

Leon County Schools

# Leon High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Leon High School

550 E TENNESSEE ST, Tallahassee, FL 32308

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

### 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.**

It is our mission that all students graduate from Leon High School prepared to the best of their abilities to be creative problem-solvers and adaptive to change in a globally competitive society.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Leon High School will be an engaging, safe and respectful learning environment that produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society. To that end, instructional and organizational priorities are structured to focus on the needs of our student population by providing a flexible, comprehensive curriculum that includes rigor, diverse cultural experiences, with a strong emphasis in fine and performing arts, athletics and extracurricular programs.

### 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
Bryan, Michael	Principal	Leads a team of stakeholders to provide a safe atmosphere free of any bias in which students can achieve their maximum potential; provides a continuous learning model for teachers that fosters engagement for students at the highest level.
Molinaro, Cari	Assistant Principal	Responsible for building the master schedule that aligns with state benchmarks and standards and all things curriculum related.
Warfel, Chris	Assistant Principal	Oversees all things concerning school safety and student discipline
Hedrington, DeShone	Assistant Principal	Responsible for all things attendance - to increase daily average attendance; monitoring and reporting truancy
Bell, Riley	Assistant Principal	Responsible for all things related to facilities; campus parking and athletics.
Fabrega, Stacy	Instructional Coach	Monitors and disaggregates data for ELA with the intent to increase student achievement
Strickland, Angie	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for standards taught and materials pertaining to Physical Education
Giglio, Kayce	Reading Coach	Responsible for monitoring and disaggregating data pertaining to reading to improve student achievement on state testing.
Prasse, Ed	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for standards and materials pertaining to performing arts department.
Garcia, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for standards and materials pertaining to the Math department.
Sears, Erica	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for standards and materials pertinent to the social studies department.
Beam, Christine	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for all things related to culinary and career and tech education.
Folmar, Kelly	School Counselor	Responsible for all things pertaining to guidance, academic plans and mental wellness protocols; collaborates with APC for placement in academic programs.
Mcgriff, Tyrone	Dean	Works in collaboration with admin team for safety and security; assists administration with processing referrals and engaging students in conflict resolution.

**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.

All stakeholders are involved in the School Improvement Plan process. There are parents, teachers, students, administration and community members represented on the School Advisory Council. All come to a consensus to make decisions regarding student achievement, resources needed for technology and activities to incentivize student recognition such as honor roll, attendance and discipline achievement.

**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))

SAC meets quarterly to discuss current topics pertaining to safety, student achievement, resources for technology and hiring retention when an emphasis on recruiting minority teachers. There is an Open Hearing to discuss the School Improvement Plan data, goals and implementation. Members and visitors have an opportunity to discuss and ask questions.

**Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	56%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	37%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A



*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

### Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

### Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	218	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	299	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	389	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	297	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	304	

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	455

**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	182
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review****ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	58	51	50	60	55	51	61		
ELA Learning Gains				56			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			35		
Math Achievement*	46	45	38	53	36	38	53		
Math Learning Gains				64			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			39		
Science Achievement*	54	65	64	59	47	40	79		
Social Studies Achievement*	74	77	66	72	46	48	76		
Middle School Acceleration					40	44			
Graduation Rate	85	89	89	95	67	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	63	61	65	63	75	67	64		
ELP Progress	61	45	45						

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	85

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	624
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	95

**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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	44			
HSP	63			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	81			

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL	50			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	42			
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	51			
HSP	64			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	50			

**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**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	58			46			54	74		85	63	61
SWD	35			28			43	44		9	6	
ELL	13			29							4	61
AMI												
ASN	64			50				100			4	
BLK	38			27			32	51		41	6	
HSP	60			54			48	72		56	7	60
MUL	52			60			73	63		71	6	

## 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
PAC												
WHT	78			67			81	91		77	6	
FRL	43			33			46	53		42	7	58

## 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	60	56	46	53	64	56	59	72		95	63	
SWD	33	43	40	39	45		41	33		89	17	
ELL	5	56	60	64						100	73	
AMI												
ASN	59	54						80				
BLK	40	48	45	44	62	58	37	48		92	34	
HSP	54	58	50	61	52	55	47	85		100	77	
MUL	49	47	27	55	70		36	72		79	53	
PAC												
WHT	78	62	47	81	66	50	81	88		96	76	
FRL	37	44	41	47	55	51	41	50		94	40	

## 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	61	51	35	53	32	39	79	76		96	64	
SWD	33	52	52	37	37	40	52	41		91	19	
ELL	0	19	27	27						79	73	
AMI												
ASN	72	52		50	50					100	68	
BLK	38	38	29	32	26	25	63	55		93	47	
HSP	61	57	64	67	35		80	78		93	76	
MUL	55	55	45	68	41		90	90		94	38	
PAC												
WHT	80	62	45	70	38	48	87	90		97	72	
FRL	34	37	29	36	30	35	55	56		92	48	

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	60%	51%	9%	50%	10%
09	2023 - Spring	57%	50%	7%	48%	9%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	58%	-8%	50%	0%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	58%	-8%	48%	2%

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

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	75%	0%	63%	12%

### 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.**

Our math proficiency in Algebra and Geometry was our lowest performance level. Math is usually a strength in our students (above reading) and usually one of our highest performance levels. Gaps in learning that occurred through the pandemic have created learning loss that has significantly impacted student success in math. Along with the gaps in learning, is the lack of consistent attendance. We hope to see improvement in this area as all of our students are back in the classroom with daily face to face instruction.

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

Science experienced the greatest decline in performance with a dip in proficiency of 13%. Learning loss over the course of the pandemic is a factor, as well as regular school attendance.

**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 between the state average and Leon's proficiency rate is the area of Reading. Leon's level of proficiency was 58% where the state's proficiency rate is at 47%. We experienced an eight-percentage point increase. Factors that contributed to this overall increase were the progress monitoring that took place where we were able to identify students throughout the school year that would benefit from reading interventions.

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

The most improvement seen was in the area of Reading. We had two full-time faculty members whose position was dedicated to implementing these interventions and coaching the teachers through delivering instruction that meets students where they are at.

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

One area of concern is Attendance. 46% of the overall population has an attendance rate below 90%. Students are missing valuable instruction. As a result, students are failing courses at a higher rate.

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

1. School Safety
2. Attendance
3. Student Achievement

### **Area of Focus**

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



**#1. 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.

At Leon High School, the culture and climate of our school is a top priority second only to school safety. To that end, we began this year by emphasizing this with our staff which included a motivational speaker during our pre-planning activities. For students, we began the year with grade-level assemblies to emphasize important school protocols and to encourage students to get connected to at least one extracurricular activity. They were also introduced to many key staff members whose role is always to be a resource for student success. Positive activities for students include Honor Roll lunches, Perfect Attendance Ice Cream Socials, and Image Achievement Awards that are based entirely on honorable character traits.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

It is our goal that students will increase attendance, achieve the honor roll and decrease discipline referrals by 10%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Each quarter the administration will review reports of attendance, student grades, and disciplinary referrals to track progression towards this goal.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Cari Molinaro (molinaroc@leonschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Group Interventions - Routine check in's with students with unsatisfactory attendance, grades and discipline during interim reports.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The principal's mission is to continue to spread a consistent message of Tradition, Pride and Excellence. Building a culture where all students feel a part of this tradition without any bias or feeling of exclusion, and can get connected to extra-curricular activities offered alongside their course requirements.

**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.

Pull reports to monitor how students are progressing in attendance, grades and discipline as it relates to the school culture.

**Person Responsible:** DeShone Hedrington (hedringtond@leonschools.net)

**By When:** We will review reports quartely.

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups****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.

We noticed a decline in student engagement and student achievement despite teachers efforts to remediate, provide help sessions and to extend opportunities to submit quality work. Thus, we are keeping student engagement at the forefront. In an effort to decrease teacher frustration and to protect teachers' self-efficacy, the administration was proactive to address the concerns of teachers by engaging in crucial conversations with specific strategies to affect a greater change. This year we are focusing on school expectations.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our goal is to increase student engagement by 10%. We have recruited highly effective teachers and staff who represent our schools' diverse population.

**Monitoring:**

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

Our administration will monitor student achievement at interim and end of the quarter reports.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Cari Molinaro (molinaroc@leonschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students tend to be more engaged when they are interested in school and can identify with school culture.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research has shown that student engagement improves student achievement.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Match students with student government leaders to choose clubs of interest.

Refer students to guidance to address academic and/or mental wellness concerns.

**Person Responsible:** Cari Molinaro (molinaroc@leonschools.net)

**By When:** Every quarter

Continue to include peer sharing strategies that work for teachers in faculty meetings.

Provide on going professional development that address motivational strategies to engage students.

**Person Responsible:** Michael Bryan (bryanm@leonschools.net)

**By When:** We discuss plans for faculty meeting on routine basis. Each quarter is a reasonable timeline.

### **#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

#### **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.

#### **Measurable Outcome:**

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

#### **Monitoring:**

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

#### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

#### **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.)

#### **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

#### **Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

#### **Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***