

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lincoln Elementary Magnet School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

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: 7/29/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Lincoln Elementary Magnet School

1207 E RENFRO ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	62%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rushing, Ann	Principal	As the principal, Ms. Rushing, is the instructional lead learner. She collaborates with the Instructional Leadership Team, the faculty, and the School Improvement Team to make decisions to improve all student learning.
Keel, Sara	Magnet Coordinator	As the Magnet Coordinator, Ms. Keel, is an instructional learner. She collaborates with the Instructional Leadership Team, the faculty, and the School Improvement Team to make decisions to improve all student learning. She also leads the weekly PYP meetings to help teachers plan their instructional PYP units.
Snowden, LaGretta	SAC Member	Ms. Snowden is the SAC chair for the 2021-22 school year. She will lead the monthly meetings and help us to progress monitor our goal.
Singleton, Shawnette	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Ms. Singleton, is an instructional leader. She collaborates with the Instructional Leadership Team, the faculty, and the School Improvement Team to make decisions to improve all student learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, 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.*

3

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

495

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	65	92	82	74	79	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	8	11	13	8	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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

Sunday 9/12/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	
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		

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				67%	52%	57%	71%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	55%	58%	63%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	50%	53%	30%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				66%	54%	63%	70%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				61%	57%	62%	62%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	46%	51%	29%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				55%	50%	53%	52%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	64%	52%	12%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	80%	55%	25%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	70%	54%	16%	62%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	73%	57%	16%	64%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	55%	51%	4%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready

5th Gr. Science--FCAT

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31%	48%	78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43%	43%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	11%	22%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13%	25%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	11%	14%%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	11%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	17%	17%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47%	47%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	75%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	13%	25%
	English Language Learners	50%	50%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20%	18%	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50%	50%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	25%	0%
	English Language Learners	50%	50%	0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	62%	45%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	89%	67%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	44%	11%	11%
	English Language Learners	100%	40%	40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21%	17%	41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	0%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30%	34%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	33%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	27%	13%
	English Language Learners	50%	50%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28%	23%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	38%	13%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	50%	0%	0%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49%	32%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	20%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	9%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	50%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44%	34%	51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	60%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	50%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			FCAT-63%
	Economically Disadvantaged			FCAT-25%
	Students With Disabilities			FCAT-1%
	English Language Learners			FCAT-1%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	24			32							
ELL	67			78							
ASN	96			100							
BLK	38	53	60	31	42	50	28				
HSP	65	50		68	55		65				
MUL	91			64							
WHT	83	84		79	74		76				
FRL	54	53	57	48	45	50	45				
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							

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	439
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	73

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	98
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	78
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	79
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our 3rd graders dropped 2 points in ELA data from 2019, and our 4th graders dropped 15 points. Our 3rd graders dropped 6 points in Math data from 2019, and our 4th graders dropped 17 points. Only 38% of our black students were proficient in ELA, 31% in math, and 28% in science. Only 22% of our SWD students were proficient in ELA, 30% in math, and 11% in science.

Level 1 students--From 2019 to 2021 in ELA

3rd-8 students to 9, 4th-3 students to 15

Level 1 students--From 2019 to 2021 in Math

3rd-5 students to 14, 4th-9 students to 13

Our bottom quartile scores in reading in the 2020-21 school year jumped from 41% to 65% but this needs to stay an area of concern so we continue to move our BQ students.

Our bottom quartile scores in math in the 2020-21 school year jumped from 35% to 53% but this also needs to stay an area of concern so we continue to move our BQ students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

1. Our greatest need is meeting the needs of our Black students and Students with Disabilities in reading, math, and science.
2. We also need to continue to monitor our BQ students so they make the gains they need to make.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

1. Loss of instructional time during the pandemic
2. New Actions--Teachers will need to use formative assessment methods to design, reteach, and enrich student learning.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

2021--Our ELA gains went from 57% to 67%. Our ELA BQ improved 24% from 41% to 65%.

Our Math gains improved 1 points from 61% to 62% but our BQ improved 18% from 35% to 53%.

Our Science improved from 55% to 63%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Contributing factors--

1. In math our school took monthly assessments and looked at the data carefully and made adjustments in their teaching. They had cyclical reviews and pulled strategic small groups. They also planned several times with the Math DRT for the district.
2. Science-- One of the district resource teachers planned weekly with one of our teachers and as needed with the other two.
3. In ELA our teachers had strategic reading groups.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Scaffolded activities assigned based on need, multiple assessment checkpoints toward learning outcome, students being able to articulate what they are working on and why, and lesson adjustments based on current assessment data.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

1. Math Goal Setting Training and planning with Math DRT
2. Science Training and planning with Science DRT
3. MTSS Training
4. PLC Data Training
5. BEST Standards Training for Reading & Math

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

1. Monthly Grade Level Data PLCs, PYP Planning Sessions, and Collaborative Planning each week
2. District Content PLCs

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After looking at our data we feel we need to continue to help all students make at least one year's worth of growth. Our gain scores in reading and math have improved for the last three years but we intend for them to continue to move forward. Our students with disabilities and our African/Black students are not making the gains they need to make.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA Gains from 67%-70%, ELA BQ from 67% to 70%, SWD from 38% to 41%, and Black Students from 50% to 53%. Math Gains Gains from 62%-65%, Math BQ from 53%-56%, SWD from 25%-28%, and Black Students from 39%-41%
Monitoring:	Progress will be monitored monthly with our Walkthrough Form and by looking at our Monthly Data from our Math and ELA Monthlies. We will also monitor the iReady reading and Math data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ann Rushing (ann.rushing@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will plan collaboratively each week utilizing the standards. They will monitor their data and plan scaffolded activities based on need. They will give multiple assessment checkpoints toward the learning outcome and make adjustments based on current data. Teachers will attend monthly District Content PLCs to help plan standards-aligned lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We need to meet the needs of all students; therefore, our teachers need to use formative assessments to drive their instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will use formative assessment methods to design, reteach, and enrich student learning. They will plan scaffolded activities based on students' need, have multiple assessment checkpoints toward the learning outcome, and adjust the lessons based on current data. Students will be able to articulate what they're working on and why they are learning this.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Lincoln Elementary Magnet falls in the low category as compared to all elementary schools in the state. We are an IB Magnet Elementary School, and we emphasize our Learner Profile traits--Inquirers, Knowledgeable, Thinkers, Communicators, Principled, Open-Minded, Caring, Risk-Takers, Balanced, and Reflective. It is an expectation that we all model these attributes. Every day we say the Lincoln Pledge--We will be open-minded, caring, and reflective. We also have a schoolwide behavior plan we follow.

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.

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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Students--Model attributes of Learner Profile, Take action on what they have learned

Teachers--Model attributes of Learner Profile, take action on certain projects that speak to them, participate in school-wide action projects, sponsors for school clubs

Other Staff Members--Model attributes of the Learner Profile, participate in school-wide action projects

Parents--Help to foster a love for learning, model citizenship on a daily basis, and encourage students to do their best

PTA--Help support our students and teachers financially with instructional materials, food, and time and also to model being principled, open-minded, and reflective

ILT--Meets monthly to look at instructional priorities and the data of the school, formulates a plan for moving forward each month

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	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00