

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Leto High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	19

Leto High School

4409 W SLIGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Larissa Mccoy

Start Date for this Principal: 6/25/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (42%) 2014-15: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	19

Leto High School

4409 W SLIGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	83%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Leto High School will be a productive, well-respected academic institution where competent, caring staff support and encourage all students, where students are engaged in rigorous, relevant work grounded in core content and literacy standards, and where preparation for life is the ultimate goal of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The students and staff at A.P. Leto Comprehensive High School will strive to build a community for successful teaching and learning, that is student-centered, that cultivates caring, confident, respectful citizens, and life-long learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McCoy-Mitti, Larissa	Principal	
Eugene, Manley	Assistant Principal	
Philpot, Eva	Instructional Coach	
Sciullo, Francesca	Instructional Coach	
Sullivan-Jackson, Robyn	Instructional Coach	
Graffeo, Andrea	Assistant Principal	
Artabasy, Babita	Assistant Principal	
Klein, Jeremy	Assistant Principal	
Gehrke, Drew	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	115	151	150	495
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	110	125	70	416
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180	164	189	102	635
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	182	149	88	562

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	162	188	106	608

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

99

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/25/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	159	167	203	643
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	105	98	86	397
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	174	201	173	742
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169	203	166	83	621

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	179	190	150	682

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	159	167	203	643
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	105	98	86	397
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	174	201	173	742
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169	203	166	83	621

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	179	190	150	682

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	49%	56%	56%	35%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	54%	51%	40%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	41%	42%	39%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	47%	49%	51%	39%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	51%	48%	48%	45%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	45%	45%	47%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	63%	69%	68%	52%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	75%	73%	58%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	79 (114)	115 (159)	151 (167)	150 (203)	495 (643)
One or more suspensions	111 (108)	110 (105)	125 (98)	70 (86)	416 (397)
Course failure in ELA or Math	180 (194)	164 (174)	189 (201)	102 (173)	635 (742)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	143 (169)	182 (203)	149 (166)	88 (83)	562 (621)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
09	2019	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	44%	53%	-9%	53%	-9%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	37%	52%	-15%	53%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	66%	-8%	67%	-9%
2018	59%	62%	-3%	65%	-6%
Compare		-1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	54%	73%	-19%	70%	-16%
2018	52%	70%	-18%	68%	-16%
Compare		2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	37%	63%	-26%	61%	-24%
2018	32%	63%	-31%	62%	-30%
Compare		5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	57%	-8%	57%	-8%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	51%	56%	-5%	56%	-5%
Compare		-2%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	33	35	32	48	33	23	29		86	20
ELL	25	46	40	34	44	34	42	27		87	46
ASN	65	40		75	67		71			94	59
BLK	39	56	53	35	54	40	56	51		95	33
HSP	48	51	38	46	49	36	62	54		90	44
MUL	43	38								82	
WHT	56	48		54	60		74	60		89	44
FRL	47	51	41	45	50	33	60	54		90	43
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	33	33	32	43		31	36		84	14
ELL	15	42	35	31	49	41	34	28		75	47
ASN	59	72		71	73		73	64		90	
BLK	50	50	46	30	54	36	74	60		84	29
HSP	42	50	35	47	59	53	59	52		84	42
MUL	64	50						36			
WHT	50	62	54	48	55	73	67	70		93	46
FRL	42	51	37	45	57	50	58	53		84	42
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	5	35	38	18	44	43	18	41		76	14
ELL	9	32	38	29	46	44	25	40		57	52
ASN	48	50		48	58			69			
BLK	37	38	31	39	43	40	47	46		75	29
HSP	34	41	39	40	44	47	52	57		74	46
MUL	42	44		33				58			
WHT	30	38	38	36	52	50	50	67		77	36
FRL	32	40	38	37	44	48	49	56		73	44

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	579
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	67
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that scored the lowest for the 2018-19 school year is the learning gains for the bottom quartile Math students, with 37% of the students tested making learning gains. For the 2017-18 school year, our Math bottom quartile learning gains was not the lowest; it was 53%.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from previous year is Math Bottom Quartile. For the 2018-19 school year, 37% of the students made learning gains from one year to the next; and for the 2017-18 school year, 53% of the Math Bottom Quartile students made learning gains. Thus, there was a 16 point drop. We are currently working on ways to ensure that students are showing academic growth from pre-algebra to Algebra I EOC, and from Algebra 1 EOC to Geometry EOC.

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.

When compared to the district average, our biggest gap was Social Studies Achievement. As a school district, 75% of our students passed their US History EOC with a level 3 or higher this past school year; and, 73% statewide passed US History EOC. However, only 56% of the students at Leto passed their US History EOC with a level 3 or higher this past school year.

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

The data point that showed the most improvement was overall ELA achievement. Our students went from 44% of the students scoring a level 3 or higher to 49% of the students scoring a level 3 or higher for the 2018-19 school year. There was a strong push this past school year for authentic lesson planning (planning with the end in mind and periodic "checks for understanding" throughout the lesson) and the implementation of WICOR strategies in all subject areas.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The two areas that are of concern to our school is Course Failure in ELA/Math with 635 students in our school failing an English class or a math class. The next area of concern is 562 students scoring a level 1 on statewide assessments last school year. Most of these students are definitely part of our bottom quartile students, so we will have to continue to find innovative ways to support these students so that they can be successful.

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

1. Provide high quality, standards based instruction
2. Enhance student engagement with purposeful and consistent use of WICOR strategies
3. Reduce suspension rate with use of PBIS
4. Enhance school culture and teacher morale (community building)
5. Improve student attendance to school

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	High Quality Standards-Based Instruction and Purposeful use of WICOR Strategies
Rationale	As a school, we need to be able to continue to collaborate to share and implement strategies that will result in high quality, standards-based instruction and maximize student learning in our classrooms.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Teachers in all subject areas will provide high quality, standards-based instruction and purposefully use WICOR strategies to focus on developing valuable skills to enhance student engagement and increase achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Larissa McCoy-Mitti (larissa.mccoymitti@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	PLCs; Learning Walks; Strategy Share; Differentiated PD; WICOR Spotlight
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies are used to enable teachers to grow professionally and maximize student learning in the classroom. Student performance on common assessments, formative assessments, and standardized assessments will be used to determine teacher effectiveness.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Educate teachers on WICOR strategies through PLCs, Learning Walks, Strategy Share, Differentiated PD, and WICOR Spotlight 2. Students will collaborate with their teachers to improve their academic performance through data chats. 3. Parents will collaborate with the school by attending grade level academic nights and conference nights to learn how to support their child's learning and monitoring their child's progress.
Person Responsible	Larissa McCoy-Mitti (larissa.mccoymitti@hcps.net)

#2	
Title	Shared Pride and Ownership by all Stakeholders
Rationale	As a school, we want to continue to work on togetherness and school pride in order to increase positive school culture and climate for all stakeholders.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	For the 2019-20 school year, students, staff, and parents/guardians will work on exhibiting shared pride and ownership in the continued success of Leto High School.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Larissa McCoy-Mitti (larissa.mccoymitti@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	School Events; Teacher Spirit Days; Team Challenges
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies will enable teachers to build a strong bond and community with each other in order to do what is best for students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students, staff, and parents/guardians will work on participating in community events and projects (i.e movie night, bingo night, and other fun activities). 2. Students, staff, and parents/guardians will actively use Edsby for academic progress. 3. Students, staff, and parents/guardians will work on taking part in celebrating student success by being involved in functions, like Soaring Falcons, Senior Awards Night, etc.
Person Responsible	Larissa McCoy-Mitti (larissa.mccoymitti@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

PBIS will be used in order to help improve student attendance and behavior. The PBIS should enable us to reduce our suspension rate for the 2019-20 school year.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

The school plans on building positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by sending frequent Parent Links to parents and families to inform them of important school-related events, like Open House, 9th Grade Orientation, and Parent Teacher Conference Nights.

Our PTSA plans on putting together Spirit Nights and other fun activities for students and families.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The School Board of each Florida district is required by state law to establish a comprehensive program for student progression that is based on an evaluation of each student's performance including an assessment of how well the student masters the performance standards approved by the state board. The district's program for student progression is based on mastery of the English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies standards. (F.S. 1008.25)

The HCPS Student Progression Plan includes information on initial placement, reporting student progress, reading remediation, academic acceleration, grade promotion and retention, graduation requirements, transfer credits, student recognition, accommodations, dual enrollment, and extended learning opportunities.

For complete information, please visit our Student Progression Plan at: <http://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/docs/00/00/21/33/studentprogressionplan.pdf>

HCPS utilizes a variety of strategies for assisting students as they transition from one school to another.

HCPS employs multiple strategies for preparing children for entry into kindergarten. Over 6,000 children participate in one of several preschool programs offered by the School District (Head Start, VPK and PreK-ESE). Developmental screenings are available for all families prior to entry into kindergarten through Child Find, a service within the Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS). Additionally, the district works closely with School Readiness providers to share information.

HCPS utilizes multiple strategies for preparing students for their next school, including transitioning from elementary to middle school, middle school to high school, or simply moving to a new school mid-year. Examples include:

- Bring 6th/9th graders back early for orientation
- Train a cadre of student ambassadors to help orient other students
- Parent information and/or education opportunities
- Hold articulation meetings between 5th and 6th grade teachers
- Campus visits
- Shadow days
- Middle school students visit, tutor and or perform at elementary schools
- High school students visit, tutor, or perform at middle schools.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

To ensure support systems, small group, and individual needs are met, the PSLT:
Reviews school-wide data on an ongoing basis, identifying instructional needs across the school;
Supports the implementation of high quality instructional practices during core and intervention blocks;
Reviews progress monitoring data of core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.

The PSLT meets regularly (bi-weekly/monthly). The PSLT meeting calendar is structured around the district's assessment calendar, ensuring opportunities to review assessments, outcome data, and engage in the problem solving process for appropriate data-driven decisions.

Title I:

PartA

Funding enriches eligible schools with additional instructional staff, PD, ELP, and supplemental resources for raising student achievement in high-poverty schools.

TitleII

Funds for PD to provide/promote high quality professional learning that supports improved job performance for all resulting in increased student achievement. PD includes alternative certification, instructional support training and teacher induction program.

TitleIII

Services are provided to ensure ELLs have access to academic content that is equal in scope, sequence, breadth, and depth to the curricular offerings available to all. Services include educational materials and ELL district supported services such as interpreters, translators, bi-lingual support services, teachers, parent involvement and community outreach programs, improving education of immigrant and ELLs.

TitleX- Homeless

Coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunities. Federal funds are "braided" to support supplemental academic resource teachers at district school sites and to support selected professional learning opportunities for teachers.

TitleIV

Funds used provide academic enrichment activities for high-needs students including college and career counseling, STEM, arts, civics, IB/AP. Funds also support safe and healthy students through mental health services, drug and violence prevention and PE. Effective use of classroom technology is supported through PD.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

At the end and beginning of each year, schools take an inventory of resources, including materials, staff and allocation of funds for their building to determine the necessary resource materials and personnel available to meet the needs of their students. The leadership team/PSLT develops a resource map to identify gaps in resources and to ensure resources are available and allocated across the building for use by all grade levels and teachers.

To ensure teacher support systems and small group and individual needs are met, the Problem Solving Leadership Team (PSLT):

1. Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs across the school and all grade levels.
2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices during core and intervention blocks.
3. Review progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.
4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

The PSLT meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly) The PSLT meeting calendar is structured around the district's assessment calendar to ensure there are opportunities to review assessment outcome data and engage in the problem solving process for appropriate data-driven decisions. The members on the team include administrator(s), guidance counselor(s), school psychologist, ESE specialist, content area coaches/specialists, PLC liaisons, and other school personnel as needed.

To build capacity multi-tiered system of instructional delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive), the PSLT:

- Supports school teams with creating, managing and updating the school’s resource maps for academic and non-academic areas.
- Ensures the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels and assist teacher teams in identifying evidence-based strategies and materials for intervention delivery.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

The AVID program at our school site is geared towards meeting the needs of students and closing the achievement gap. AVID students are equipped with various strategies (Cornell note-taking, asking essential question, quickwrites, reflections, think-pair-share, carousel brainstorming, anticipation guides, etc.) that will enable them to be successful in their core classes and be ready for collegiate level work. The AVID site team meets on a periodic basis to discuss best practices, AVID strategies, and the needs of students. The AVID curriculum and strategies foster students' critical thinking skills, enrich their problem solving skills, and promote collaboration with peers to accomplish common tasks.

The Collegiate Academy is also a great program that we offer at our school. Students register for the Collegiate Academy before the beginning of their 9th grade school year through the district's magnet office. Students in this program are exposed to accelerated and rigorous course work and also take Hillsborough Community College (HCC) dual enrollment courses in order to earn their Associate of Arts (AA) Degree by the end of their senior year of high school. In addition, we offer dual enrollment courses to students not enrolled in the Collegiate Academy who qualify with a 3.0 unweighted GPA and qualifying PERT scores.

Moreover, our College and Career Counselor is a great resource for students when it comes to picking the right college and/or career. The College and Career Counselor is equipped with rich information for post high school to ensure that our students are prepared for life and to be productive and competitive citizens in tomorrow’s society. She assists students with SAT and ACT registrations as well as waivers for these tests if students qualify for the waivers. In addition, she assists with their college applications, sending transcripts, and all Bright Future information.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: High Quality Standards-Based Instruction and Purposeful use of WICOR Strategies				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Shared Pride and Ownership by all Stakeholders				\$732.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3240		2421 - Leto High School	Title, I Part C		\$453.00
			<i>Notes: 500 magnets to give out to parents and families so that they can feel more connected to our school.</i>			
	3240		2421 - Leto High School	Title, I Part C		\$279.00
			<i>Notes: 600 door hangers to pass out to our rising 9th grades during a mass home visit to meet our 9th grade families.</i>			
					Total:	\$732.00