

Manatee County Public Schools

Lincoln Memorial Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Lincoln Memorial Middle School

305 17TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

<https://www.manateeschools.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.

Our mission is to cultivate caring, responsible scholars who will strive to reach their highest potential in pursuit of academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We envision students who are empowered through academic excellence and collaboration within an engaging, student-centered learning environment. With mutual trust and involvement among all school stakeholders, we will encourage career exploration with a diverse selection of enrichment opportunities.

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
King, Ronnie	Principal	Oversite of all school functions
Brown, Minetha	Assistant Principal	

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.

Each member of the Instructional Leadership Team is responsible for a goal. They work with their department to set a goal. After they set the goal, they return to meet together as an ILT team to tweak the goals so they are aligned with the overall goal of the school as envisioned by administration. These goals will then be shared at the SAC meeting for approval.

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 will be monitored monthly by the ILT team and using progress monitoring data from PM1 and PM2 and other progress monitoring assessments.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	91%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	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)* 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: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	70	134
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	29	40
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	65	74	180
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	37	59	130
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	65	74	180
	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	11	29	40

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	44	50	52	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	65	61	160
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	8	21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	54	74	176
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	56	59	152
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	54	74	176

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	37	57	66	160

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	44	50	52	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	65	61	160
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	8	21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	54	74	176
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	56	59	152
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	54	74	176

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	37	57	66	160

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*	27	47	49	28	49	50			
ELA Learning Gains				37					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39					
Math Achievement*	43	61	56	37	35	36			
Math Learning Gains				42					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54					

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	23	48	49	25	57	53			
Social Studies Achievement*	38	70	68	62	54	58			
Middle School Acceleration	74	81	73	74	47	49			
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	59	34	40	56	79	76			

* 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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	264
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	26	Yes	2	2
ELL	30	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	42			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	40	Yes	1	
FRL	43			

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	24	Yes	1	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	48			
MUL	31	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	42			
FRL	46			

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	27			43			23	38	74			59
SWD	16			24			11	28			5	50
ELL	14			31			21	27			5	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			39			18	37	83		5	
HSP	24			42			22	33	72		6	60
MUL	50			64							2	
PAC												
WHT	34			45							2	
FRL	26			42			21	36	72		6	61

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	28	37	39	37	42	54	25	62	74			56
SWD	5	33	34	15	35	48	0	21				
ELL	19	28	24	39	44	39	20	65				56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	35	40	33	41	56	20	56	74			
HSP	35	38	33	42	44	52	31	73	79			56
MUL	23	15		38	46							
PAC												
WHT	42	56		33	35							
FRL	27	36	35	35	44	55	26	61	74			69

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												
SWD												
ELL												

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												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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
07	2023 - Spring	21%	43%	-22%	47%	-26%
08	2023 - Spring	23%	45%	-22%	47%	-24%
06	2023 - Spring	27%	45%	-18%	47%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	43%	59%	-16%	54%	-11%
07	2023 - Spring	38%	58%	-20%	48%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	42%	41%	1%	55%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	21%	45%	-24%	44%	-23%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	58%	18%	50%	26%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	56%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	69%	-31%	66%	-28%

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.

Schoolwide ELA performance showed a 27% proficiency. The FAST assessment is new to all and more information on how to use the assessment data to design instruction is necessary. Many of our teachers are working with the instructional coaches to ensure that instructional paces is aligned with the assessment schedule. Some of the issues that Lincoln face are having and sustaining an ELA instructional team was not fully developed. This has been a difficult task for years. In addition to staffing concerns there has been loss of instructional time due to weather, attendance and discipline issues, large class sizes, limited resources for students with limited English proficiency and staff concerns due to attendance.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year was in Civics. The data shows a 27% decline. The percentage of students scoring level 3 or above declined from 62% to 35%. The greatest factor contributing to this decline is pacing of instruction. There is one teacher who teaches Civics. The teacher is working with the instructional coach to ensure that pacing is up to par with the pacing guide. Ensuring that the students have been exposed to the standards that will be assessed is the current priority. Last year, the teacher had difficulty keeping pace and there were many standards that were not covered. Other factors that contributed to low scores were changing/clarifying the standards (without proper training on reading and understanding them) and the larger class sizes. Lincoln averages 28 students/teacher. This may appear normal for some institutions but due to the large reading deficit many of the students face, the larger class sizes make it difficult for the teacher to differentiate and provide individual guidance when necessary. This, along with the discipline issues, increase the difficulty of managing the classroom.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap when compared to the state average in Civics. The data shows a 27% decline. The percentage of students scoring level 3 or above declined from 62% to 35%. The greatest factor contributing to this decline is pacing of instruction. Other factors contributed to changing/clarifying the standards and class size.

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

The data component showing the most improvement is Math. There was an increase of 11 percentage points: (from 37 to 48%). The new actions taken by Lincoln was to increase the number of Math teachers with content expertise. New teachers were hired providing the opportunity to reduce the class size. Teachers plan weekly with the Math coach and she is available to support them with planning and instructional delivery. The focused collaborative planning with the Math coach weekly assists with teachers designing and delivering quality instruction.

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

Two potential areas of concern are student attendance and out of school suspensions. The average daily attendance for 2022-23 was 88%, with 43% of the students being chronically absent. There were 364 days of out of school suspensions during the 2022-23 school year. Although out of school suspensions are necessary to maintain campus safety and to maintain a proper learning environment, they decrease the amount of learning time. The loss of instructional time due to student absences and disciplinary absences is detrimental to academic achievement.

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

ELA performance of all students (particularly students with disabilities and ELL students).

Math performance of all students.

Loss of instructional time due to student absences and discipline consequences.

Positive school culture

Academic performance of students with disabilities and ELL students.

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.

Across all grade levels the Reading proficiency was 27%. When students have a significant deficit in Reading, there will be deficits in almost all other areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of May, 35% of all students will score at level 3 or above on the FAST Reading PM 3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be monitored at the classroom, grade level and school wide level. Teachers will review student performance and differentiate instruction based on need. Tier 2 interventions will be used to support core instruction. The data teams will review PM 1 and PM 2 data, along with core assessments and intervention data to continuously determine what level of support is necessary, and make adjustments as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.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.)

Differentiation of instruction in core classes using curriculum aligned with BEST standards, LEXIA Reading intervention program, Writing across the curriculum, cross-curricular use of Reading strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiation of instruction is necessary to ensure that the instructional strategy aligns with the student need. If the data shows that the student has not mastered the standard, reteaching is necessary. Reteaching may involve other methods than those that were previously used. LEXIA is a researched based program that provides standards based lessons to support core instruction. Writing across the curriculum will support the literacy standards across all content areas. Cross-curricular use of Reading strategies will strengthen the knowledge base of each student by repetitive use of strategies while deepening the understanding of the content.

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.

Collaborative planning with Reading coach between ELA and Reading teams
Quarterly assessments for progress monitoring

Data chats between teachers and students and teachers and coach
ESE para for instructional support
Weekly meetings with District instructional specialist

Person Responsible: Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

#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.

Although Math was a significant area of growth, there is a crucial need for continued focus in this area. Developing a deep understanding of Mathematical concepts and problem solving will assist students in increasing critical thinking skills. Math use is a daily part of living.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of May 2024, 54% of all students will score at level 3 or above on the FAST Math assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through PM 1 and PM 2 data, ALEKS (8th grade students through critical thinking course), Dreambox and Acaletics data (Foundational Math courses- students scoring level 1 and 2 on state assessments). Teachers will also use quarterly and unit assessments to monitor student performance. Students in grades 6-8 Math courses will receive additional support through the use of the IXL program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ronnie King (kingr@manateeschools.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.)

ALEKS (8th grade students through critical thinking course), Dreambox and Acaletics data (Foundational Math courses- students scoring level 1 and 2 on state assessments). Teachers will also use quarterly and unit assessments to monitor student performance. Students in grades 6-8 Math courses will receive additional support through the use of the IXL program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All programs being used are research based programs that have proven success with students needing the additional Math support. Students require the opportunity for continuous skill review. This allows for students to use repetition to maintain a high level of Math fluency.

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.

Collaborative planning with the Math coach

Data chats between coach and Math team and teachers and students

Weekly support and planning with district Math instructional specialist

Person Responsible: Ronnie King (kingr@manateeschools.net)

By When: May 2024

#3. 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.

In 2022, the Civics percentage of proficiency was 62%. In 2023, the proficiency level decreased to 38%. By monitoring the pacing of instruction, the attendance of students and the teacher and by providing support through resources, the scores can increase.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of May, 60% of all students will score at level 3 or above on the Civics PM 3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Observations to monitor pacing of instruction.
PM 1 and PM 2 assessments along with the unit assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.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.)

Weekly planning and support meetings with the district instructional specialist. Ensuring there is proper alignment of the standards between the instructional clarifications and instructional delivery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In conversation with the teacher and instructional specialist, and through a review of the data, the pacing has been the greatest factor that contributed to the decrease. If the focus is placed on maintaining the instructional pacing, this will foster an increase in performance.

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.

Weekly meetings with district instructional specialist
Weekly planning with district instructional specialist

Person Responsible: Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.net)

By When: May 2024

#4. 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 scores were significantly low and historically have been low.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024 the proficiency level of students on the grade 8 Science assessment will increase to 35%.

Monitoring:

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

Science is a core area of learning. Science connects with many other subjects and supports problem solving as well as inductive and deductive reasoning skills that are useful daily.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ronnie King (kingr@manateeschools.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.)

Incorporation of WozEd activity based learning and weekly planning meetings with district Science instructional specialist.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increasing hands-on learning is a research based approach to increase depth of knowledge.

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.

Planning of instruction using WozEd materials
Data chats using PM 1 and PM 2 assessments
Weekly meetings/planning with district Science instructional specialist

Person Responsible: Ronnie King (kingr@manateeschools.net)

By When: May 2024

#5. 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.

Intervention will have a positive effect on all systems. If we are able to create a welcoming environment for all stakeholders, increase morale, decrease discipline referrals and increase student motivation, this will have a positive impact on the overall student.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, decrease discipline referrals by 10% from the 2022-23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

ILT will monitor the number of referrals, MTSS will monitor the fidelity of interventions and intervention data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.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.)

Check in/check out
Small group instruction
Mentors
CHAMPS schoolwide implementation
Schoolwide PBIS

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Each of the strategies above are research based intervention. Data has shown the impact on students of similar demographic to those that attend Lincoln.

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.

Data chats with discipline team
Focus meetings with teachers
CHAMPS training and fidelity checks
PBIS positive quarterly celebrations

Person Responsible: Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.net)

By When: May 2024

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)).

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be shared through SAC and PTO as well as each parent meeting that is held on campus to review the Title I requirements. In addition to this, a copy will be posted on the website (<https://www.manateeschools.net/lincoln>), as well as a hard copy will be available for review in the front office.

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))

The school has an open house, a conference night, a quarterly family/community event and multiple volunteer opportunities planned throughout the year to promote and build positive relationships with all stakeholders. The school will welcome families to participate in the PTO and SAC organizations and invite them to share their voice through whatever method is convenient (meeting, phone call, email or written notice). The school promotes the use of the FOCUS portal system and encourages positive weekly phone calls from teachers to families.

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)

The school will collaborative planning to allow time for teachers to plan effective and engaging lessons with coaching staff (Math and Reading). The school will use a coaching model that supports immediate feedback on lesson delivery and will continuously focus on assessing student data to continue to align instruction. The staff will use strategies to differentiation instruction based on student need.

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))

As application, organizational members are invited to SAC and PTO to provide input and to align resources for student and family use.

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))

The school has an onsite guidance counselor and the social worker is allocated 4 days/week. There is a psychologist and a guidance counselor intern that is also on site. These individuals make up the social service team and they ensure that service are provided to students and work with teachers to share strategies to foster students' skills outside of the academic subject areas. In addition, the annual mental health training is provided.

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))

The guidance counselor works with the Civics teacher to share post secondary opportunities and career development opportunities with the students.

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).

The school uses CHAMPS and PBIS strategies at the core level for all students. Once students are identified as needing additional support, the MTSS team develops an intervention strategy. After data is reviewed, if the student is having a negative response, they are referred to IST. This team develops an intensive support plan for the student.

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))

CHAMPS training is provided for all staff. Instructional staff have collaborative planning and work closely with the academic coaches and the district specialists to plan effective lessons.

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))

The school does not assist preschool children in transition.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
5	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