

02/01/2021

Dear Parents and Community Members:

We are pleased to present you with the Annual Education Report (AER) which provides key information on the 2019-2020 educational progress for the Lincoln-King Academy. The AER addresses the complex reporting information required by federal and state laws. The school's report contains information about student assessment, accountability, and teacher quality. If you have any questions about the AER, please contact Mr. Price OR Ms. Aferi at LKA for assistance.

The AER is available for you to review electronically by visiting the following web site https://bit.ly/37kDvzk and https://bit.ly/3s09cWI (Adams Young) or you may review a copy in the main office at your child's school.

LKA School:

For the 2019-2020 school year, schools were identified using definitions and labels as required in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). A Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) school is one that has at least one underperforming student subgroup. An Additional Targeted Support (ATS) school is one that has a student subgroup performing at the same level as the lowest 5% of all schools in the state. A Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) school is one whose performance is in the lowest 5% of all schools in the state or has a graduation rate at or below 67%. Some schools are not identified with any of these labels. In these cases, no label is given.

Our school was identified as a "HAS NOT BEEN GIVEN ONE OF THESE LABELS".

Lincoln-King Academy continuous school improvement plan focuses on strategies to improve academic performance as identified by the ongoing review of data. However, internally, Lincoln-King Academy has identified key challenges for the school as Informational Text in the area of English Language Arts and Measurement in the area of Mathematics. The key initiatives being taken at Lincoln-King Academy to accelerate student achievement in these areas and close persistent gaps in achievement are to provide additional instruction on Informational Text concepts, such as main ideas and details and citing evidence in text, and Measurement concepts, such as elapsed time and geometry.

Our goals are tied to both core and organizational areas assessed on the State assessments and other local standardized tests. All staff work in vertical and horizontal content/grade level teams on the school plans. The building leadership team then used content/grade level plans to design a building-wide plan. The plan included strategies and activities to improve deficit areas in math, expository text structures and student writing skills across content areas. We continue our staff development focus within Professional Learning Communities, which directly affects student achievement as a building. The primary work of our PLCs is to disaggregate data within the district and tailored strategies and activities to specific classroom and grade level practices. In addition, grade level interventions for at-risk students are continually designed to meet all of the students' specific needs through our MTSS program. Teachers also participated in collaborative studies focused on targeted instruction or collaboration projects across the district to improve instruction through use of our content leaders. These initiatives were connected to the goals of the school improvement plan.

- 1. Process of Assigning Pupils: Lincoln-King Academy is a state-funded, public school academy. Therefore, there is no cost to attend the Academy. The school is open to any child wishing to attend. Students must be age-appropriate for their respective grade, and they must reside in the state of Michigan. By law, the school cannot restrict enrollment based on selection criteria. The school can, however, limit the total number of students who may attend the school. If the number of applications exceeds the number of offered seats, a random selection process will determine who attends the school.
- 2. <u>Status of School Improvement Plan:</u> Over the past two years we are proud of the many successes that we have had at Lincoln-King Academy. Our student population continued to grow and expand through the open enrollment/lottery procedure. Our School Improvement Plan (SIP) has been accepted by the State of Michigan as a good model for improvement. Via our data-driven SIP we will address our challenges in student achievement/gaps and overall customer satisfaction.
- 3. <u>Description of our school:</u> Our school is "Charting a Better Course for Detroit's Youth" through excellence in education for K 8th grade and preparing them for the next steps in their educational journey. Our program is designed to develop the whole child. We see our students as customers who are entitled to the best in education. We facilitate student success through a standards-based curriculum, rigorous academics, and diverse after-school activities that are designed around students in a safe and nurturing environment. We engage students with blended learning, combining classroom study with the latest educational technology and utilizing digital learning tools such as Compass Learning. Our students advance at their own speed and own their learning process through self-directed lessons.

- 4. <u>Curriculum:</u> Lincoln-King Academy's rigorous instructional program is aligned with Michigan's Common Core State Standards and is established for K-12 in English Language Arts and Literacy in History, Social Studies, and Mathematics. The curriculum can be accessed via internet at http://www.cornerstoneschools.org/resources/ Lincoln-King Academy uses the Curriculum Trak as a tool for its entire curriculum mapping & aligning and a copy of curriculum is available in the main office.
- 5. NWEA- MAP and i-Ready Scores: One-hundred percent of our instructional staff are highly qualified and certified in their area of specialty. Our student's NWEA MAP Scores are as follows: In 2016-17, students at Lincoln-King Academy, who tested in both the fall and spring testing terms on the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) assessment, grew an average of 41% based on projected growth targets according to NWEA 2016 Normative data.
- **In 2017-18,** students at Lincoln-King Academy, who tested in both the fall and spring testing terms on the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) assessment, grew an average of **71%** based on projected growth targets according to NWEA 2017 Normative data.
- **In 2018-19,** students at Lincoln-King Academy, who tested in both the fall and spring testing terms on the i-Ready diagnostic assessment, grew an average of 55% in Reading and 63% in Maths based on projected growth targets.
- In 2019-2020, students at Adams-Young & Lincoln-King Academy (School), who tested in both the <u>fall and</u> <u>winter</u> testing terms on the i-Ready diagnostic assessment, grew an average of <u>16%</u> in Reading and <u>16%</u> in Math based on projected growth targets
- 6. <u>Parent-Teacher Conferences:</u> We have an active and engaged Parent Teacher Organization and a very good turnout for the Parent-Teacher Conferences.

Parent Teacher Conference Attendance							
	Percentage attended						
Conference	nce 2018-19 2019-20						
Fall	90	89					
Winter	89	80					
Average	90	88					

Lincoln-King Academy District continues to be an excellent educational experience for students in Sixth through Tenth Grade. Our goal is to develop confident, compassionate, intellectually curious young people who are well prepared to excel throughout their high school years to live a fulfilling life. Through a menu of

challenging academics, Lincoln-King Academy provides opportunities for students to grow and stretch in new directions. We have a strong parent community who are involved with multiple aspects of our school. Our dedicated staff is well trained and committed to professional learning and best practices. Together staff, parents and external partners support the school journey of growth. Our staff is committed to developing the whole child by building character and ensuring the progression of intellectual, social, emotional and physical growth.

Excitement and enthusiasm are two words that describe our school students. Kindergarten through middle school is a unique time in children's lives when they carefully explore their purpose in life, new activities, interests and ideas. The planned curriculum, with emphasis on career and college skills, is designed to prepare students for the expectations of tomorrow.

We look forward to another rewarding and successful school year!

Sincerely,

P. Price Ms. Aferi

Mr. Phillip Price, Principal (6-12)

Ms. Mallory Aferi (K-5)



Annual Education Report Lincoln-King Academy (00133)

High School Graduation: Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Rate

dent Group Baseline Data Most Recent Results	Interim Objective	Interim Objective	Long-Term Target
--	-------------------	-------------------	------------------



Annual Education Report Lincoln-King Academy (00133)

Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D.
Lincoln-King Academy (00133)	7	16	4	0

Professional Qualifications are defined by the State and may include information such as the degrees of public school teachers (e.g., percentage of teachers with Bachelors Degrees or Masters Degrees) or the percentage of fully certified teachers

Inexperienced Teachers

	Total Number of Staffing Group		Percent Inexperience d			Count Low- Poverty Schools	Percent Low- Poverty Schools
Lincoln-King Academy (00133)	27.00	1.00	3.7%	1.00	3.7%	N/A	N/A

Inexperienced Principals and Other School Leaders

	Total Number of Staffing Group			9	<i>J</i>	Count Low- Poverty Schools	Percent Low- Poverty Schools
Lincoln-King Academy (00133)	2.94	1.00	34.0%	1.00	34.0%	N/A	N/A

Teacher Emergency or Provisional Credentials

			Emergency or	9	9	Poverty	Percent Low- Poverty Schools
Lincoln-King Academy (00133)	27.00	0.00	0.0%	0.00	0.0%	N/A	N/A

Out-of-Field Teachers

	Total Number of Teachers	Number of Out-of-Field Teachers		Poverty	9	Count Low- Poverty Schools	Percent Low- Poverty Schools
Lincoln-King Academy (00133)	27.00	2.00	7.4%	2.00	7.4%	N/A	N/A



Annual Education Report Lincoln-King Academy (00133)

NAEP Grade 4 Math

	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	24	41	29	7
Male Female	51 49	22 25	40 42	30 28	8 5
National Lunch Program Eligibility Eligible Not Eligible Info not available	51 49 ‡	36 12 ‡	44 37 ‡	18 40 ‡	2 11 ‡
Race/Ethnicity White Black or African American Hispanic Asian American Indian or Alaska Native Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Two or More Races	65 17 9 3 ‡ ‡ 5	15 51 34 9 ‡ ‡ 29	41 39 45 32 ‡ ‡ 42	36 9 17 37 ‡ ‡ 22	8 1 4 222 ‡ ‡ 7
Student classified as having a disability SD Not SD	11 89	60 19	29 42	10 31	1 7
Student is an English Language Learner ELL Not ELL	10 90	37 22	46 40	14 31	2 7

[‡] Reporting Standards not met. Note: Observed differences are not necessarily statistically significant. Detail may not sum to total because of rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education. Institute for Education Sciences. National Center for Education Statistics. National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) 2019 Mathematics Achievement.



Annual Education Report Lincoln-King Academy (00133)

NAEP Grade 8 Math

	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	32	68	31	9	
Male Female	51 49	33 31	67 69	31 31	10 7
National Lunch Program Eligibility Eligible Not Eligible Info not available	4 55 ‡	48 19 ‡	52 81 ‡	16 43 ‡	3 13 ‡
Race/Ethnicity White Black or African American Hispanic Asian American Indian or Alaska Native Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Two or More Races	70 15 8 3 ‡ ‡	25 64 41 14 ‡ ‡ 39	75 36 59 86 ‡ ‡ 61	37 9 16 52 ‡ ‡ 24	11 1 2 21 ‡ ‡
Student classified as having a disability SD Not SD	10 90	75 27	25 73	5 34	0 9
Student is an English Language Learner ELL Not ELL	6 94	60 30	40 70	8 32	1 9

[‡] Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Observed differences are not necessarily statistically significant. Detail may not sum to total because of rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education. Institute for Education Sciences. National Center for Education Statistics. National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) 2019 Mathematics Achievement.



Annual Education Report Lincoln-King Academy (00133)

NAEP Grade 4 Reading

	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	36	64	32	7
Male Female	51 49	40 32	60 68	28 36	6 9
National Lunch Program Eligibility Eligible Not Eligible Info not available	53 47 ‡	49 21 ‡	51 79 ‡	20 45 ‡	3 13 ‡
Race/Ethnicity White Black or African American Hispanic Asian American Indian or Alaska Native Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Two or More Races	65 18 9 3 ‡ ‡ 5	29 58 50 18 ‡ ‡	71 42 50 82 ‡ ‡ 67	37 15 18 44 ‡ ‡ 35	9 2 2 15 ‡ \$
Student classified as having a disability SD Not SD	10 90	74 31	26 69	10 34	1 8
Student is an English Language Learner ELL Not ELL	11 89	57 33	43 67	14 34	3 8

[#] Rounds to zero

[‡] Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Observed differences are not necessarily statistically significant. Detail may not sum to total because of rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2019 Reading Assessment.



Annual Education Report Lincoln-King Academy (00133)

NAEP Grade 8 Reading

	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	27	73	31	3
Male Female	51 49	32 21	68 79	26 37	2 3
National Lunch Program Eligibility Eligible Not Eligible Info not available	47 52 ‡	39 15 ‡	61 85 ‡	19 43 ‡	1 4 ‡
Race/Ethnicity White Black or Afican American Hispanic Asian/Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander American Indian or Alaska Native Two or More Races	70 15 8 3 ‡ ‡	22 48 36 14 ‡ ‡	78 52 64 86 ‡ ‡ 77	35 12 22 56 ‡ ‡ 40	3 0 1 6 ‡ ‡ 5
Student classified as having a disability SD Not SD	11 89	71 21	29 79	5 35	0 3
Student is an English Language Learner ELL Not ELL	6 94	57 25	43 75	6 33	0 3

[#] Rounds to zero

[‡] Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Observed differences are not necessarily statistically significant. Detail may not sum to total because of rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2019 Reading Assessment.



Annual Education Report Lincoln-King Academy (00133)

NAEP Participation Data

Grade		Participation Rate for Students with Disabilities		Participation Rate for Limited English Proficient Students	
4	Math	86.9	2.25	97	0.97
	Reading	85.4	2.57	98	1.04
8	Math	81.9	2.48	95	1.79
	Reading	83.3	2.41	91	3.97

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is periodically administered by the U.S. Department of Education based on assessments administered to samples of students in each state. Federal regulations require the display of state level NAEP data on the Annual Education Report. These data represent the performance of the most recent sample of Michigan students on the NAEP.



Annual Education Report Lincoln-King Academy (00133)

Sec. 1003 School Improvement Fund

District Name	School Name	Type of School		Strategies Implemented
---------------	-------------	----------------	--	---------------------------



Annual Education Report Adams-Young Building (03724)

High School Graduation: Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Rate

dent Group Baseline Data Most Recent Results	Interim Objective	Interim Objective	Long-Term Target
--	-------------------	-------------------	------------------



Annual Education Report Adams-Young Building (03724)

Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers

Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D.
-------	------	------	-------

No Data to Display

Professional Qualifications are defined by the State and may include information such as the degrees of public school teachers (e.g., percentage of teachers with Bachelors Degrees or Masters Degrees) or the percentage of fully certified teachers

Inexperienced Teachers

Total Number of Staffing Inexperience Group d		J	Percent High- Poverty Schools	Count Low- Poverty Schools	Percent Low- Poverty Schools
---	--	---	-------------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------------

No Data to Display

Inexperienced Principals and Other School Leaders

	Total Number	Number	Percent	Count High-	Percent High-	Count Low-	Percent Low-
	of Staffing	Inexperience	Inexperience	Poverty	Poverty	Poverty	Poverty
	Group	d	d	Schools	Schools	Schools	Schools

No Data to Display

Teacher Emergency or Provisional Credentials

of Teachers		Emergency or Provisional	Poverty	<i>J</i>	Poverty	Percent Low- Poverty Schools
	Credentials	Credentials				

No Data to Display

Out-of-Field Teachers

	Total Number of Teachers	Number of Out-of-Field Teachers		Count High- Poverty Schools	J	Count Low- Poverty Schools	Percent Low- Poverty Schools
--	--------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	------------------------------------



Annual Education Report Adams-Young Building (03724)

NAEP Grade 4 Math

	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	24	41	29	7
Male Female	51 49	22 25	40 42	30 28	8 5
National Lunch Program Eligibility Eligible Not Eligible Info not available	51 49 ‡	36 12 ‡	44 37 ‡	18 40 ‡	2 11 ‡
Race/Ethnicity White Black or African American Hispanic Asian American Indian or Alaska Native Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Two or More Races	65 17 9 3 ‡ ‡	15 51 34 9 ‡ ‡ 29	41 39 45 32 ‡ ‡ 42	36 9 17 37 ‡ ‡ 22	8 1 4 222 ‡ ‡ 7
Student classified as having a disability SD Not SD	11 89	60 19	29 42	10 31	1 7
Student is an English Language Learner ELL Not ELL	10 90	37 22	46 40	14 31	2 7

[‡] Reporting Standards not met. Note: Observed differences are not necessarily statistically significant. Detail may not sum to total because of rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education. Institute for Education Sciences. National Center for Education Statistics. National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) 2019 Mathematics Achievement.



Annual Education Report Adams-Young Building (03724)

NAEP Grade 8 Math

	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	32	68	31	9	
Male Female	51 49	33 31	67 69	31 31	10 7
National Lunch Program Eligibility Eligible Not Eligible Info not available	4 55 ‡	48 19 ‡	52 81 ‡	16 43 ‡	3 13 ‡
Race/Ethnicity White Black or African American Hispanic Asian American Indian or Alaska Native Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Two or More Races	70 15 8 3 ‡ ‡	25 64 41 14 ‡ ‡ 39	75 36 59 86 ‡ ‡ 61	37 9 16 52 ‡ ‡ 24	11 1 2 21 ‡ ‡
Student classified as having a disability SD Not SD	10 90	75 27	25 73	5 34	0 9
Student is an English Language Learner ELL Not ELL	6 94	60 30	40 70	8 32	1 9

[‡] Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Observed differences are not necessarily statistically significant. Detail may not sum to total because of rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education. Institute for Education Sciences. National Center for Education Statistics. National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) 2019 Mathematics Achievement.



Annual Education Report Adams-Young Building (03724)

NAEP Grade 4 Reading

	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	36	64	32	7
Male Female	51 49	40 32	60 68	28 36	6 9
National Lunch Program Eligibility Eligible Not Eligible Info not available	53 47 ‡	49 21 ‡	51 79 ‡	20 45 ‡	3 13 ‡
Race/Ethnicity White Black or African American Hispanic Asian American Indian or Alaska Native Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Two or More Races	65 18 9 3 ‡ ‡ 5	29 58 50 18 ‡ ‡	71 42 50 82 ‡ ‡ 67	37 15 18 44 ‡ ‡ 35	9 2 2 15 ‡
Student classified as having a disability SD Not SD	10 90	74 31	26 69	10 34	1 8
Student is an English Language Learner ELL Not ELL	11 89	57 33	43 67	14 34	3 8

[#] Rounds to zero

[‡] Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Observed differences are not necessarily statistically significant. Detail may not sum to total because of rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2019 Reading Assessment.



Annual Education Report Adams-Young Building (03724)

NAEP Grade 8 Reading

	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	27	73	31	3
Male Female	51 49	32 21	68 79	26 37	2 3
National Lunch Program Eligibility Eligible Not Eligible Info not available	47 52 ‡	39 15 ‡	61 85 ‡	19 43 ‡	1 4 ‡
Race/Ethnicity White Black or Afican American Hispanic Asian/Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander American Indian or Alaska Native Two or More Races	70 15 8 3 ‡ ‡	22 48 36 14 ‡ ‡	78 52 64 86 ‡ ‡ 77	35 12 22 56 ‡ ‡ 40	3 0 1 6 ‡ ‡ 5
Student classified as having a disability SD Not SD	11 89	71 21	29 79	5 35	0 3
Student is an English Language Learner ELL Not ELL	6 94	57 25	43 75	6 33	0 3

[#] Rounds to zero

[‡] Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Observed differences are not necessarily statistically significant. Detail may not sum to total because of rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2019 Reading Assessment.



Annual Education Report Adams-Young Building (03724)

NAEP Participation Data

Grade	Subject	Participation Rate for Students with Disabilities	Standard Error	Participation Rate for Limited English Proficient Students	
4	Math	86.9	2.25	97	0.97
	Reading	85.4	2.57	98	1.04
8	Math	81.9	2.48	95	1.79
	Reading	83.3	2.41	91	3.97

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is periodically administered by the U.S. Department of Education based on assessments administered to samples of students in each state. Federal regulations require the display of state level NAEP data on the Annual Education Report. These data represent the performance of the most recent sample of Michigan students on the NAEP.



Annual Education Report Adams-Young Building (03724)

Sec. 1003 School Improvement Fund

District Name	School Name	Type of School		Strategies Implemented
---------------	-------------	----------------	--	---------------------------