Lincoln Elementary Magnet School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lincoln Elementary Magnet School

1207 E RENFRO ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

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.

Lincoln Elementary Magnet will promote the growth of life-long learning and academic excellence through inquiry to make the world a better place.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lincoln lions, excelling academically while exploring the world.

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
Rushing, Ann	Principal	Instructional Leader of the School Plans and guides the professional development needs of the teachers to improve student achievement. Involved in the IB PYP planning, programme development plan, and PLCs Oversees the budget, facility, and operations of the school
Giblin, Anna	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader of the School Plans and guides the professional development needs of the teachers to improve student achievement. Involved in the IB PYP planning, programme development plan, and PLCs
Keel, Sara	Magnet Coordinator	Plans and guides the professional development needs of the staff for our PYP IB World School Collaboratively plans each week with all grade levels on their Units of Study Guides the staff with all things PYP Monitors and completes all paperwork for PYP
Benchikh, Jenna	Other	Supports teachers in the MTSS process Provides job embedded professional development Helps teachers select and implement the most appropriate academic interventions Provides interventions to students who are struggling academically Facilitates RtI Meetings and communicates with stackholderes
Valdivia, Angela	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Teacher SAC Chair

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.

At the end of the year, we shared our data with the School Advisory Council. The committee felt we needed to continue to focus on our Black students and our Students with Disabilities since they are not making satisfactory progress compared to their peers.

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))

Each month the School Advisory Council meets and discusses a subject area and looks at current data. Teachers will also have PLCs and meet quarterly to look at data and make adjustments to their plans. As part of our PYP we are focusing on Approaches to Learning which are Social Skills, Research Skills, Thinking Skills, Communications Skills, and Self-Management Skills. We feel these will help students be more successful. During the year we will continue to revise the plan for continuous improvement.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	94%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B	
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	0	9	12	12	4	9	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	17	15	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	16	11	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	10	18	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	8	14	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	1	4	4	5	8	0	0	0	29

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	0	0	4	9	4	0	0	0	17

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	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	26	15	7	8	6	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	10	12	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	10	17	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	6	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	26	15	7	8	6	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	10	12	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	10	17	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	1	6	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	57	50	53	60	53	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				63			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			65		
Math Achievement*	62	56	59	67	50	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				63			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31			53		
Science Achievement*	58	50	54	48	59	59	63		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	59	59	30					

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	305
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	25	Yes	4	2
ELL	72			
AMI				
ASN	94			
BLK	29	Yes	4	1
HSP	65			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	75			

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%
FRL	45			

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	22	Yes	3	1
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	40	Yes	3	
HSP	66			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	45			

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	57			62			58					64
SWD	18			27			30				3	
ELL	71			82							3	64
AMI												
ASN	84			97			100				3	
BLK	30			38			15				4	
HSP	60			67			59				5	62
MUL	64			64							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	71			68			82				4	
FRL	40			49			39				5	50

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	60	63	49	67	63	31	48					30
SWD	22	29	20	21	28	9						
ELL	56	57		81	71							30
AMI												
ASN	96	94		100	83							
BLK	33	53	48	42	49	33	21					
HSP	65	60		76	68		60					
MUL	64			64								
PAC												
WHT	77	63		79	63		70					
FRL	44	58	53	53	53	30	27					

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	66	67	65	63	62	53	63					
SWD	24			32								
ELL	67			78								
AMI												
ASN	96			100								
BLK	38	53	60	31	42	50	28					
HSP	65	50		68	55		65					
MUL	91			64								
PAC												
WHT	83	84		79	74		76					
FRL	54	53	57	48	45	50	45					

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	60%	53%	7%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	54%	7%	58%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	46%	16%	50%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	60%	55%	5%	59%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	59%	12%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	53%	13%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	47%	11%	51%	7%

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.

Science was our lowest score. 58% of our 5th grade students were proficient in science. This was a 10% increase from the previous year. This is also 7 points higher than the state average.

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

Our math scores went from 67% proficient in 2022 to 65% proficient in 2023. In the 2022-23 school year we had no district personnel collaborating with us or doing walkthroughs with us. In the 2021-22 school year we had a district resource teacher that was able to coach our teachers and give feedback.

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.

There is no gap compared to the state average. We are 7% higher in both ELA, Math, and Science. Each year we are above the state and district average.

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

Our Science component showed a 10% increase, from 48% proficient to 58% proficient. Our teachers collaborated together, attended district science trainings, and worked with one of the district science resource teachers.

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

1. Level 1 on statewide ELA Assessments
2. Absent 10% or more days

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

1. Students with Disabilities
2. Our Black Population
3. Attendance
4. Level One Students
5. Science

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 Early Warning System

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.

46 students (10%) were absent 10% or more days.

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

23 students (5%) will be absent 10% or more days from August 2023 to May 2024.

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

1. RtI Resource Teacher will monitor classroom attendance weekly with an attendance incentive club.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jenna Benchikh (jenna.benchikh@hcps.net)

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.)

The Attendance Incentive Club will check in with their teacher daily and with Mrs. Benchikh once a week. Those who meet their goal of 100% attendance for the week will spend time together and receive a special incentive.

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

Students need to feel they belong. Mrs. Benchikh will be able to form relationships with these students. Review of Educational Research analysis of 46 studies found that strong teacher-student relationships were associated in both the short- and long-term with improvements on practically every measure schools care about: higher student academic engagement, attendance, grades, fewer disruptive behaviors and suspensions, and lower school dropout rates.

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. Identity students who have been absent 10% or more days during the 2022-23 school year.
2. Hold a meeting with these students describing the club and its purpose.
3. Notify the parents that their child is a part of the club.
4. Implement the action steps--check-in system, meet with RtI Resource teacher weekly, be a part of the incentive time if goal is met.
5. Check data monthly and make adjustments.

Person Responsible: Jenna Benchikh (jenna.benchikh@hcps.net)

By When: Attendance data will be monitored weekly.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

Research has historically indicated strong correlations between student engagement (typically defined as attention to the area of focus, active participation in learning, and time on task) and student achievement. As an IB World School we want our students to collaborate, inquire, ask questions, communicate, research, and take action. These actions will help our students to be engaged and to make academic progress.

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

As measured by PM3, our reading, math, and science assessments will increase by 5%. We will also be looking at our subgroups. Our Black students and SWD students will increase by 10%.

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

Data will be monitored after PM1, PM2, and PM3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ann Rushing (ann.rushing@hcps.net)

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.)

IB Practices--Inquiry, Collaborating, Communicating with one another, Questioning and Researching Hands-On Activities, Kagan Structures, Long Term Investigations, Enhanced Vocabulary Instruction, Opportunities for application of learning, Small Group Instruction, Scaffolding and Collaborative Team Planning.

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

We want to meet the needs of all of our students and improve academic performance. Research shows that student engagement enhances overall student achievement.

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. On-going professional development for teachers by fellow teachers on effective engagement strategies
2. IB Weekly Team Planning meetings where inquiry units are planned which will include questioning, researching, approaches to learning and action
3. Learning Walks for Teachers
4. Utilization of Jr. Great Books within the Units of Study
5. Long-Term Investigations conducted to engage students in science standards.

6. Quarterly data PLCs to monitor progress in all 3 subject areas
7. Quarterly meetings will be held for parents to discuss engaging ways they can work with their students in reading, math, and science

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

By When: Progress will be monitored quarterly by progress monitoring measures

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).

We are categorized as ATSI which means we have one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%. Our 2 subgroups below 41% are our SWD-Students with Disabilities and our Black Students. Our Students with Disabilities have a federal index number of 22, our Black students have a federal index number of 40. This year we bought an RtI Resource Teacher to help with our Tier 3 students. This will help us with both subgroups. She will be able to work with teachers and with students to help close the gap. We have also budgeted to give our teachers time for collaborative planning and for DATA PLCs so that all students can be monitored closely, and plans made when students are not meeting the benchmarks.
Math manipulatives will be bought to give students the opportunity to understand the concepts they will be learning. Additional library books will also be purchased based on the interests of students.

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.

https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/lincoln
We send monthly newsletters with information about our school, our SIP, our progress, and ways parents can be involved. Texts are sent weekly with important news about our school.

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))

Teachers use various methods of communicating with parents. As a school, every student is given an agenda. Teachers communicate daily within the agenda, and many have other text-based ways to

communicate with parents. We have 3 school-wide conference nights, one of which is a student-led conference. Teachers are always willing to conference with a parent if there is a need.
We also have many different family nights--World Fest, Evening of Expression, Grandparents' Bingo, Cookies and Canvas--A Night of Painting, Playdate with Dudes, and PTA Sweets with your Superwoman,

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))

One of our areas of focus is Student Engagement. Research shows that if students are engaged, learning is enhanced. We will provide professional development in this area, provide time for teachers to do Learning Walks to see how others are using student engagement strategies, plan collaboratively, implement the Units of Study of our IB program where students inquire, think, research, discuss, and take action.

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))

Our plan is developed in coordination and integration with IB World Schools and other state and district requirements.