Lincoln Park Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lincoln Park Elementary School

7600 KERSHAW ST, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Lincoln Park Elementary School is to motivate students to become productive and proficient while enjoying a fun learning environment. The mission will be accomplished through a challenging and creative curriculum, a competent, committed and caring staff that engages in multiple professional learning and staff development opportunities, teacher data chats with administrators, student data chats, teachers supporting teachers while supporting a positive and safe student learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Lincoln Park Elementary School team partners and collaborates with the district, parents and the greater community to create an atmosphere where all students will want to come to school and enjoy a fun learning environment while increasing their wealth of knowledge that leads to student competency in all academic areas.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lawson-Sellers, Jobenna	Principal	Oversight and supervision of all school operations. Develop and monitor school-wide goals and data to ensure student achievement and improvement. Monitor teaching, learning, and student progress. Collaborate with stakeholders to make decisions that support student learning and development.
Moody, Dr. Patrice	Assistant Principal	Assist with school operations and supervision. Assist with data analysis and the monitoring of student progress. Oversee discipline, safety, and other duties as assigned.
Phillips, Ashley	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Provides mentorship for new teachers and coaching for identified teachers. Leads Professional Learning Communities. Assists with the data analysis and instructional plan for student growth.
Chancey, Heather	Instructional Media	Oversee Accelerated Reader and other reading initiatives. Keep administration abreast of AR data and book needs within the school. Oversee the ordering of books for media center, approval of books for media center and classroom libraries, and justification process for teachers and approval of media.
Lambert, Tourischeva	Other	Oversees the RTI/MTSS process for students. Assists teachers with progress monitoring plans and determining appropriate interventions and completes necessary paperwork for compliance.
Lambert, Chresal	Teacher, ESE	Provides mentorship for new teachers. Leads Professional Learning Communities. Responsible for the teaching and learning of ESE teachers.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Lincoln Park strives to include and illicit support from all of our stakeholders to promote a positive school culture for the benefit of our students. We also solicit input from our stakeholders (parents, school faculty/staff, community) through meetings and surveys to improve procedures, processes and academic instruction. Our teachers consistently contact parents to keep them informed of academic and behavioral progress. In addition, our school advisory council (SAC) consists of school administration, teachers, students, parents, local business partners, church affiliations, and residents of the community who are all involved in
making decisions and collaborating on ways to improve our school's physical and culture environment, academic, financial, and related services provided to our student population. SAC meets four time per year and all stakeholders are invited to attend and participate. We solicit input through planning forms and surveys so that all stakeholders are given the opportunity to provide input.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

School data is analyzed throughout the school year and involve monitoring of Schoolnet assessments, STAR data, and FAST progress monitoring data. The leadership team will participate in continuous data discussions with teachers. Teachers will engage students in data discussions and goal setting for each individual student to actively participate in their data chats. Data analysis of progress monitoring periods 1-2 will assist with the school plan to see if instructional practices are successful or if there are additional supports needed for teachers and/or students.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	91%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	17	17	17	15	11	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions		1	2	2	4	8	10	0	0	0	27
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	4	11	3	8	2	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	1	5	9	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	16	10	2	7	0	0	0	41

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	3	6	8	7	0	0	0	27

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	24	11	20	12	16	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	2	2	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	3	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	11	6	4	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	4	10	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	9	12	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	18	10	16	8	11	0	0	0	65

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	3	14	6	10	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	4	2	3	0	0	0	10

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	24	11	20	12	16	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	2	2	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	3	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	11	6	4	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	4	10	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	9	12	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	18	10	16	8	11	0	0	0	65

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	3	14	6	10	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	4	2	3	0	0	0	10

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	24	48	53	44	51	56	35		
ELA Learning Gains				59			26		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54					
Math Achievement*	14	50	59	39	46	50	35		
Math Learning Gains				52			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				77			10		
Science Achievement*	5	52	54	50	52	59	30		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		62	59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	18
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	70
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	375
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	14	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	17	Yes	1	1
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	15	Yes	1	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	51			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	24			14			5					
SWD	14			14							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23			12			7				4	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	20			12			6				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	44	59	54	39	52	77	50					
SWD	27	60		19	45							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	37	61	54	36	52	80	39					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64			50								
FRL	42	58	50	38	52	75	43					

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	35	26		35	29	10	30					
SWD	17			28								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	29		33	32	10	34					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT				60								
FRL	30	23		33	26	10	28					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	29%	49%	-20%	54%	-25%
04	2023 - Spring	25%	57%	-32%	58%	-33%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	27%	44%	-17%	50%	-23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	26%	51%	-25%	59%	-33%
04	2023 - Spring	16%	58%	-42%	61%	-45%
05	2023 - Spring	17%	47%	-30%	55%	-38%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	7%	51%	-44%	51%	-44%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Lincoln Park's data showed the lowest performance group as Students With Disabilities. Contributing factors to last year's lower performance included: shortage of highly qualified teachers; lack of ESE teachers/assistants; turnover and novice teachers to the profession, student attendance and behavioral issues.

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

Overall for ELA there was a -17.1% decline in ELA. Our economically disadvantaged students ELA decreased by -17.4%; SWDs decreased by -16.8%; black students decreased by -11.2%. For Math the overall decline was -22.3%; economically disadvantaged was by -21.7%; SWDs decreased by -14.1%; and black students declined by -21.5%. For science, there was an overall decline by -44.6%; economically disadvantaged was -36.4 % ; and blacks was -32.2%.

Contributing factors to last year's lower performance included: shortage of highly qualified teachers; lack of ESE teachers/assistants; high teacher to student ratios; turnover and novice teachers to the profession; and student attendance and behavioral issues.

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.

The greatest gap overall was in the area of math math -41.4% for math. There was also a noticeable gap in Science at -45.4 decline. Contributing factors included high student teacher ratios. Class size- our tested 4th grade had 40 students and students rotated on 3 teacher split. Behavior issues were also an issue.

Contributing factors to last year's lower performance included: shortage of highly qualified teachers; lack of ESE teachers/assistants; high teacher to student ratios; turnover and novice teachers to the profession; and student attendance issues.

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

None. We will focus on analyzing the specific data throughout the year and conducting more in-depth data chats to closely monitor learning. We will add the monitoring of School net by class/teacher for each assessment. We will work with teachers to determine the specific standards that students require remediation.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Two areas of concern are attendance and behavior. Both absences and tardies increased every quarter. Discipline referrals also increased every quarter. For the 3rd quarter there was a decline in absences for black students by 27.

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

Our top 2 priorities for this school year are:
1. Increase Federal Index 41% or greater for SWDs
2. Learning Gains for LQ for ELA and Math

Other areas of concern include:
Increasing Attendance, Decreasing Tardies, Behavior Management, Increasing Science Proficiency

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

With an intentional focus on positive culture and environment, we will strive to maintain a supportive and fulfilling environment with learning conditions that meet the needs of all students. Thus, due to extremely high teacher turnovers, emphasis will be placed on increased teacher retention and recruitment.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Lincoln Park will retain 5 out of the 6 new teachers on staff ; thus, our teacher retention rate will increase (83% retention rate) during the 2023 - 2024 school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

During the 2023 - 2024 school term, administration will complete climate survey with teachers using the 30/60/90 day model. Encourage teachers to complete certification requirements prior to summer (June/July) to increase the eligibility for rehire. Administration will monitor the number of teachers who resign and/or transfer during the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jobenna Lawson-Sellers (jlawson-sellers@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

According to Hanover (2020) the following 4 researched-based strategies/interventions are successful when used to mitigate attrition:
* Support teacher wellbeing
* Promote teacher engagement
* Create a supportive school climate
* Monitor teacher retention and attrition

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher retention has become a serious concern for our school. Thus, the existing teacher shortages poses serious challenge to our school opening and maintaining appropriate academic instruction for our students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Support Teaching Practice
2. Address staff burnout by promoting employee wellness/Activities

3. Teacher of the Month
4. Staff Drawings/Awards
5. Establishing a positive school climate and supportive work environment.

Person Responsible: Jobenna Lawson-Sellers (jlawson-sellers@ecsdfl.us)

By When: On-going (May 2024)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The data for students in two of the subgroups (students with disabilities) have shown a decline in math performance and overall has not reached 41% proficiency for ELA or Math. Students with disabilities were at 27% proficiency for ELA and 19% for Math. Students with disabiltiies also trailed in learning gains. As a result, our students with disabilities have the greatest struggle in all content areas because they have lower reading skills that negatively impacts their academic success.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students with disabilities will increase their federal index by 3 percentage points going from a federal index of 38% for 2022 to 41% federal index on the 2024 FSA/FAST.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monthly Teacher Data Meetings to Review School data (iReady Data, Unit Assessments, FAST Data or STAR Data)
Weekly Classroom Walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jobenna Lawson-Sellers (jlawson-sellers@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

HMH Reading Tabletop Mini Lessons
IReady Teacher Assigned Lessons and Tools For Instruction
Phonics Chip Kit
Phonics Chip Kit Lessons by 95% Group
Sonday Systems
Provided Explicit Vocabulary Instruction in all content areas.
95% Phonics Booster for grades 1-3 25 day phonics tune up

The classroom teacher and the ESE teacher will communicate continuously to discuss student progress and areas of need. Gen ed teachers will plan along with the ESE teacher and lesson plans will be shared so that the special educators can prepare for small group instruction. Teachers will work collaboratively to design instruction and incorporate opportunities for students to practice skills that data reflects is at a deficit.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All of the strategies are state and district proven to move students in their academic achievement and show promising and strong evidence. In review of our 2022 FSA data, students lacked the basic skills and therefore need intensive and explicit instruction. What Works Clearinghouse, Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in K-3rd, recommends teaching students academic language skills, including the use of
inferential and narrative language, and vocabulary knowledge (promising evidence) and the need to develop awareness of the segments of sound in speech and how they link to letters (strong evidence).

Recommended through the following strategies:
Phonological Awareness Lessons by 95% Group
Phonics Chip Kit Lessons by 95% Group
Sonday Systems 1
Also, Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words (strong evidence)
Phonics Chip Kit Lessons by 95% Group
Sonday Systems 1.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Training for ESE teachers on Sonday System - evidence based strategies.
2. Collection of initial iReady and FAST or STAR data to use for data analysis to determine if student is making progress and ongoing Monitoring of data.
3. Monthly Data Chats and Goal Setting
5. Standards based instruction and use of ESE intervention for reteaching and remediation monitored through classroom daily walk throughs by administration.
6. Monitoring of curriculum based assessments (Schoolnet Unit Assessments)

Person Responsible: Jobenna Lawson-Sellers (jlawson-sellers@ecsdfl.us)

By When: On-going

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In reviewing our 2022 Math FSA ESSA assessment data, the only sub group that fell below 41% proficiency was our students with disabilities. Our data further revealed that
20% of our students with disabilities were proficiency in Math.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our ESSA sub group, students with disabilities, will increase their 2022 FSA Math proficiency federal index by 21 percentage points, going from a federal index of 20% to a federal index of 41% on the 2024 Math FAST PM3.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Data from STAR360, i-Ready, Schoolnet, and core math unit assessments will be analyzed and reviewed. In addition, there will be daily classroom walkthroughs to monitor curriculum implementation, planning, instructional presentation, and classroom common board configuration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dr. Patrice Moody (pmoody@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Utilizing our district-wide curriculum.
2. Utilizing Math Frameworks and Math Year-at-a-Glance.
3. Expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies.
4. Teach students how to use visual representations.
5. Mathematical Language: Teach clear and concise mathematical language and support students' use of the language to help students effectively communicate their understanding of mathematical concepts.
6. According to 10 Key Mathematics Practices for All Elementary Schools: Students are expected to use hands-on materials and visual representations to show concepts and procedures.
7. General education classroom teachers and ESE inclusion teachers will work cooperatively on creating lesson plans, sharing strategies, and instructional implementation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In analyzing our 2022 FSA Math results, achievement for our students with disabilities subgroup appear to be displaying deficiencies with the problem solving process and lacking skills with the use of visual representation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teachers provide opportunities for students to utilize mathematical language within content-reading, writing, listening, and speaking on a daily basis
2. Teachers provide opportunities for student discourse around standard-aligned tasks on a daily basis based on their Common Board Configuration
3. Teachers provide students opportunities to solve math problems using a variety of strategies on a daily basis
4. Teachers provide opportunities for students to utilize visual and concrete models to represent mathematical thinking and justify the mathematical solution identified by the appropriateness of the rigor of the standard

Person Responsible: Dr. Patrice Moody (pmoody@ecsdfl.us)

By When: On-going

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Funding allocations for Title I funds are based on survey 3 poverty data. Schools receive these allocations in the spring and work with Title I and the level directors to determine how those funds are utilized. Title I schools also receive additional funding for low income students to support parent involvement. UniSIG allocations are based on school grade and overall Federal Index rates and are received in late summer. The schools work with the School Transformation Office (STO) and level directors to determine the usage of these funds to maximize impact on student achievement. Both Title I and UniSIG are aligned so there are no resource duplications between these two main school improvement funding sources. The Human Resource Department works with Budgeting, Finance, Title I, STO, and Executive staff to review staffing to ensure schools in need have staffing that reflects the need of the school. Title I, UniSIG, Reading Allocation, ESSER, and SAI funding sources are utilized to add supplemental positions to meet the needs of schools and align to state and district goals. School Improvement funding allocations are also utilized to pay staff to attend planning sessions and professional development sessions with the Professional Development Department and STO based on input from BSI and the district. The district identifies resources for coaching and planning support through the level directors, School Transformation Office, Title I, and Professional Development Department. Schools are tiered based on need including school grade, overall federal index, graduation rates, and ESSA subgroup data. Supplemental resources in addition to the district purchased core resources are reviewed based on the school need and approved for purchase utilizing school improvement funding and SAI funding. The district has also begun to utilize Canvas as the LMS to help support resource allocation to include benchmark aligned lessons, professional development, and content training for schools. Additional support that is identified by quarterly meetings with schools and monthly meetings with the BSI team will be supported through the LMS to ensure school needs and district resources are being appropriately allocated for the 2023-2024 school year.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The following data was used to determine the critical need:
57% of Kindergarten ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.
76% of First grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.
63% of Second grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

Students who score below the 40th percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading are not considered proficient. The number of students who were not considered proficient at the end of 2022-2023 indicates a need to 1) improve core instruction and 2) identify student deficiencies and provide interventions immediately in order to close achievement gaps.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

The following data was used to determine the critical need:
Third grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 73% on the 2023 FAST.
Fourth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 70% on the 2023 FAST.
Fifth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 74% on the 2023 FAST.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

ELA proficiency as determined by those scoring at or above the 40th percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading 2023 will increase for grades kindergarten through 2nd grade to 50% or higher on FAST-STAR PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The ELA proficiency rate will increase for grades third through fifth to 50% or higher in each grade on the 2024 FAST PM3.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

To monitor for desired outcomes, we will collect data, analyze, and track the percent of students scoring satisfactorily each quarter. We will identify students in need of intervention according to the intervention decision tree.
a. Kindergarten: STAR Early Literacy results and percent of students earning satisfactory performance on the standards-based grading rubric.
b. First grade: STAR Early Literacy/Reading results and the percent of students meeting benchmark on the first grade quarterly decoding probe per classroom. (See FOCUS report)
c. Second grade: STAR Reading results and the percent of students whose fluency rate is average per the time of year on the Hasbrouck and Tindal fluency norms chart. (See Amira)
d. Grades 3-5: analyze results by classroom of district module assessments.
2. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to observe delivery of Pre-K to Grade 5 literacy instruction and suggest improvements through the use of the Florida Literacy Practice Profiles.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lawson-Sellers, Jobenna, jlawson-sellers@ecsdfl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Lincoln Park Elementary uses HMH Into Reading 2022 for its Comprehensive Core Reading/Language Arts Program (CCRP)
The district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan outlines in detail how Into Reading meets Florida' s definition of evidence-based.The district ELA Department mapped B.E.S.T. and created

curriculum frameworks to ensure that Tier I instruction is standards-aligned.
In order to ensure the measurable outcomes are reached in K-5, our school will 1) focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 CERP and 2) provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills according to the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees.
Tier 1 instruction is monitored by the school's administration team through weekly classroom walkthroughs and by being present during collaborative lesson planning. Teachers and RtI teams monitor the effectiveness of interventions with individual students by collecting data and tracking student progress.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The use of Houghton Mifflin Into Reading 2022 as a Comprehensive Core Language Arts/Reading Program is supported by recommended practices in the The Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides as described in the K-12 CERP. The core curriculum includes accommodations for students with a disability, and students who are English language learners; provides print-rich explicit and systematic, scaffolded, and differentiated instruction; builds background and content knowledge; incorporates writing in response to reading; and incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning.
A focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) with this comprehensive curriculum will increase the proficiency of our students in K-5.
Furthermore, following the Institute of Education Sciences recommendations (strong evidence) for interventions, teachers follow the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees to provide interventions in decoding and building fluency, matched to student need during a dedicated intervention period daily.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership-
Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth.
Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing.
Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.
Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching-
District coaches and/or school mentor teachers will facilitate use of the literacy practice profiles in the delivery of instruction with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing.
Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.
Action Step 3: Assessment
Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention.
Grade level teams will meet to discuss the use of formative assessment to guide differentiation in the classroom; analyze core reading material assessment results, and use STAR for screening, diagnostics, and progress monitoring.
Action Step 4: Professional Learning -
We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following:
Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees
Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period.
Five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan
The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The Title I Annual Meeting is held during the first quarter of the school year. All stakeholders (families, teachers, staff, and community members) are invited to attend. During this meeting the following information is shared: School Improvement Plan, Parent & Family Engagement Plan, Title I Budget, Parents' Right to Know (defined by Title I law), and the School-Family Compact.

Throughout the school year, SIP progress is regularly shared and discussed through the School Advisory Council. Regardless of membership status, all stakeholders are invited to attend School Advisory Council meetings.

Links to the school's SIP are posted on the school's homepage https://www.escambiaschools.org/lpes as well as the schools Our Title I Family page.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

During the 23-24 school year, the school has a variety of methods to communicate student progress with parents.
FAST data will be reviewed with families. Lincoln Park hosts several events to review progress monitoring data with parents. Goodies with Guardians, Pastries with Parents are scheduled after PM1 and PM2 to review student performance with parents. Coffee and Conversations will be scheduled each quarter to hold report card chats will be scheduled to keep parents abreast of their child's performance.

Two academic Family Nights are scheduled to build the capacity of families in Language Arts (Family Literacy Night -ELA) & Family Night (STEM) and Math (Parent Math Seminar). Teachers will share strategies which can be used at home.

The Parent & Family Engagement Plan is shared with families during the Title I Annual Meeting, posted on our website, and messaged to families through the student information system FOCUS.

The Parent & Family Engagement Plan is accessible from our school's website: https://www.escambiaschools.org/lpes.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

In analyzing our 2022 ESSA subgroups data, our school will focus on strengthening the academic program for our students with disabilities in the areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics. Thus, to increase the amount and quality of learning time, effective classroom intervention practices found on What Works Clearinghouse will be implemented. In addition, our faculty will train parents to empower them with skills to assist students towards mastering standards.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Head Start: LEA cofunds Head Start for a maximum of 206 children. These services are provided in schools with our highest poverty. Family events provide guidance and modeling of emergent literacy development activities.
Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten: Title I Part A co-funds VPK services, by extending full day services in schools with our highest poverty. Family events provide guidance and modeling of emergent literacy development activities.
Title I, Part C: Migrant families participate in a LEA Advisory Council for English Language Learners. Translators are available for teacher conferences as well as to assist with translation of documents to be provided for families. Family events provide guidance and modeling of emergent literacy development activities.
Title I, Part D: Resources are provided for parents whose children are enrolled in Neglected &

Delinquent programs.
ESOL-Title III: Provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) such as services and paraprofessionals.
Title IV, Part A: Provides students with a well-rounded education, supports safe and healthy students, and supports the effective use of technology. Schools benefit through Capturing Kids' Hearts training and the services of the secondary schools guidance TSA.
Carl Perkins Career and Technical Education Act: Provides funds to increase the quality of career and technical education.
Title IX, Part A: Provides hygiene items, school supplies, enrollment assistance, social work, and advocacy. Assistance for housing, food, clothing, and other emergency support are available for families referred under Title IX.
IDEA: Provides students with disabilities a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) that is tailored to their individual needs including an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), placement in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), appropriate evaluation, parent and teacher participation, and procedural safeguards.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Students can be recommended for counseling, mental health supports by a teacher, administration, or counselor. Parents may also request these services at the school. All students are in the MTSS system. Meetings are scheduled for the students who are identified as needing additional support. These students are then given additional interventions and support through Tier II or Tier III. The interventions and services are monitored through the RTI process.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

n/a

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

All students are in the MTSS system. Meetings are scheduled for the students who are identified as needing additional support both academically and/or behaviorally. These students are then given additional interventions and support through Tier II or Tier III interventions . The interventions and services are monitored through the RTI process which includes meetings scheduled with the child's parents, teachers, and other pertinent stakeholders. Progress is monitored and analyzed to determine if students' are in need of additional supports or if sufficient progress has been made.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional development (PD) at Lincoln Park for the 2023-24 school year include both Title One Funded and Other funded PD: Title One Funded PD: Whole Brain Teaching for Challenging Students;

Thinking Maps Write from the Beginning and Beyond, Setting the Stage.
Other Funded PD: Thinking Maps; Math Difficulties, Disabilities, and Dyscalculia; Emotional Friendly Teaching

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

n/a