

Polk County Public Schools

Lincoln Avenue Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Lincoln Avenue Academy

1330 LINCOLN AVE N, Lakeland, FL 33805

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/laa>

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.

We model for our students the behaviors of internationally minded people who recognize the talents within themselves and others, respect individual and cultural differences, and appreciate their roles as stewards of our planet.

We create an environment that instills in our students the insight to value and take responsibility for their own learning, while encouraging them to be curious inquirers as they interact with the world around them.

We focus our transdisciplinary units of study on concepts of global significance, promoting an awareness of the commonality of the human experience, which fosters their sensitivity to the differences within our world-wide community.

We empower students to take their learning to thoughtful and appropriate actions that affect our global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"We, at Lincoln Avenue Academy, are committed to developing in our students the potential to become global leaders, prepared to take action to better our 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
Kirby, Antionette	Principal	<p>The roles and responsibilities of Lincoln's principal are defined by the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. They include but are not limited to: obtaining high student learning results, establishing student learning as a priority, implementing an instructional framework, establishing a learning environment that is conducive to the learning of all students, employ and monitor a decision-making the process that is based on vision, mission, and improvement priorities using facts and data, developing other leaders within Lincoln, retaining and developing an effective and diverse faculty and staff, and maintaining a safe and orderly facility.</p>
Blackwell, Marti	Instructional Coach	<p>The role of the coach is to build teacher capacity and their understanding of instructional practices as related to high yield instructional strategies, BEST Standards and Data Driven Instruction. An instructional coach is a learner who models continuous improvement, lifelong learning, and goes above and beyond to ensure student success. Instructional coaches will promote reflection, provide guidance and structure where needed, and focus on strengths, collaboration and common issues of concern. They are responsible for ensuring high-quality instruction in classrooms through modeling, co-planning, co-teaching and providing feedback to teachers.</p>
Ebbole, Jenna	Instructional Coach	<p>The role of the coach is to build teacher capacity and their understanding of instructional practices as related to high yield instructional strategies, BEST Standards and Data Driven Instruction. An instructional coach is a learner who models continuous improvement, lifelong learning, and goes above and beyond to ensure student success. Instructional coaches will promote reflection, provide guidance and structure where needed, and focus on strengths, collaboration and common issues of concern. They are responsible for ensuring high-quality instruction in classrooms through modeling, co-planning, co-teaching and providing feedback to teachers.</p>
Spickard, Ann	Teacher, K-12	<p>Job duties include assisting with the implementation of a systematic school-wide approach to tiered intervention within a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS). Activities may include coordinating classroom intervention programs, providing curriculum and instructional support to teachers including effective intervention strategies, and implementing specialized services to meet the needs of students. In addition, provide academic support in the implementation of language and cultural acquisition in the PYP program.</p>
Lokey, Diana	Magnet Coordinator	<p>The job duties include oversight and coordination of all IB related activities including the PYP Exhibition, teacher training, program of inquiry and unit development, and student evaluation. The role of the IB PYP Coordinator is to plan and oversee the implementation and management of the program. Through coordination with teachers, administrators, and the IB, the coordinator is responsible for the full delivery of the curriculum including documentation, reporting, analysis, and evaluation. As a gifted teacher this teacher is responsible for organizing, implementing, and supporting modified</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		instructional strategies to meet the needs of gifted students in gifted and/or basic education classes.
Sumner, Joshua	Assistant Principal	Provides support to the school's principal. Works with teachers to ensure the implementation of high yield strategies. Ensure a safe and secure learning environment. Monitors and develops plans to address early warning system.

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.

The School-Wide Improvement Plan was developed with a compilation of all stakeholders. The stakeholders involved were the leadership team and teachers. The initial school improvement plan was developed during the summer and the school achievement data was used to direct the programs and initiatives for the school year. Staff are presented with the SIP during pre-planning week and SAC reviews the SIP during the first SAC meeting. SAC also reviews the SIP at the mid-year point after mid-year progress monitoring data is available.

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))

The SIP is monitored for effective implementation and impact throughout the year by the leadership team, school staff, and SAC. Progress monitoring data is utilized to ensure instructional practices are increasing student achievement. Discipline data is monitored monthly by the PBIS team to ensure students are actively engaged reducing office referrals and suspensions. Based on data, revisions will be made to both the instructional plan and discipline by the leadership team and the PBIS team. The revisions will be presented to staff and the SAC.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	58%
Charter School	No

RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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)	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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	8	7	9	13	10	7	0	0	0	54	
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	1	5	2	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in Math	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	3	5	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	3	4	0	0	0	11	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	6	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	16	

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	1	1	0	1	5	6	0	0	0	14

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	10	12	8	9	9	7	0	0	0	55	
One or more suspensions	2	2	2	1	2	6	0	0	0	15	
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	0	2	2	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	9	0	0	0	15	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	11	16	0	0	2	0	0	0	38	

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	2	1	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	10	12	8	9	9	7	0	0	0	55	
One or more suspensions	2	2	2	1	2	6	0	0	0	15	
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	0	2	2	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	9	0	0	0	15	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	11	16	0	0	2	0	0	0	38	

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	2	1	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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*	78	45	53	86	47	56	85		
ELA Learning Gains				76			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			62		
Math Achievement*	82	49	59	83	42	50	76		
Math Learning Gains				84			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			38		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	82	41	54	89	49	59	84		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	319
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	555
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	65			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	55			
HSP	82			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	92			
FRL	58			

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				
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	94			
BLK	67			
HSP	85			
MUL	93			
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	65			

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	78			82			82					
SWD	60			70							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	87			93							2	
BLK	57			63			50				4	
HSP	80			86			85				4	
MUL	86			86							2	
PAC												
WHT	88			88			95				4	
FRL	58			64			54				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	86	76	64	83	84	73	89					
SWD												
ELL	70			60								
AMI												
ASN	95	93		100	86							
BLK	68	58	46	71	80	71	78					
HSP	92	75		81	90							
MUL	100	91		100	82							
PAC												
WHT	92	81	82	86	85	73	95					
FRL	69	63	40	67	78	70	67					

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	85	55	62	76	57	38	84					
SWD	62			38								
ELL	67			58								

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	100			100								
BLK	63	33		47	31		56					
HSP	86	54		77	42		69					
MUL	94			81								
PAC												
WHT	92	63		87	65		96					
FRL	61	30		46	30		60					

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	83%	43%	40%	54%	29%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	53%	31%	58%	26%
03	2023 - Spring	77%	42%	35%	50%	27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	87%	51%	36%	59%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	92%	56%	36%	61%	31%
05	2023 - Spring	76%	44%	32%	55%	21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	82%	39%	43%	51%	31%

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.

Based on 2022-2023 school year FAST data, ELA scores were the lowest. From PM1 to PM 3, proficiency increased in 3rd grade 30% to 77%, 4th grade 22% to 84%, and 5th grade 25% to 84%. As a school, proficiency for PM3 was 81.29%. One contributing factor was an unfamiliarity with the structure of the FAST. An additional contributing factor was the need to adjust to the new BEST Standards.

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

Science showed the greatest decline from 89% to 82%. A contributing factor was a decline in performance in the nature of science strand. The nature of science strand was Lincoln's lowest scoring strand at 70%.

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.

As a school, Lincoln performed above the state average in all grade levels and subject areas. Lincoln continues to outperform the state.

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

Greatest improvement was evident in math scores. From progress monitoring 1 to 3, third grade math proficiency scores increased from 20% to 87% demonstrating a growth of 67%. As a school, Lincoln focused on redesigning math lessons, homework, and tasks to ensure alignment to the BEST benchmarks.

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

Based on the EWS, one area of concern is the number of students with attendance below 90%.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement are ELA, Science, and Math. ELA and Science we will focus on proficiency and math a priority is learning gains.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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 state of Florida made a shift in 2021-2022 to the BEST standards for primary grades. Starting in 2022-2023, students statewide were assessed based on the BEST standards. It is imperative that educators understand each of the standards and the progression of the benchmarks. Standards-based instruction will ensure that students will receive an equivalent experience. The BEST standards encourage a broader view of literacy that promotes knowledge-building across varied domains and subjects, making the integration of content and collaboration among teachers much easier to achieve.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Lincoln Avenue Academy will increase overall proficiency by a minimum of 5% in ELA and Math. Lincoln will increase science proficiency by 7%.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring tools, classroom observations, and learning artifacts will be used to monitor for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Antionette Kirby (antionette.kirby@polk-fl.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.)

Strategy 1: Collaborative Planning with a infusion of IB trainings

Strategy 2: Implementation of the Standards Based Instruction Tool for Monitoring

Strategy 3: Learning Arc Implementation

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategy 1: Positive effects will improve their quality as professionals and as Hattie (2003) suggests, teacher quality alone accounts for 30% of the variance in student performance. The communities that will be formed by working collaboratively will enhance teacher effectiveness and expertise (Hattie, 2015).

Strategy 2: The implementation of the Standards Based Instruction Tool will ensure that student work provides students with an equivalent experience of what is expected on standardized assessment. Additionally, it will ensure the work provided to students is on grade level.

Strategy 3: Implementing the Learning Arc will ensure that teachers understand the full extent of the standards so that they can better instruct 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.

Develop a timeline for weekly PLCs as well as staff development opportunities throughout the year based on current data to ensure data driven instruction based on the BEST standards. Ensure learning arc is implemented during collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Marti Blackwell (marti.blackwell@polk-fl.net)

By When: Following the first PM assessment.

Implement TIBS (Transdisciplinary International Baccalaureate Studies) during collaborative planning and collect evidence of student samples to show evidence of strategy implementation.

Person Responsible: Diana Lokey (diana.lokey@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

Engage in daily walkthroughs utilizing the district created Standards Based Instruction Tool. Meet with leadership team to plan based on data from the tool. Share out data with staff.

Person Responsible: Antionette Kirby (antionette.kirby@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

#2. 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.

Creating a positive culture with authentic student engagement is a critical element for a successful school environment. The data showed a historic trend of increasing office behavior incidents, therefore a present need is to reduce the number of office interventions and discipline incidents and increase the amount of positive behavior reinforcement. If the majority of students are authentically engaged and a positive school culture is pervasive throughout campus then negative behavior will be reduced helping us to achieve our objective for the 2023- 2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, the amount of student discipline incident referrals will be reduced by fifteen percent as compared to last year's number of discipline incidents.

Monitoring:

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

The Student Discipline Report will be analyzed monthly as a leadership team and the data will be shared with teachers. At monthly MTSS meetings with grade level teams will gather supporting data of students not responding to Tier I practices, to develop a focused small group-oriented response to situations where problem behavior is likely. Additionally, a student not responding to Tier 2 behavior supports is referred to Lincoln's school-based PBIS Leadership Team for individualized Tier 3 behavior support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Sumner (joshua.sumner@polk-fl.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.)

Increased student engagement will be implemented to achieve our desired outcome. A multi-disciplinary approach will be utilized to ensure students are active participants in their education. Additionally, a positive behavior intervention support system will be implemented with fidelity to ensure our area of focus is ascertained. Research shows increased level of student engagement and motivation will positively impact overall school culture and climate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research based evidence was used when selecting the strategy of increased student engagement within a positive school environment. According to Bradshaw's "Implementation of School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports in Elementary Schools," research shows the benefits of how adhering to a PBIS framework relates to increasing student engagement. When our students are engaged and positive behavior is celebrated, our desired outcomes will be achieved.

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.

Monthly MTSS meetings with academic and behavior analysis.

Person Responsible: Ann Spickard (ann.spickard@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

Monthly discipline data analysis with all staff.

Person Responsible: Joshua Sumner (joshua.sumner@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

Weekly behavior reflection at grade level PLC. Teachers will analyze behavior data using the district created communication tool as a behavior tracking system.

Person Responsible: Marti Blackwell (marti.blackwell@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

Monthly PBIS celebrations to reinforce desired behaviors and positively impact school culture.

Person Responsible: Joshua Sumner (joshua.sumner@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

Weekly classroom observations walkthroughs as a leadership team to monitor student engagement.

Person Responsible: Antionette Kirby (antionette.kirby@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

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).

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**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA****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**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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

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.

NA

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))

NA

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)

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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).

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No