

Leon County Schools

Lincoln High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	27
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Lincoln High School

3838 TROJAN TRL, Tallahassee, FL 32311

<https://www.leonschools.net/lincoln>

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 educational setting at Lincoln High School fosters flexible, comprehensive, and challenging academic and extra-curricular programs which maximize each student's potential. Lincoln graduates will be productive, contributing members of society who have a strong sense of personal responsibility, a sense of national citizenship, a life-long love of learning, and a respect for the diverse contributions of all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The educational setting at Lincoln High School fosters flexible, comprehensive, and challenging academic and extra-curricular programs which maximize each student's potential. Lincoln graduates will be productive, contributing members of society who have a strong sense of personal responsibility, a sense of national citizenship, a life-long love of learning, and a respect for the diverse contributions of all. Our Beliefs are

- to recruit and retain enthusiastic, highly-qualified faculty and staff members who are dedicated to creating an environment where all students can learn and are valued.
- to provide the highest quality academic instruction possible.
- to create a well-balanced learning community that encourages students to utilize critical thinking skills in problem solving and to develop time management skills to accomplish goals.
- to model and encourage, for students, a love of life-long learning, a sense of personal responsibility, and a respect for each other.
- to ensure that every student graduating from Lincoln has been given the opportunity to explore career and educational options and has been given guidance in making his/her post-secondary decisions.
- to prepare students to become proactive, productive citizens willing to improve their society as a whole.
- to encourage students to become citizens by volunteering in the community. Participation in this endeavor will allow them to develop leadership skills, an appreciation for all segments of society, and a knowledge that they can make a contribution to the well-being of the community at large.

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
Burch, Allen	Principal	Dr. Burch is supported by three assistant principals and one dean. The principal has designated specific responsibilities to each assistant principal and dean, which is broadly described through attendance, curriculum, and student services. Additional duties may be assigned to any member of the administrative team as situations dictate. All administrators participate in monthly faculty professional development and are assigned teacher observation duties.
Demps, Arva	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Attendance
Tibbitts, Jen	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum
Monroe, Brent	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Administration
Thompson, Heather	Dean	

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.

s

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))

s

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	29%

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 *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				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	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	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	52	51	50	55	55	51	54		
ELA Learning Gains				50			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			23		
Math Achievement*	43	45	38	47	36	38	36		
Math Learning Gains				40			19		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31			19		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	54	65	64	58	47	40	52		
Social Studies Achievement*	72	77	66	66	46	48	71		
Middle School Acceleration					40	44			
Graduation Rate	94	89	89	97	67	61	98		
College and Career Acceleration	60	61	65	58	75	67	51		
ELP Progress	20	45	45	42			20		

* 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	94

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	577
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	97

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	37	Yes	2	
ELL	20	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	51			
HSP	57			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	48			

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	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	44			
HSP	47			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	43			

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	52			43			54	72		94	60	20
SWD	19			28			34	28		13	6	
ELL	13			27							3	20
AMI												
ASN	69			27			40	84		82	6	
BLK	39			32			39	59		41	6	
HSP	51			38			53	60		48	6	
MUL	58			52			50	73		65	6	
PAC												
WHT	59			53			68	84		72	6	
FRL	38			32			43	52		36	6	

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	55	50	33	47	40	31	58	66		97	58	42
SWD	17	33	36	25	18	20	13	33		95	23	
ELL	28	47		40	31		30	50				42
AMI												
ASN	72	67		62	45		60	50		100	82	
BLK	39	42	33	27	37	30	40	50		97	42	
HSP	46	38	17	40	31	31	58	51		100	56	
MUL	57	38	10	43	32		65	75		96	58	
PAC												
WHT	64	56	35	63	46	38	69	77		98	70	
FRL	34	42	33	28	34	32	38	45		97	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	54	42	23	36	19	19	52	71		98	51	20
SWD	14	22	18	16	23	19	37	31		96	19	
ELL	20	40		27	27					92	50	20

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
AMI												
ASN	66	56		56	21		50	80		100	78	
BLK	38	33	18	21	17	14	29	53		97	29	
HSP	47	39	26	38	16	13	52	66		89	67	
MUL	46	49	42	43	21		52	71		100	50	
PAC												
WHT	66	46	27	49	22	33	72	84		99	64	
FRL	35	36	25	25	23	20	30	48		95	29	

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
10	2023 - Spring	51%	51%	0%	50%	1%
09	2023 - Spring	54%	50%	4%	48%	6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	42%	58%	-16%	50%	-8%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	48%	1%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	65%	-12%	63%	-10%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	75%	-4%	63%	8%

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.

From the FY22 data, our lowest performance was Math Lowest 25th percentile. While reflecting the lowest performance of our metrics, it also represents the largest gain from the previous school year, moving from 19% to 31%. Data from the 2023 school year has not been made available yet.

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

Our Social Studies achievement showed the greatest decline from the prior year, decreasing from 71% in 2021 to 66% in 2022. Data from the 2023 school year has not been made available yet.

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.

Social Studies

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

The area that showed the most improvement was our Math Lowest 25th Percentile. Math support designees provided additional intervention by pulling out students from elective courses and working with students in Math courses. Math interventionists worked inside of general Math courses and also pulled out students for additional support.

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

Based on the EWS data, two potential areas of concern are lower 25% ELL and SWD performance.

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

1- Increasing SWD from FY22 31% ESSA Federal Index

2- Increasing ELL from FY22 38% ESSA Federal Index

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

Lincoln's reading and writing achievement scores were above the State but below the District average. While this is measured in FAST ELA scores, reading comprehension and writing skills are fundamental to success in every subject.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Lincoln students will score above the state and district average in ELA learning gains and will match the state average in ELA bottom 25th percentile.

Monitoring:

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

Students will participate in quarterly progress monitoring through standards- aligned county- made diagnostics. Teachers will review data from these assessments and adjust instruction as needed. Students who fall into the bottom 25% will also complete the STAR assessment to monitor their progress in reading fluency and comprehension. ELA interventionists will work inside of general English courses and will also pull out students for additional support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allen Burch (burcha@leonschools.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.)

Students will continue to improve in critical reading and text-based writing, both in the classroom and on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking for English/ Language Arts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implement the following strategies into everyday English/Language Arts instruction to support critical reading and text-based writing:

- B.E.S.T. ELA Standards-based fiction and non-fiction supplements.
- County-developed progress monitoring in reading comprehension and data analysis to guide instruction
- STAR assessments to track the progress of the bottom quartile students - Tier 2 & 3 Interventions

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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 percentage of our bottom 25% making learning gains has improved and data shows growth in students achieving Level 3 or higher on the FSA Algebra I and Geometry EOCs, however, Lincoln High School math learning gains are below the state and district average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Lincoln will match or exceed the district and State Math achievement levels as measured by the Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) EOC in Algebra I and Geometry.

Monitoring:

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

Students will complete quarterly progress monitoring through county-made standards- aligned diagnostics for Algebra 1 and Geometry. Math support designees will provide additional intervention by pulling out students from elective courses and working with students in Math courses. Math interventionists will work inside of general Math courses and will also pull out students for additional support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allen Burch (burcha@leonschools.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.)

Supporting our 9th and 10th grade students in the lowest 25% using the Algebra IA and IB curriculum. Additionally, implementing the ALEKS online program which has differentiated learning tailored specifically to each student to help build algebraic skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The ALEKS program comes with the adoption of our new textbooks. The ALEKS program claims “through adaptive questioning, ALEKS accurately assesses a student’s knowledge state and then delivers targeted instruction on the exact topics the student is most ready to learn.” We will implement ALEKS into the Algebra and Geometry instruction to support student learning and 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

Science achievement for Lincoln High School was below the State and District average. While this is measured in Biology scores, biological concepts are fundamental to the Science curriculum.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Lincoln students will score above the district average and will match the State average in Science achievement.

Monitoring:

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

Students will complete quarterly standards-based county-made diagnostic progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allen Burch (burcha@leonschools.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.)

Students will apply text-based evidence in support of biological concepts on the EOC. Students will be given activities, labs, projects, and assignments which involve more scientific readings; assignments that contain a wide array of question types that cover the state assessment goals; and more graphical analysis of data on homework, tests, and quizzes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implement the following strategies into everyday Biology instruction to support biological concepts:

- County-based progress monitoring assessments
- County-wide pacing guide
- Pearson textbook-supplied resources

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**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.

Lincoln High School Social Studies Achievement, while above the state average, is below the district average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Lincoln will match the district and State Social Studies achievement levels as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment in United States History.

Monitoring:

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

Students will complete quarterly progress monitoring to assess their level of skill. Teachers will adjust their instructional practices as needed based on the data from these assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allen Burch (burcha@leonschools.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.)

Students will continue to improve in achievement levels, both in the classroom and on the Florida Standards Assessment EOC, for United States History.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implement the following strategies into everyday United States History instruction to support achievement levels:

- District-based progress monitoring
- District-adopted textbook
- Online access to McGraw-Hill Connect ED

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation**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.

Student graduation requirements, including test performance, continue to become more demanding.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Provide students additional opportunities to meet graduation requirements.

Monitoring:

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

Students will receive the opportunity to earn a concordant score through the ACT or SAT. Students will have additional opportunities for test prep tutoring by teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allen Burch (burcha@leonschools.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.)

Identify students who meet the requirements for additional opportunities and provide them with these opportunities at least once per semester.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In addition to curriculum mapping, which will provide additional support for students who struggle on state assessments, additional opportunities will be provided for concordant scores.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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 FY22, most school grade components increased for Lincoln High School. ELL students increased from the prior year in all school grade components but still performed lower than any other subgroup listed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to improve in all school grade components by 4%; however we also want to show growth in our subgroup data for our ELLs to increase from 38% from FY22 to 42% above the ESSA threshold.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through classroom walkthroughs, teacher evaluations, data chats, and PD agendas and sign-ins.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allen Burch (burcha@leonschools.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.)

These strategies will improve instructional practice specifically related to differentiation:

1. Identify targeted lower 25% students
2. Implement technology software Imagine Learning, Power Up, IXL
3. Implement small group instruction in reading and math classes to differentiate and close learning gaps
4. Reading interventionist will push into and pull out of English 1 and 2 as well as Algebra 1 and Algebra 1B
5. Professional development on effective differentiation strategies in classroom implementation to result in academic achievement for subgroups as well as closing foundational gaps.
6. Implement year round tutorials to help support academic achievement
7. Remediation through pull out tutorials
8. Monitoring through walkthroughs, teacher evaluations, school and teacher data, data chats, and PD agendas and sign ins

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In school tutorial groups gives us the opportunity to strategically cover academic deficiencies in all content areas in a small group setting. Additionally, using various software programs like Imagine Learning, Power Up, and IXL, allows teachers and administration to monitor data and student achievement throughout the strategic interventions and use the data to inform instruction and plan for small groups. Lastly, providing good professional development opportunities allows teachers to collaborate and implement effective teaching methods targeting subgroup populations such as our ELLs.

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. Identify the lowest 25%
2. Implement software programs for differentiation
3. Implement small group models in reading and math classes to allow for differentiation
4. Remediation through pull outs
5. Provide PD opportunities focused on subgroups and differentiation using the standards-based curriculum (i.e. differentiation for ELLs from the multicultural department).
6. Monitoring will occur through pull outs, observations, and data chats.

Person Responsible: Allen Burch (burcha@leonschools.net)

By When:

#7. 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 FY22, most school grade components increased for Lincoln High School. SWD students increased from the prior year, but SWD's subgroup is still the second lowest in all school grade components.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to improve in all school grade components by 5%; showing significant growth in our subgroup data for our SWDs to increase from 31% from the FY22 to closer to the ESSA threshold.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through classroom walkthroughs, teacher evaluations, data chats, and PD agendas and sign ins.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allen Burch (burcha@leonschools.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.)

These strategies will align with strategies to improve instructional practice specifically related to differentiation:

1. Identify targeted lower 25% students
2. Implement technology software Imagine Learning, Power Up, IXL
3. Implement small group instruction in reading and math classes to differentiate and close gaps
4. Reading interventionist will push into and pull out of English 1 and 2 as well as Algebra 1 and Algebra 1B
5. Professional development on effective differentiation strategies in classroom implementation to result in academic achievement for subgroups as well as closing foundational gaps.
6. Implement year round tutorials to help support academic achievement
7. Remediation through pull out tutorials
8. Monitoring through walkthroughs, teacher evaluations, school and teacher data, data chats, and PD agendas and sign ins

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In school tutorial groups gives us the opportunity to strategically cover academic deficiencies in all content areas in a small group setting. Additionally, using various software programs like Imagine Learning, Power Up, and IXL, allows teachers and administration to monitor data and student achievement throughout the strategic interventions and use the data to inform instruction and plan for small groups. Lastly, providing good professional development opportunities allows teachers to collaborate and implement effective teaching methods targeting subgroup populations such as our ELLs.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#8. 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.

For the 23Y we will focus on positive school culture and environment by incorporating initiatives on campus that foster collaboration, team building, and camaraderie with the goal to create a supportive and fulfilling environment for teachers, staff and students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to have 75% of out faulty and staff participate in the new initiatives on campus, giving faculty and staff several options that will meet the various needs of all.

Monitoring:

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

We will have sign in sheets and incorporate anonymous feedback surveys for faculty and staff. Feedback will be taken to committees in order to adapt to the needs of our faculty and staff for optimal positive school culture.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Thompson (thompsonh@leonschools.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.)

These initiatives will align with the ultimate goal to promote and improve a positive school culture:

- 1) Lincoln Master Class
- 2) New teacher cohort lead by principal
- 3) Celebrate 3838 Committee
- 4) Hosting of interns

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These initiatives will provide the faculty and staff a sense of collegiality, as well as opportunities for collaboration. These opportunities ultimately will harvest a supportive and fulfilling environment with the overarching goal of providing learning conditions that meet the needs of all of our students, fostering a positive school culture. Building and maintaining relationships amongst faculty and staff through these initiatives throughout the year will help with teacher retention and recruitment.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

School improvement funding will be reviewed through the Lincoln School Advisory Council, which meets monthly.