Lincoln Avenue Academy

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lincoln Avenue Academy

1330 LINCOLN AVE N, Lakeland, FL 33805

http://schools.polk-fl.net/laa

Demographics

Principal: Antoinette K IR By

Start Date for this Principal: 1/3/2001

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	58%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (87%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (84%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Polk 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

Lincoln Avenue Academy

1330 LINCOLN AVE N, Lakeland, FL 33805

http://schools.polk-fl.net/laa

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)
Elementary School KG-5	No	33%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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 model for our students the behaviors of internationally minded people who recognize the talents within themselves and others, respect individual and cultural differences, and appreciate their roles as stewards of our planet.

We create an environment that instills in our students the insight to value and take responsibility for their own learning, while encouraging them to be curious inquirers as they interact with the world around them.

We focus our transdisciplinary units of study on concepts of global significance, promoting an awareness of the commonality of the human experience, which fosters their sensitivity to the differences within our world-wide community.

We empower students to take their learning to thoughtful and appropriate actions that affect our global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"We, at Lincoln Avenue Academy, are committed to developing in our students the potential to become global leaders, prepared to take action to better our world."

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
Hollen, Evelyn	Principal	The roles and responsibilities of Lincoln's principal are defined by the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. They include but are not limited to: obtaining high student learning results, establishing student learning as a priority, implementing an instructional framework, establishing a learning environment that is conducive to the learning of all students, employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission and improvement priorities using facts and data, developing other leaders within Lincoln, retaining and developing an effective and diverse faculty and staff, and maintaining a safe and orderly facility. Evelyn Hollen practices shared decision making that is based on vision, mission and improvement priorities using facts and data. She gives priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency; while she uses critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions. Frequently she reflects and evaluates decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome; implements follow-up actions; and revises those decisions as needed. Through the school-based Leadership team, she empowers others and distributes leadership when appropriate. All members of the leadership work as a unit to meet the needs of staff and students at their differentiated level. The Florida State Standards set expectations in all ELA and content literacy classrooms to provide students with instruction and practice in the use of close reading strategies to ensure deeper comprehension of what is being read. District provided CISM (Comprehension Instructional Sequence Module) training provides teachers with a highly research-based instructional framework and toolkit of strategies for the use in planning and implementing close reading lessons. CISM is grounded in providing scaffolds for students to independently use while reading and responding to their reading of complex text. Each member of the leadership team works with teachers on each grade level and is responsible for reviewing students' literacy data and creating lessons that are responsive to identified student needs. They are responsible for acting on the literacy data by providing additional instruction/support where needed. Common assessments are used to identify effective reading strategies and guide instruction for re-teach or enrichment. Kanika Dailey: The assistant principal assists the school principal in providing the vision and leadership necessary to develop and administer educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available in order to enhance student achievement. Reading Coach: The role of Reading Coach entails collaborative planning with all grade levels, especially in the area of writing strategies across the curriculum, ensuring vertical and horizontal alignment of the writing curriculum. This includes modeling high yield teaching strategies, remediating students, developing assessments etc Martine Blackwell: The role of Math Magnet Attractor Unit entails collaborative planning with all grade levels, ensuring vertical and horizontal alignment of the math curriculum. This includes modeling high yield teaching strategies, remediating students, developing assessments etc Anne Spickard: The role of the STEM lead is to work to facilitate school wide programs and professional development, provide instructional support, analyze data and coach teachers to achieve school goals and ensure success for all students in regards to STEM as well as all academic areas. Also, to lead the

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		MTSS process for all grade levels in collaboration with the MTSS RtI Team. Diane Lokey: The role of English Language Arts Magnet Attractor Unit entails collaborative planning with all grade levels, ensuring vertical and horizontal alignment of the ELA curriculum. Additionally, ensuring that the school's International Baccalaureate's documentation is complete as well as the school's philosophy is aligned to that of the IBO.
Spickard, Ann	Teacher, K-12	The role of the STEM lead is to work to facilitate school wide programs and professional development, provide instructional support, analyze data and coach teachers to achieve school goals and ensure success for all students in regards to STEM as well as all academic areas. Also, to lead the MTSS process for all grade levels in collaboration with the MTSS RTI Team.
Blackwell, Marti	Teacher, K-12	The role of Math Magnet Attractor Unit entails collaborative planning with all grade levels, ensuring vertical and horizontal alignment of the math curriculum. This includes modeling high yield teaching strategies, remediating students, developing assessments etc
Dailey, Kanika	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the school principal in providing the vision and leadership necessary to develop and administer educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available in order to enhance student achievement.
Lokey, Diana	Teacher, K-12	he role of English Language Arts Magnet Attractor Unit entails collaborative planning with all grade levels, ensuring vertical and horizontal alignment of the ELA curriculum. Additionally, ensuring that the school's International Baccalaureate's documentation is complete as well as the school's philosophy is aligned to that of the IBO

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 1/3/2001, Antoinette K IR By

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
43

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	58%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (87%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (84%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	104	88	88	90	88	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	544
Attendance below 90 percent	3	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	7	7	4	5	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 STAR ELA	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 STAR Math	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/4/2020

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	108	90	90	89	88	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	2	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	108	90	90	89	88	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	2	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	90%	51%	57%	90%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	51%	58%	68%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	49%	53%	63%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	93%	57%	63%	97%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	90%	56%	62%	78%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	90%	47%	51%	78%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	95%	47%	53%	85%	46%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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.

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	91%	52%	39%	58%	33%
	2018	97%	51%	46%	57%	40%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	91%	48%	43%	58%	33%
	2018	85%	48%	37%	56%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	87%	47%	40%	56%	31%
	2018	88%	50%	38%	55%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	93%	56%	37%	62%	31%
	2018	87%	56%	31%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	93%	56%	37%	64%	29%
	2018	90%	57%	33%	62%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	94%	51%	43%	60%	34%
	2018	93%	56%	37%	61%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	95%	45%	50%	53%	42%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	83%	51%	32%	55%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	71	64		67	86	90					
ASN	100	89		100	95		100				
BLK	78	60	59	81	83	80	95				
HSP	94	75		87	94						
WHT	91	72	82	99	90	100	95				
FRL	80	74	71	80	88	89	87				

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	70			60							
ASN	100	74		100	87		90				
BLK	84	67	56	69	51	48	68				
HSP	89	53		96	84		82				
WHT	90	70	52	96	80	95	86				
FRL	85	59	48	77	63	57	74				

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	67			92							
ASN	95	86		100	96		94				
BLK	80	62	56	92	64	60	53				
HSP	94	81		97	92	90	93				
WHT	91	63	63	98	74	77	90				
FRL	81	62	45	93	64	61	65				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	87
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	606
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	76
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	97
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	77
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	88
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	90
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	81
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

The 19-20 data component that showed the lowest area of performance was Math Learning Gains at 68%.
The contributing factors to last year's low performance was that 65% of Caucasian females made gains as compared to 71% of Hispanic and 78% of African American females. A trend for the 19-20 school year include Caucasian students scoring below the total Math Learning Gains score of 68% (65% of Caucasian students made learning gains in math).

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is proficiency in ELA. The school grade component that shows an decline is 93% ELA proficiency in the 18-19 school year compared to 86% ELA proficiency in the 19-20 school year. A factor that contributes to this decline is that FSA end of year proficiency levels are being compared to STAR mid year levels.

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.

In all components of the school grade, Lincoln's data outperformed the 2019 state average, including:
-ELA Achievement: +29%
-Math Achievement: +26%
-ELA Learning Gains: +12%
-Math Learning Gains: +6%
-ELA Lowest 25th Percentile: +25%
-Math Lowest 25th Percentile: +40%

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

The data component that showed the most improvement from the 18-19 to the 19-20 school year was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. This increase was from 76% learning gains in the 18-2019 school year to 78% learning gains in the 19-20 school year. The new actions taken in this area include specific interventions including small group instruction, intensive standard remediation and increased parent communication.

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

In reflection of the EWS data, a potential area of concern is the suspension totals for the 19-20 school year. The previous year's EWS data indicated 0 suspensions in the 18-19 school year and 27 suspensions in the 17-18 school year compared to 37 suspensions recorded in the 19-20 school year.

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

1. Mathematics learning gains at 68%, specifically caucasian students at 65%
2. ELA achievement at 86%
3. Mathematics achievement at 89%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lincoln will focus on math learning gains. Lincoln's data reflects that 68% of students made learning gains. This is the lowest measurement within our school data used to calculate school grades.
Measurable Outcome:	Lincoln will increase the math learning gains of our students from 68% to 93% by the end of the 2020-21 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Evelyn Hollen (evelyn.hollen@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lincoln teachers will participate in weekly Transdisciplinary International Baccalaureate Studies (TIBS) during year-round curriculum development sessions, IB trainings and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) focused on problem and inquiry based learning, small group instruction, standard unpacking, summer learning, Emergenetics and intensive remediation within an MTSS framework.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The above strategy provides opportunities for educators to work collaboratively in ongoing sessions in which inquiry, action and reflection result in instructional strategies that will best meet the needs of all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a timeline for weekly PLCs as well as staff development opportunities throughout the school year based on current data available at time of PLC to ensure data driven instruction.

Person Responsible	Diana Lokey (diana.lokey@polk-fl.net)

Implement TIBS (Transdisciplinary International Baccalaureate Studies) and collect evidence of student samples to show evidence of implementation of strategies discussed

Person Responsible	Marti Blackwell (marti.blackwell@polk-fl.net)

Provide specific and timely feedback to teachers based on administrator observation as well as student feed back, as glows and grows, based on IB reference rubrics

Person Responsible	Kanika Dailey (kanika.dailey@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lincoln will focus on ELA achievement. Lincoln's data reflects that 86% of students were proficient in ELA. ELA achievement decreased by 4 percentage points from the prior year.
Measurable Outcome:	Lincoln will increase the ELA achievement of our students from 86% to 93% by the end of the 2020-21 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Evelyn Hollen (evelyn.hollen@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lincoln's teachers will participate in weekly Reading Endorsement classes, leading to 100% of our teachers receiving reading endorsement by the state of Florida. The classes focus on foundations of reading instruction, application of research-based instructional practices, foundations of assessment and foundations and applications of differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These courses are offered by the state of Florida and have been developed to reflect best practices in English-Language Arts instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop a time-line for all course work.
2. Implement instruction and collect teacher evidence.
3. Provide feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible	Kanika Dailey (kanika.dailey@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Lincoln's leadership team will conduct non-evaluative observations to ensure the fidelity of implementation for the practices learned during PLCs. Our focus on math learning gains and implementation of research-based strategies will provide the additional support to increase overall math achievement.

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.

• Orientation: Our school begins the year by welcoming our Lincoln families with a summer post card inviting
the students to their new classrooms on the date of Polk County's Orientation. Lincoln's Orientation is an opportunity for parents to meet their teacher and begin a personal relationship with the teacher.
• Parent Information Night: Within the first two weeks, our Kindergarten, first grade and fifth grade families are invited bask to Lincoln for an evening information event. During this meeting, parents are informed of their child's grade levels
procedures and expectations for the year, our school's mission and vision, as well as all dates for the year in which the families can be involved.
• Parent Education Night: Within the first four weeks of school, our teachers host a Parent Education Night. This intention of this night is to inform our families of our school's mission and vision, current educational shifts, mandates, and best practices that affect our students.
• Portfolios: Three times each year, teachers engage in portfolio conferences with each student's families. The first one is face-to-face with teachers. The second and third conferences are student led.
During this time, teachers share the student's individual strengths and weaknesses of each student, while at the same time, gather additional information from the families about each child.
• Educational Culminating Events: Each grade level hosts various events throughout the year that encourage
parental and family involvement by inviting them into the school. An example of these events include: Grandparent's Day, Arctic Day, Special's Showcase, classroom celebrations, awards ceremony, chess team, music performances, fieldtrips, PTO meetings, SAC meetings, FCAT celebrations, Earth Day tree plantings, 100th Day Celebrations, Donuts for Dads, Muffins for Moms, Jump rope for Heart, Chinese New Year, Arctic Day, and many others.

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: Math				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0251 - Lincoln Avenue Academy			$0.00

			Notes: Lincoln teachers will participate in weekly Transdisciplinary International Baccalaureate Studies (TIBS) during year-round curriculum development sessions, IB trainings and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) focused on problem and inquiry based learning, small group instruction, standard unpacking, summer learning, Emergenetics and intensive remediation within an MTSS framework.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$0.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0251 - Lincoln Avenue Academy			$0.00
			Notes: Lincoln teachers will participate in weekly Transdisciplinary International Baccalaureate Studies (TIBS) during year-round curriculum development sessions, IB trainings and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) focused on problem and inquiry based learning, small group instruction, standard unpacking, summer learning, Emergenetics and intensive remediation within an MTSS framework.			
					Total:	**$0.00**