

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lincoln Elementary Magnet School



2020-21 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lincoln Elementary Magnet School

1207 E RENFRO ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ann Rushing

Start Date for this Principal: 6/25/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	94%
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 (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lincoln Elementary Magnet School

1207 E RENFRO ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">63%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">72%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Lincoln Elementary Magnet will promote the growth of life-long learning and academic excellence through inquiry and rigorous assessment. Students will develop as caring seekers of knowledge helping the world to become a more peaceful place. Our program will encourage compassion, communication, and self-reflection.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lincoln lions, excelling academically while exploring the 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
Rushing, Ann	Principal	Leadership team includes: Ann Rushing (principal), Shawnette Singleton (assistant principal), Michelle Arn (PYP Coordinator), Matthew Grant (School Counselor), Amanda Holland (K grade chair), Caitlin Fitzpatrick (grade 1 chair), Rebecca Lombard (grade 2 chair), Jana Williams (grade 3 chair), Julie Rodrigues (grade 4 chair), Angela Valdivia (grade 5 chair), Christina Mayfield (media specialist), Sarah Keel (reading coach), and Nicole Rees (inclusion chair)

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/25/2020, Ann Rushing

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.*

11

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	94%
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 (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	90	85	72	83	72	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474
Attendance below 90 percent	3	2	4	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 10/29/2020

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	77	86	78	71	70	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460
Attendance below 90 percent	2	5	5	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	1	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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	77	86	78	71	70	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460
Attendance below 90 percent	2	5	5	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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	67%	52%	57%	67%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	55%	58%	62%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	50%	53%	57%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	66%	54%	63%	68%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	57%	62%	64%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	46%	51%	38%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	50%	53%	53%	48%	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	64%	52%	12%	58%	6%
	2018	78%	53%	25%	57%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	55%	25%	58%	22%
	2018	68%	55%	13%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
	2018	69%	51%	18%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	54%	16%	62%	8%
	2018	79%	55%	24%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	57%	16%	64%	9%
	2018	65%	57%	8%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	53%	54%	-1%	60%	-7%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	51%	4%	53%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	52%	0%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	28	41	29	33	48	41	18				
ELL	50			33							
ASN	100	79		100	95						
BLK	41	49	46	40	38	29	26				
HSP	63	48		65	55		44				
MUL	90			70							
WHT	80	64		80	76		87				
FRL	53	50	41	50	47	37	43				
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	22	16	16	24	23	18					
ELL	25	20		33	40						
ASN	100	100		100	100						
BLK	41	41	25	42	45	20	39				
HSP	68	59	25	64	59	55	47				
WHT	88	74		84	64		62				
FRL	59	55	31	56	51	32	39				
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	19	52	50	31	44	37	21				
ELL	28	37		40	53						
ASN	87	75		100	94		70				
BLK	51	58	63	53	58	41	33				
HSP	55	54	40	53	57	33	48				
WHT	89	68		87	64						
FRL	54	57	59	55	58	41	40				

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	94
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	38
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	55

Hispanic Students	
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	80
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	77
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	46
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 lowest data was bottom quartile gains in Math at 35%. There was no consistent coaching in this area. In the 2019-20 school year there was more training in the math curriculum. We also were a part of the Monthly Math Initiative in the district which helped our teachers to see the strengths and weaknesses. Data was discussed and plans were made to fill the gaps.

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

ELA data in grades 3 and 5 dropped by 14% in the 2018-19 school year. We lost our reading coach mid year in the 2018-19 school year. Teachers lost that support and coaching. The 5th grade classes had been grouped by abilities. One class had few role models.

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 5th grade Math data was 7% lower than the state but our 4th grade ELA data is 22% above the state average. Again, the classes were grouped by abilities and there were no role models. That has been addressed and fixed.

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

Our 4th grade ELA score is up by 12% and our 4th grade Math data is up by 8%. 4th grade contributed this gain to their planning and implementation of Rtl groups. This continued in the 19-20 school year. We also began the Monthly Math Assessments which we felt helped us to know which areas needed more assistance and time.

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

After analyzing the EWS data, we have no potential concerns. However, we will continue to monitor our bottom quartile and hope to see a decrease in our level 1 students. Identified students will be monitored for these two areas throughout the year by reviewing iReady data and Report Cards.

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

1. Increasing Science scores by 10 points, from a 55% to a 65%.
2. Increasing Math bottom quartile scores from 35% to 46%.
3. Increasing Math and ELA proficiency to 70%
4. Increasing learning gains in Math and ELA to 66%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our instructional practices must include learning targets that are aligned to the standard(s) being taught for the day. If students are not understanding the standard(s), there must be systematic small group instruction that occurs. Our bottom quartile scores are the lowest scores and have decreased over recent years. We also have concerns with two subgroups within our bottom quartile--students with disabilities and African American students.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to increase our bottom quartile scores in ELA from 41% to 52% and in Math from 35% to 46%. Within this subgroup, we also plan to increase our students with disabilities federal index score from 34% to 45% and our African American students federal index from 38% to 50%. Our learning gains will increase in Math from 61% to 66% and in ELA from 57% to 66%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ann Rushing (ann.rushing@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will explicitly reteach the learning target to students who do not master it, cyclical reviews will be done, monthly assessments will be taken and data will be reviewed to help make corrections to misconceptions. To help alleviate the deficiencies, the LAFS lessons from i-Ready will be used in both reading and math. Achieve 3000 will also be utilized along with direct, implicit instruction in areas of weaknesses.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We believe by utilizing small groups when needed to explicitly reteach and correct misconceptions, we will have an impact on all students. With the data from I-ready, Achieve 3000 and data from the monthly math assessments, teachers can use I-Ready online remediation, i-Ready LAFS lessons, and direct, implicit instruction to remediate.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Educate teachers on our current data and what needs to improve.
2. Provide professional development in the area of SIPPS, Achieve 3000, i-Ready LAFS materials for K-5, and other areas when a need arises.
3. Monitor small group times.
4. Analyze data regularly to meet student needs.
5. Help teachers in creating flexible groups based on student data.

Person Responsible Ann Rushing (ann.rushing@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our science scores have been stagnant for the past several years and are not as proficient as our ELA or Math scores.

Measurable Outcome: We plan to increase our Science scores by 10 points from a 55% to a 65%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ann Rushing (ann.rushing@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will pose open ended questions based on our units of study, and students will focus on developing claims with research based evidence (both text and hands-on inquiry evidence). Teachers will provide modeling and critical thinking opportunities for students to explain and understand scientific phenomena. Students will record and share science learning via written communications in the form of reports, posters, or reflections in a "journal" format and/or media presentations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We believe that using text, supplemental resources, and hands-on inquiry evidence will help to teach the concepts and to correct misconceptions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide PD to place science standards in the appropriate Units of Study for PYP
2. Provide necessary PD to help teachers maximize their knowledge in science
3. Monitor data from Form Assessments.
4. Analyze data regularly to meet student needs and to steer instruction

Person Responsible Ann Rushing (ann.rushing@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will address the remaining school wide improvement priorities through data analysis at Professional Learning Community meetings. Data meetings will be scheduled with grade level teams quarterly. The focus of the data meetings will be to determine the level of reteaching that is needed to support students in being successful at end of unit summative assessments. Our school's leadership team will monitor the identified groups of students performing below grade level and active participation at grade level PLC meetings to monitor the level of planning to support the academic needs of our identified group of students.

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 Elementary Magnet School for International studies is a fully authorized International Baccalaureate World School. We believe in educating the entire child. Beginning in Head Start, our students are taught the Learner Profile Attributes which are: Inquirers, Knowledgeable, Thinkers, Communicators, Principled, Open Minded, Caring, Risk Takers, Balanced, and Reflective. Our students and staff model these attributes each day. We also believe in students and teachers having voice, choice, and ownership. This helps to create a positive school culture and environment. Our school has an active PTA and Instructional Leadership Team. We also have activities and traditions for parents, students, and teachers. Students and adults are taught to take action on things that matter. We have many clubs where students can lead by example. We desire for our students to make a positive difference in our world.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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