Sail School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sail

2006 JACKSON BLUFF RD, Tallahassee, FL 32304

https://www.leonschools.net/sail

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 provide an educational choice for high school students in Leon County. By way of an innovative, high-quality, respectful, and caring environment, SAIL seeks to provide a diverse student population with the foundation necessary to become responsible citizens in a global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

SAIL will be a haven for students who are looking for an engaging, safe, and respectful learning environment that embraces individuality and produces students who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to society as a whole.

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
Roberson, Matt	Principal	Ensures the mission and vision for the school is supported and implemented for all students. Provides leadership in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data. Facilitates implementation of intervention plans, professional development opportunities and technical assistance for problem-solving activities. Serves as primary contact for PTSO and community partners.
John, Linda	Assistant Principal	(APC) Provides leadership in student data collection and evaluation of data. Monitors the implementation of appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies, assists with design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective instructional strategies. Creates master schedule and works collaboratively with staff in managing curriculum.
Crowder, Kari	Assistant Principal	(APA) Manages student attendance as related to district policy. Communicates with students, parents and Social Workers to track excessive absenteeism. Works with teachers and staff on identifying and contacting parents of students with various attendance concerns.
Pell, Robert	Dean	As referral coordinator, provides information about ESE services and manages our Problem Solving Team. Serves as primary district contact for ESE and ESOL. Assists in the management of student IEPs. Serves as Dean of Students and helps work through behavior and attendance issues collaboratively with students, teachers, admin and parents.
Langston, Julie	Reading Coach	Literacy Instructional Coach / Reading Coach - Works with all departments to implement school-wide reading initiatives. Manages school Literacy Team, coordinates and implements research-based reading strategies and progress monitoring tools. Analyzes data for teachers to help with instructional decisions.
Matherne, Marlow		ELA Department Chair who will provide information about core instruction and the new BEST ELA Standards. Participates in student data collection and collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support. Teaches English 2/ and English 2/Honors and one section of ENC1101/1102. Reading Endorsed.
Cone, Marcia	Math Coach	Math department leader/coach that will provide information about core instruction, new standards, participates in student data collection, and collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support. Mentor new math teachers and assist in classes.
Taylor, Danielle		Science Department Chair who will provide information about core instruction. Participates in student data collection and collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		1, 2 and 3 instruction and support. Teaches Biology, AgriScience, and AP Environmental Science. Participates in data collection as it relates to creating PD and providing Gifted Services. Serves as TEC and Gifted Coordinator.
Starkey, Caitlin		Social Studies Department Chair who will provide information about core instruction. Participates in student data collection and collaborates with staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction support. Teaches US History/honors and AP Psychology.

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.

Necessary stakeholders were involved in identifying needs, setting goals, and drafting solutions for meeting those goals. The School Advisory Council will review the SIP and requested funding amounts and vote for final approval. The Student Government Association students, which represents the student body, provided input on key goal areas.

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))

In following best practices of the continuous improvement model, Focus Areas will be monitored quarterly and teacher leaders will meet with involved teachers to discuss progress and needed instructional shifts.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	51%
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)* 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	65	51	50	66	55	51	55		
ELA Learning Gains				58			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			24		
Math Achievement*	51	45	38	41	36	38	40		
Math Learning Gains				33			23		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			36		
Science Achievement*	84	65	64	67	47	40	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	83	77	66	79	46	48	54		
Middle School Acceleration					40	44			
Graduation Rate	96	89	89	97	67	61	98		
College and Career Acceleration	49	61	65	49	75	67	44		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELP Progress		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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	428
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	572
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

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	56			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	44			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	61			

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	36	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	64			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	48			

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	65			51			84	83		96	49	
SWD	48			34				69		36	5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53			36				60		25	5	
HSP	44										1	
MUL	53							90			2	
PAC												
WHT	72			55			94	88		51	6	
FRL	58			32			71	65		44	6	

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	66	58	38	41	33	44	67	79		97	49	
SWD	27	30	19	24			28	50		94	19	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	52	46	21	15		29			100	21	
HSP	64											
MUL	67	90										
PAC												
WHT	71	57	28	51	42	60	74	83		95	53	
FRL	53	53	27	30	18		54	68		96	35	

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	55	46	24	40	23	36	58	54		98	44	
SWD	30	33	18	32	20		54	18		100	14	
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	17	11	0	21	17			33		100	10	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	59	52	36	43	20	50	57	62		97	49	
FRL	29	33	23	33	26		33	25		100	44	

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	71%	51%	20%	50%	21%
09	2023 - Spring	61%	50%	11%	48%	13%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	58%	-20%	50%	-12%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	58%	2%	48%	12%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	65%	19%	63%	21%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	75%	8%	63%	20%

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.

Math Proficiency results are predicted to be 52%. This is the lowest performing category as compared to the other core academic performance measures. Although this is our lowest academic measure, this component improved 11 percentage points over the previous year.

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

The Graduation Rate declined one percentage point going from 97% to 96%. All other reporting categories reflected an increase. As a small co-hort group to begin with, this percentage result falls within a desirable goal outcome.

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 negative gap was with the Math Proficiency results, scoring at 52% compared to the state average of 56% across all math levels. Although there remains a gap of 4 percentage points, the results reflect a 11 percentage point increase from the prior year.

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

The proficiency results from the Biology EOC increased from 67% to 88%, a 21 point increase. Classes were differentiated based on Honors and Regular which allowed the teacher to differentiate instruction.

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

EWS data collection is only required for grades K-8.

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

Increase Math Proficiency
Increase subgroup performance in the SWD category
Increase subgroup performance in the Black/African American category

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 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.

Math proficiency is performing below the state average and is at 52%.

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

Math Proficiency Target of 56% to match the state average.

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

Planned data review meetings among the department to analyze district progress monitoring assessments and quarterly class grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marcia Cone (conem@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.)

Implement a Continuous Improvement Model of reviewing data results from progress monitoring assessments and adjusting instruction based on performance data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is an effective strategy for planning, implementing instruction, checking student learning results, and making informed decisions for adjusting instruction.

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.

Schedule monthly department meetings and track when progress monitoring assessments will be administered. During meetings teachers will analyze classroom performance data, curriculum pacing, and district progress monitoring results.

Person Responsible: Marcia Cone (conem@leonschools.net)

By When: -Monthly department meetings - reflected by agenda/notes -Check-in with administration quarterly to review key data points

#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.

SWD - Overall performance was 36%. Areas that reflect a need for improvement are ELA Learning Gains of the Lower 25% - results were 19%, and Career and College Readiness results were at 19%.

Black/African-American - Overall performance was 41%, the minimum requirement. Areas that reflect a need for improvement are Math Achievement and Math Learning Gains - results were 21% and 15%, respectively.

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

SWD -- ELA LG 25% - 35% (all students were at 38%) Coll & Car - 36% (all students were at 49%). Improvements in these areas along with maintaining current category performance will bring the SWD subgroup to 41%.

BLK - Math Achievement - 30% (all students were at 41%) and Math LG - 30% (all students were at 33%). Improvements in these areas along with maintaining current category performance will bring the SWD subgroup to 44%.

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

FAST Progress Monitoring data, math progress monitoring data, and College and Career Readiness data will be analyzed and tracked for these specific subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda John (johnl@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.)

Frequent - monthly and quarterly, data specific meetings will be held by the ELA and Math departments to review the data and align results to the LCS ELA Decision Tree, Math Department Intervention Plan, and CTE teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is an effective strategy for planning, implementing instruction, checking student learning results, and making informed decisions for adjusting instruction on targeted subgroups.

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.

Schedule monthly department meetings and track when progress monitoring assessments will be administered. During meetings teachers will analyze classroom performance data, curriculum pacing, and district progress monitoring results. Data will be disaggregated to specific subgroups. CTE teachers will track readiness for taking certification exams.

Person Responsible: Linda John (johnl@leonschools.net)

By When: -Monthly department meetings - reflected by agenda/notes -Check-in with administration quarterly to review key data points

#3. 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.

An identified area of focus for the 2023 - 2024 school year is to improve the average attendance rates for students. We will utilize a positive approach to decrease our absenteeism this school year.

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

According to the Early Warning System report for SAIL High School, 115 students had attendance rates of below 90% for the school year 2022-2023. Our goal for the 2023 - 2024 school year is to reduce the absenteeism rate to 90 students or below.

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

Data will be analyzed on a monthly bases using FOCUS attendance reporting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kari Crowder (crowderk@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.)

The evidence-based intervention we will implement for attendance rates will be based on PBIS strategies. Students with good to excellent attendance, and/or improved attendance will be recognized on a monthly basis through our school news letter that is presented every week, school-wide, through classroom teachers during 3rd and 4th period. Students with excellent attendance will be rewarded quarterly at our Honor Roll/Attendance Party. Attendance campaigns will take place throughout the year in our weekly "Message in a Bottle" listserve and FOCUS emails.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There is strong evidence that students with 90% attendance rates and higher acheive at a higher level than those students who are absent frequently. Attendance rates have been linked to graduation rates and high school completion.

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.

Attendance reports from FOCUS will be analyzed on a weekly/monthly time frame throughout the school year to identify students with excellent attendance and also students who are below the 90% attendance rate for intervention.

Person Responsible: Kari Crowder (crowderk@leonschools.net)

By When: Monthly throughout the school year.

The SGA class provided input for positive interventions which included an end of year party for students with excellent attendance, quarterly rewards such as school "money" for our school "treasure trove" store, providing rewards for students who "improve" their attendance rate from last year or throughout the school year, and SGA students being more available for students who need support. SGA mentioned that providing a safe environment will help students who don't feel safe to come to school. SGA is interested in creating a mentorship program for students with poor attendance.

Person Responsible: Kari Crowder (crowderk@leonschools.net)

By When: Meet monthly with SGA students and sponsor. Provide attendance data when appropriate for incentives and/or mentorship.

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).

The School Advisory Council will review any funding allocations dedicated to school improvement and will vote to approve any disbursement of funds.

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: Math				$315.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	1200	0204 - Sail	School Improvement Funds	3.0	$315.00
			Notes: Funding for three substitute teachers to cover the Math Department for a day of PD in reviewing data and pacing.			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				$250.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	5100	0204 - Sail	School Improvement Funds		$250.00
			Notes: Student incentive rewards for meeting attendance goals.			
					Total:	$565.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes