

School District of Osceola County, FL

Neocity Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Neocity Academy

195 NEOCITY WAY, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Yvette Ponzoa

Start Date for this Principal: 1/1/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Osceola 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Neocity Academy

195 NEOCITY WAY, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	31%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola 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.

The mission of NeoCity Academy is to develop students who believe that the world can be a better place and that they can be the ones to make it happen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

NeoCity Academy was founded under the belief that a future where students own their learning is fundamentally more impactful than one where they do not. NeoCity Academy is actively engaging students in inquiry-driven, project-based learning to make this possible, with the ultimate goal of graduating students ready to change the world.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Meechin, Michael	Principal	<p>Areas of Responsibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schoolwide Operations • Strategic School Improvement Planning • School Budget • Human Resources • Public Relations • Graduation Data & At-Risk • DOE Data Validation • VAM Data Validation • Master Schedule • Attendance Programs & Interventions • University & Industry Partnerships • Other Duties as Assigned
Seabolt, Justin	Assistant Principal	<p>Areas of Responsibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main Office Operations • Exceptional Student Education & 504s • Summer Instructional Programs • Multi-Tiered Systems of Support • Professional Development • After School Programs & Extracurriculars • Grade Reporting • State Assessment & Industry Certification Supervision & Reporting • College Board Programs Supervision • Positive Behavior Supports and Interventions • Awards & Recognitions • Transportation • Emergency Management Plans • Field Trips • Serve as Local Education Agency Representative, When Necessary • Other Duties as Assigned
Jasmin, Kristina	Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate Professional Development Programs & PLC Systems • Coordinate Advisory Program • Coordinate New Teacher Induction (For New Teachers to SDOC) • Coordinate and Administer All Student Discipline • Administer Attendance Interventions • Serves as AP Coordinator • Supervise and Coordinate State Assessments and College Board Assessments • Coordinate Industry Certification Exams • Serve as Local Education Agency Representative, When Necessary • Supervise Students on Campus, When Necessary • SSD & Assessment Accommodation Coordinator • Other Duties as Assigned

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/1/2018, Yvette Ponzoa

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

19

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	114	107	102	0	323
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	108	0	0	219
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0

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

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	108	0	0	219
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0

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

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	91%	57%	56%	0%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	48%	51%	0%	47%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	43%	42%	0%	41%	41%
Math Achievement	91%	46%	51%	0%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	45%	41%	48%	0%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	90%	46%	45%	0%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	100%	69%	68%	0%	71%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	70%	73%	0%	70%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	91%	47%	44%	55%	36%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	0%	47%	-47%	53%	-53%
	2018					
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	0%	62%	-62%	67%	-67%
2018					
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					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	49%	-49%	61%	-61%
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	84%	44%	40%	57%	27%
2018					

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
HSP	93	59	69	86	52						
WHT	94	45		93	50						
FRL	91	55	60	85	37						
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
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

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	531
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	72
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Our learning gains categories across all sub-groups are an area of focus for our school. We have students that trend toward high achievement levels and with this comes a need for strategic planning to ensure learning gains for these students.

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

We do not have comparative data yet.

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.

We do not have comparative data yet.

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

We do not have comparative data yet.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our learning gains categories across all sub-groups are an area of focus for our school. We have students that trend toward high achievement levels and with this comes a need for strategic planning to ensure learning gains for these students.

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

1. Improve learning gains in English Language Arts
2. Improve learning gains in Mathematics

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students are NeoCity Academy need to continue to make learning gains in the areas of literacy, specifically making learning gains on both the ELA 9 and ELA 10 FSA. At a school like NeoCity Academy, it is not enough to only focus on Achievement Levels of students, but also ensure that they are making learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: Less than 5% of students who take the FSA ELA 9 and ELA 10 will experience slide back in their scale score. Slide back is defined as a decrease in the student's scale score.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael Meechin (michael.meechin@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will engage in an inquiry-based curriculum that is aligned to the standards in the respective English Language Arts course.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our inquiry-based curriculum is developed to engage students in high levels of critical thinking. We know that this will produce a student who is able to succeed on the FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All instructional staff will be trained in best practices and inquiry-driven strategies to increase student engagement.
2. Differentiated instructional strategies will be implemented in our classrooms to ensure that we are meeting students where they are.
3. Leadership will monitor classrooms via observations and walkthroughs providing specific feedback to our instructional staff.
4. We will offer additional support and intervention to students who are struggling during our Research time.

Person Responsible Michael Meechin (michael.meechin@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students are NeoCity Academy need to continue to make learning gains in the areas of mathematics, specifically making learning gains on Geometry FSA. At a school like NeoCity Academy, it is not enough to only focus on Achievement Levels of students, but also ensure that they are making learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: Less than 5% of students who take the FSA Geometry will experience slide back in their scale score. Slide back is defined as a decrease in the student's scale score.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will engage in an inquiry-based curriculum that is aligned to the standards in the respective Geometry course.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our inquiry-based curriculum is developed to engage students in high levels of critical thinking. We know that this will produce a student who is able to succeed on the FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All instructional staff will be trained in best practices and inquiry-driven strategies to increase student engagement.
2. Differentiated instructional strategies will be implemented in our classrooms to ensure that we are meeting students where they are.
3. Leadership will monitor classrooms via observations and walkthroughs providing specific feedback to our instructional staff.
4. We will offer additional support and intervention to students who are struggling during our Research time.

Person Responsible Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Well-implemented programs designed to foster SEL are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior.

A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need to develop the social, emotional and academic competencies they need to succeed in life.

Measurable Outcome: 2019-20 SEL Climate Survey showed a 93% of students answered favorable for school belonging. In 2020-21 this question will be increased by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael Meechin (michael.meechin@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to address their needs throughout all courses within the curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: SEL is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-created. (Gardner, 1983).

Action Steps to Implement

1. The curriculum will be planned to keep students interested in focus and tie problem-solving process to real world issues impacting youth.
2. Teachers and staff will continue to build a positive school culture that is inclusive of all learners.
3. As we plan lessons student agency will remain in focus - given them voice and choice in their learning.
4. Students are provided outlets throughout the day such as mental awareness, breathing exercises, yoga, and meditation.

Person Responsible Michael Meechin (michael.meechin@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for All Students

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A college-going culture builds the expectation of post-secondary education for all students. For our students at NeoCity Academy we are focused on developing problem-solving skills that will help students understand and overcome barriers to college admissions.

Measurable Outcome: With our first Junior class we are going to ensure that 100% of the students have take the SAT before the end of the school year. We will also ensure that 100% of our Juniors have completed at least one college application before the end of the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael Meechin (michael.meechin@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We know that access to post-secondary education is a perceived barrier with our stakeholders. We will use strategies that educate the entire family unit as to the roadmap toward college readiness and admission.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students should be supported in their efforts to reflect on their future and should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to promoting students' aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lessons. (Pointer & Lieber 2004)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be supported, advised, and encouraged in an environment that fosters post-secondary college and career readiness for success in school and in life.
2. The school will participate in giving students the tools that are needed, such as SAT access and opportunity and college application planning, to gain admission to post-secondary.
3. Teachers will plan to incorporate activities that hone problem-solving skills in the curriculum.

Person Responsible Michael Meechin (michael.meechin@osceolaschools.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ESSA data showed the school had several small subgroups. The school wants to ensure that no subgroup falls below the 41%.

Measurable Outcome: We will ensure that no subgroup falls below 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael Meechin (michael.meechin@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all their students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers that share common planning will participate in weekly collaborative meetings that will focus on the development of inquiry-driven lessons and assessments.
2. Collaborative meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with the instructional coach.
3. Teachers will focus on creating learning goals and targets for individual students.
4. Teachers will participate in professional development that is targeted at meeting the needs of the diverse learners in their classrooms.
5. Students will participate in targeted intervention in tier 1, 2, and 3.

Person Responsible Michael Meechin (michael.meechin@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Science education is driven by the need to cultivate students' minds, develop their capacity to engage in scientific inquiry, and teach students how to reason in a scientific context.

Description and Rationale: Science allows students to explore their world and discover new things. It is also an active subject, containing hands-on labs and experiments. This makes science well-suited to inquiring minds.

Measurable Outcome: In the 2020-21 school year. We want to see growth of our AP Physics scores of 10% increase from the last school year. In AP Biology and AP Chemistry, our first year with both courses, we would like to see a baseline of 40% on the pass rate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give facts meaning, teach concepts that matter in students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving complex problems.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will attain and breakdown achievement data from district assessments during weekly common planning.
2. Science teacher participate in collaborative planning sessions weekly to ensure that content is inquiry-driven.
3. Teachers will participate in PD that will focus on driving instruction through inquiry and PBL.
4. Teacher will learn and implement standards based instruction and grading to break down student progress on outcomes.
5. The administration will provide professional development sessions to teachers as the need arises.
6. Teacher will provide tier 2 and tier 3 instruction based on outcomes, data, student assessment results, and collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Learning gains will be addressed through a focus on inquiry-based learning and a standards-based curriculum aimed at ensuring gains for our lowest levels of learners.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Our school has been built from the ground up beginning with one grade level. We now have three grade levels and our culture is focused on building an inquiry-driven learning process that is focused on solving real-world problems. Students at NeoCity embrace a Culture of No Excuses - where engaging in purposeful work focused on learning outcomes (standards) is the expectations for all learners.

We have several support systems that ensure all students are successful and completing the work that is assigned to them.

Our culture puts students first and centers their learning around them. Students are provided with times within the school day where they own their learning. Student autonomy in the learning process allows students to take ownership in their time management and organizational skills. In addition, our curriculum focuses on a design-thinking problem-based approach - no matter the content area students are working through complex problems.

Our parents are kept informed via our School Advisory Council, Remind channels and robust social media platforms. Our SAC also provide input on the school improvement planning and goal setting processes.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for All Students	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00