Abraham Lincoln Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 1/4/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2019-20 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%)
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 was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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

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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	84%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
Peoples, Sabrina	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.
Johnson, Bruce	Assistant Principal	Duties include (but are not limited to) overseeing the maintenance of the facilities, discipline, safety, textbooks, supervision and evaluation of staff, assistance with technology needs and troubleshooting, liaison with guidance, nurse, county office, teachers, parents and students.
Zwilling, Daniel	Dean	He 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. He participates in the weekly student services team meetings where student needs are addressed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/4/2016, Darin Jones

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	276	265	239	0	0	0	0	780
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	15	17	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	35	39	0	0	0	0	88
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	6	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	66	55	0	0	0	0	189
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	83	78	0	0	0	0	240
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Overage	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	47	35	0	0	0	0	118
	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	29	22	0	0	0	0	78

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/14/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

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

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	
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

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

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**	
	(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.

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%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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%	2
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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 category was 6th grade math. We identified that a specific teacher struggled with classroom management and maintaining high expectations. We realized that in the past our high quality math teachers who can handle tougher classes end up getting higher grade levels such as 8th grade math.

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. We are also using higher quality methods for identifying which students may succeed in Algebra. Our Algebra 1 passing rate is extremely high compared to the state, so we are okay exposing students to a high er level course if they qualify, which means our achievement level in 8th grade is going to be lower than the state average.

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

Our science scores made a 12 point jump which drastically helped our school grade. This was due to placing targeted students into advanced coursework as well as into our magnet classes. Through usage of reading scores, we assigned students that would previously be overlooked into rigorous courses. We also partnered up with the University of Florida and the CREST program to bring culturally responsive STEM lessons into the classroom. Leading up to the assessment we used cross-team review to pair up magnet students with our major program students in each class to go over science standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our biggest area of need according to EWS are our students with Level 1's in Math and ELA. Many of the feeder schools are lower performing so we have many students that start out at Lincoln as a Level 1. We have seen some trends where students also slide down over their middle school time. We are focused on making sure students in our traditional program are reaching their learning gains so that they don't stay a Level 1.

Another area of concern is our ESSA subgroup of African American students as well as our economically disadvantaged students being at a 33 and 36 percent passing rate respectively. These two categories often overlap at Lincoln and we have to find new ways to assist with students in these subcategories to succeed given the immense opportunities available to them through the magnet program.

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

1. Math Learning Gains
2. Lowest Quartile for ELA
4. Lowest Quartile for Math
5. School Discipline

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our African American students who are also FRL do not perform at a satisfactory level on the Math FSA. These is especially seen in the Math 6 and Math 8 categories. This is due to a few factors. Our Math 6 Lowest Quartile for Math is low because our 6th grade magnet group has a high percentage of students taking Math 7 Adv. This bring down the denominator for Math 6 and puts a spotlight on the disparity within our school. In the past, 6th grade math was not seen as the area where we needed to put the strongest teacher. Instead this was used in our higher level math classes. We are now seeing that this is a foundational class that we need to establish well, so that more 7th and 8th graders in our school qualify for Math 7 Advanced and ultimately Algebra. We are targeting all 2.5 students and moving them into our Math 6 Advanced course which puts them on the Algebra track. We also have placed a Co-teacher in 50% of our Math 6 classes to provide instructional support for our students in the following categories: SWD, FRL, and AA. All students coming into Lincoln will receive an IXL account with a push for curriculum under the Summer Surge. This is a 4 week, 20 part lesson addressing standards that need to be understood before coming to Lincoln. Students will have the ability to show mastery and prevent the typical summer slide that occurs in these subgroups. All students will complete a diagnostic IXL assessment during the first two weeks of school to determine their current skill levels.
Measurable Outcome:	Our percentage of students in the lowest quartile for math who show an annual learning gain will increase from a 37 to a 40.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lowest Quartile students will be closely monitored using baseline, mid-quarter, and quarterly progress monitoring for growth on standards. We will move high quality teachers to classes with a higher proportion of LQ students. Those students will also receive targeted intervention through IXL support. We also have changed to team based math groups so that each teacher with LQ students has one prep and can focus on targeted intervention with their planning time. Two of our teachers with the highest concentration of LQ students will have a common planning period to go over data. We will have monthly data chats with math teachers to determine appropriate course of remediation for students in our LQ using progress monitoring data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data-driven instruction and putting students with high quality teachers are research based strategies. Using AIMS as a baseline and and then bi-quarterly progress monitoring will determine the amount of time and remediation is spent on specific standards. Students will be given the diagnostic assessment on IXL which allows teachers to give targeted problems to areas of weakness. Common planning is also important if used to share data and let that drive instructional practices.

Action Steps to Implement

All students will take a baseline assessment in AIMs for Math and ELA. Our students under a level 3 in ELA will take the iReady Diagnostic assessment.

Person Responsible	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)

All students in Math 6, 7, and 8 will take the IXL diagnostic in math by the end of September.

Person Responsible	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)

All students will take the November Write Score and a second test in February.

Person Responsible	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)

Quarterly Progress Monitoring and bi-quarterly mini-assessments for tested subjects.

Person Responsible	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	All students in need of laptops will be given one. This is coordinated by Mr. Johnson and will ensure that students who are on the Digital Learning Academy are getting the same access to education as their peer groups who are on the DLA with access to a computer device.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase the performance of our Economically Disadvantaged students to meet or exceed the ESSA federal index target of 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bruce Johnson (johnsob@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students learning from home need to have reliable access to synchronous and asynchronous learning from their classroom teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have many students who are opting for the Digital Academy (470 out of our 730 students). If they do not have reliable devices, this will lead to lost instructional time and disengagement. If we can also create successful HyFlex classrooms, classroom behavior incidents can decrease.

Action Steps to Implement

All students identified who are DLA and need a laptop.

Person Responsible	Bruce Johnson (johnsob@gm.sbac.edu)

Coordinate laptop inventory with the district and coordinate pickup with parents.

Person Responsible	Bruce Johnson (johnsob@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELA LQ learning gains for African American students are not at a satisfactory level compared to the district and to the state. We have identified that this is due to two things, lower reading levels, and lack of ability to create well written essays. The majority of our LQ students are African American.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase our annual learning gains for student in our lowest quartile for ELA by 3 percentage points. Last year our scores for ELA was a 32 so our goal is a 35.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be utilizing the iReady diagnostic assessment and targeted curriculum as well as the two Write Score Assessments. Students in our LQ will also be taught using the American Reading Company curricullum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Identifying areas of weakness is the crucial entry point for instruction. We also need differentiated instruction that meets students where they are. Write Score and iReady provide standards based assessment and remediation that helps the teacher efficiently target growth and learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule and excuse diagnostic assessments. The iReady assessment will be done during the first two weeks of school. Write Score will be scheduled for November and February.

Person Responsible	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)

Train teachers on how to analyze data.

Person Responsible	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)

Monitor Teacher and Student usage.

Person Responsible	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In order to close the achievement gap for African American students we need students in the 2.5 category for either FSA to move to the achievement level. This has been an area of weakness for us in the past.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase by 3 percent our achievement for African American students in Math and ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We have identified students in the 2.5 category for Advanced coursework. In some cases students will be recommended for a Leadership Development class where a teacher will provide wraparound support for 2.5 students to succeed in Advanced coursework. This will come through note taking skilsl, computer literacy, management skills, and teaching the 7 Habits of Highly Successful Teens through the Leader in Me program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In the past students had the ability to succeed in Advanced coursework but they were lacking in general skills that students in the magnet program. In targeted focus groups conducted last year, students identified that they needed a teacher advocate for them on campus that could help them navigate the challenging coursework.

Action Steps to Implement	

Identify students for advanced coursework as well as determine if they would benefit from the Leadership class. We will also provide guidance and training through the Leader in Me program for the teacher. Students will receive progress monitoring in pursuing their goals.

Person Responsible	Sabrina Peoples (peoples@gm.sbac.edu)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have identified that we need to increase our African American enrollment of students in the Lyceum program. This cannot just be accomplished through the lottery but rather through targeted selection and removal of barriers to enrollment.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase enrollment in the Lyceum program by African American students by 2%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will foster relationships with local feeder schools to identify and cultivate African American candidates that are zoned for our school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Many times we have students that could have been identified early in the magnet process who would succeed in the program but we are not able to identify them until the 7th or 8th grade year.

Action Steps to Implement

Foster relationships with the administration at Idylwild, Williams, and Lake Forest Elementary. Create a partnership with the nonprofit, Kids in Positive Places, where we will bring elementary students on campus for our 6th period so that they receive skills needed for success. This will allow us to build rapport and guide families through the magnet application process.

Person Responsible	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our BPIE identified that an area of focus for Lincoln was to increase our multi-tiered system of student supports and problem-solving process for all students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase the performance of our students with disabilities to meet or exceed the ESSA federal index target of 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jill Gano (monkja@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Administration and the guidance team will meet with district personnel to determine appropriate placement for the student and create plans that meet the individuals needs of the students through consult, co-teaching, or self- contained with an emphasis on the least restrictive environment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If students are given the appropriate scaffolds and supports, they can reach their potential in the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration will meet with district personnel to discuss incoming students and develop appropriate placement based on their level of need for support. Master schedule will be done accordingly.

Person Responsible	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)

Co-teacher will be systematically placed on classrooms of need. A content specialist science teacher will assist for our resource classroom for the science class to assist in an identified area of need.

Person Responsible	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)

Students will be have progress monitoring as well as be identified to see if students are able to increase their time in the general education classroom.

Person Responsible	Ricky Bell (bellre@gm.sbac.edu)

School-wide mentoring program for students with disabilities in need of positive mentoring relationships.

Person Responsible	Daniel Zwilling (zwillingdf@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

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. This has to start in 6th grade math to be successful. We are utilizing Upstream methods and partnering with the nonprofit Kids in Positive Places, which will bring targeted students in the 5th grade of our feeder schools over to Lincoln for 6th period so they can receive tutoring and mentoring help. This will allow our future incoming classes to have a higher math skill level and be on track for advanced coursework.

During the last year, we have increased the number of students in our Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups in our Lyceum Magnet program. If a student is strong academically and has mastered the standards, they are recommended for Lyceum classes even if they are not in the program. If they are strong in one subject area, they might take a class or two in the Lyceum, while if they are strong in many subjects, they might take many Lyceum classes. We have increased our enrollment of Black students in our advanced coursework through this model. That being said, it has not always meant that all of the barriers to their success have been taken down. Students may have the capability but not the background knowledge, discipline, computer literacy, or have the confidence to step into a learning environment where they are not used to. Many of our Hybrid students did not succeed academically even though they were exposed to a much higher rigor. To adjust for this, our team identified that we need our Hybrid students to take a leadership class, where they learn study habits, computer literacy, and leadership skills, while also having a peer group where they can discuss the challenges of feeling isolated in a Lyceum class where they may not have any of their close peer group. We also see this class as a way for our entire school to start utilizing best practices in their classrooms based on the feedback from this class.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Lincoln Middle School is a very diverse school in that half of our school is zoned from the neighboring communities and consists of primarily Black students. The majority of our zoned students earn Level 1's and 2's on their FSA. The other half of our school is comprised of a highly competitive magnet program where students have some of the highest scores in the state. Because of this reality, Lincoln motto is "Every Child. Always." We believe that every child that comes through our doors should receive a high quality education that pushes them no matter what skill level they are on when they come to us.

Through partnerships with Project SUCCESS, System of Care, Greenhouse Church, and University of Florida CREST program we are able to meet the social and emotional needs of our students in culturally responsive ways.

Lincoln is a Positive Intervention Behavior Support (PBIS) school and this year that will be headed up by both of our deans. The goal is to find ways foster positive behavior through praise as well as create systems that eliminate problem behaviors from occurring.

We have partnered with a wide variety of businesses and organizations to meet the needs of our students. Crevasse's Cremation, Maple Street Biscuit, Satchel's Pizza, McDonald's, Collier Enterprises, Creative and Innovative Solutions, and West Lab Pharmacy work within our vision to help us with our goals. We also believe in Upstream Management where sometimes problems can be avoided by addressing issues at an earlier process. For this reason we partnered with Kids in Positive Places where we will bring in targeted 5th grade students from our neighboring feeder schools to receiving mentoring and tutoring during 6th period on campus.

Our School Advisory Council provides input in regards to our School Improvement Plan and our academic goals for the school year. In addition to that, our PTA assists in helping bridge the gap between teachers and parents as well as advocate and raise funds for the various needs of both groups.

Our community is one of our strongest assets and we will continue to foster these partnerships going forward.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$10,596.60
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	9800		0112 - Abraham Lincoln Middle School	General Fund		$3,187.00
			Notes: IXL 2 year plan			
	9800		0112 - Abraham Lincoln Middle School	General Fund		$7,409.60
			Notes: Write Score Budget			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				$0.00

5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$10,596.60