	25	1	18	16		7			
ASN	98	89		100	98		98	100	97		
BLK	17	34	32	15	33	31	9	27	85		
HSP	79	64		71	79		70	70	100		
MUL	81	81		78	81			80			
WHT	94	73		95	88		93	100	97		
FRL	19	34	33	15	32	30	15	31	88		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	96
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	83
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	84
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our lowest components continue to be our lowest quartile for Math and ELA. We can also isolate this down to our 6th grade gains for ELA and Math which were much lower than the gains for other grade levels.

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

Our 6th grade math component showed the largest decrease in achievement. In 2018 we were at a 45% while last year we were a 32% in this category. We had a new teacher teaching our advanced math 6 students from our major program. These are students that are a 2.5 and up. We also had a higher proportion of students in our Lyceum program take Math 7 Adv. instead of Math 6 Adv.

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.

Our greatest gap between the state and school was in our 8th grade math. We were 28% lower than the state average of a 46%. We are comfortable with this because we place any student who is a level 3 from their Math 7 scores into Algebra. That means that the 18 percent who scored on achievement level during 8th grade year, were not on achievement level the year prior. Going forward, we are making sure that our Math 7 Adv. course is truly preparing our students for Algebra during their 8th grade year by meeting all the standards.

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

Our Algebra component showed a 12% improvement. This was a big focus for us as seen in the previous question. We targeted our students that came from our major program and qualified for Algebra by making sure they were getting additional support through IXL and mentoring.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Our truancy is a big area of concern going forward into this year. We created a report that will be sent to administration daily to effectively monitor attendance input by teachers. We also have 94 6th graders coming in with Level 1's on their FSA from the prior year. While this can definitely be an area to target for learning gains, it can hurt us in the achievement category.

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

1. 6th Grade Math
2. School Discipline
3. Lowest Quartile for ELA
4. Lowest Quartile for Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	6th Grade Math
Rationale	We have a high number of African American and economically disadvantaged students coming in with a Level 1 for math. We want to make sure that our major program students are making the learning gains necessary to qualify for Math 7 Adv. in their 7th grade year and then possibly qualify for Algebra during their 8th grade year. This means that African American and economically disadvantaged Level 1 students need to earn close to a 2.5 bucket to qualify for our Math 7 Adv. class and then earn a 3 their 7th grade year so that they can take Algebra and earn a high school credit before they graduate from Lincoln. Having a higher rate of African American students reaching a Level 3 or higher will decrease the achievement gap of all students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We would like to increase our number of African American and economically disadvantaged students who will eventually get into Algebra their 8th grade year by 5 a year. In 2018 we had 20 students qualify. This year we have 25 students qualify. We would like 30 students to qualify after this year and that means we would like 35 6th graders in our major program to earn a 2.5 or above this year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	All 6th grade students will be placed on IXL. They will start the year with a diagnostic assessment to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses. Each teacher will be responsible for tracking progress on IXL and AIMS after receiving student performance on standardized test.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	IXL is a proven program that identifies areas of strength and weaknesses. It gives students choice to determine areas they need to focus on as well as tracks student answers and progress for teachers to monitor. This follows in line with Daniel Pink's theories on flow and student learning.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sign up all 6th grade students for IXL 2. Assess all students through diagnostic 3. Perform data chats with all students individually 4. Create one class specifically for IXL intervention and monitoring 5. Track progress for school
Person Responsible	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)

#2	
Title	Lowest Quartile for ELA
Rationale	Many of our students are coming to us below grade level in Reading.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We would like to improve our ELA learning gains for our Lowest Quartile from 32% to 42%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	We have purchased the American Reading Company product to supplement Codex and district books. This program identifies the reading needs of each individual student and then provides them with books and lessons that are on their reading level and interest level. Students with disabilities are showing lower than grade level reading skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our struggling readers are not engaged in the current structure so we want to identify ways to get them excited about reading and become life long learners. Our students with disabilities are showing lower than grade level reading skills which inhibits them from performing academically as well as
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train Reading and ELA Teachers in American Reading Company platform 2. Assess all major program students through the IRLA (Independent Reading Level Assessment) 3. School wide reading initiative 4. American Reading Company Book talks during Morning News 5. Monitor progress on AIMS 6. Monitor progress of SWD on AIMS and on FSA for learning gains growth.
Person Responsible	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)

#3	
Title	School Discipline
Rationale	If students are missing class time due to discipline events, they will not be able to make their learning gains. The majority of our referrals and suspensions are for our African American and economically disadvantaged students. We also have a high percentage of students with disabilities receiving referrals. Restorative practices should help decrease future incidents.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We would like to drop our out of school suspension days and in-school detention days by 10 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Marlon Jones (jonesmd@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	We have retrained our leadership on Positive Behavior Intervention Support and are implementing it school-wide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	PBIS has been shown to decrease discipline data as well as benefit the school culture and climate. High rates of suspension have been proven to have higher concentrations in African American students, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities. PBIS will be used as a restorative practice and a way to create safe learning environments for all students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train leadership team in PBIS. Each team has a representative that meets every 2 weeks. 2. Have Registered Behavior Technician (Dean Ellerbe) assist in classroom protocols and procedures 3. Restructure hallways and morning zones to better facilitate supervision and PBIS 4. Institute restorative practices in every discipline incident 5. Create PBIS room for lunch rewards 6. Reward students through PBIS activities scheduled quarterly.
Person Responsible	Marlon Jones (jonesmd@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

We will also implement the following:

- Project Success addressing drug and alcohol prevention and mental health
- Campus Clean Up Crew and Noble Terriers mentoring with Mr. Jones
- School-wide mentoring set up through community organizations
- Lincoln Ladies program set up through the counseling team
- System of Care for students in crisis
- Top notch athletic program to improve culture and climate

- Culturally Responsive and Effective STEM Teaching partnership through the University of Florida
- Utilizing Fine Arts to cultivate and create holistic learners in our major program.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: 6th Grade Math				\$1,746.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0112 - Abraham Lincoln Middle School	General Fund	0.0	\$1,746.00
			Notes: We purchased IXL for the school for this area of focus. While the initial cost is 9 dollars per student, it is only 4 dollars to add on a subject area to this so we are negotiating this for the all of our 7th and 8th grade students. The 6th grade students will be paid for by the district.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest Quartile for ELA				\$7,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0112 - Abraham Lincoln Middle School	Other	0.0	\$7,000.00
			Notes: We purchased the IRLA for this area of focus.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: School Discipline				\$1,200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0112 - Abraham Lincoln Middle School	General Fund	0.0	\$1,200.00
			Notes: Purchased Terrier Tickets and created PBIS room			
Total:						\$9,946.00