

School District of Osceola County, FL

Neocity Academy



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	27

Neocity Academy

195 NEOCITY WAY, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Yvette Ponzoa

Start Date for this Principal: 12/22/2017

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2020-21 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
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

Neocity Academy

195 NEOCITY WAY, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	28%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Meechin, Michael	Principal	Schoolwide Operations Strategic School Improvement School Budget and Finances Recruitment, Hiring and Retention Professional Development Students with Disabilities Community Relations & Partnerships Graduation Data & At-Risk DOE Data Validation Master Schedule Attendance Programs & Incentives University & Industry Partnerships Presentation of Learning
Seabolt, Justin	Assistant Principal	Student Admissions Section 504 Summer Instructional Programs Multi-Tiered Systems of Support After School Programs & Extracurriculars Data Validation & Grade Reporting Standardized Assessment Advanced Placement & Capstone Emergency Management Plans Serve as Local Education Agency Representative, When Necessary
Jasmin, Kristina	Dean	Build Capacity Through Professional Development Coordinate Advisory Program Coordinate New Teacher Onboarding & Support Coordinate Student Discipline Coordinate Attendance Interventions Coordinate Positive Behavior Supports & Interventions Coordinate Student Transportation Proctor Standardized Assessments, When Necessary MTSS Team Member Serve as Local Education Agency Representative, When Necessary Supervise Students on Campus, When Necessary
Motta, Jonathan	Instructional Coach	Coordinate & Support the Implementation of Bulb Digital Portfolio Coordinate & Build Capacity for Student Internships Coordinate the Individual Learning Plan MTSS System Coordinate the Presentation of Learning Coordinate any Student Exhibitions of Work Coordinate Freshmen Orientation Programs Coordinate Program of Study Advisory Boards Proctor Standardized Assessments, When Necessary MTSS Team Member

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Serve as Local Education Agency Representative, When Necessary Supervise Students on Campus, When Necessary
Cuellar, Ariel	Instructional Coach	Build Capacity Through Professional Development Coordinate all Advanced Placement Programs Coordinate all Local, State, and National Standardized Assessments Coordinate all Industry Certification Assessments Coordinate all Graduation Testing Requirements Coordinate all SSD & Assessment Accommodations Proctor Standardized Assessments, When Necessary MTSS Team Member Serve as Local Education Agency Representative, When Necessary Supervise Students on Campus, When Necessary

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 12/22/2017, Yvette Ponzosa

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

26

Total number of students enrolled at the school

431

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	123	106	98	100	427
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	12	14	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	7	13	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	3	3

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		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	0	114	107	102	0	323
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	1	0	1
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	

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	
Students with two or more indicators	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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	0	114	107	102	0	323
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	1	0	1
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	

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	
Students with two or more indicators	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		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				91%	57%	56%		56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	48%	51%		54%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	43%	42%		47%	44%
Math Achievement				91%	46%	51%		39%	51%
Math Learning Gains				45%	41%	48%		40%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				90%	46%	45%		46%	45%
Science Achievement				100%	69%	68%		67%	67%
Social Studies Achievement					70%	73%		70%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	91%	47%	44%	55%	36%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	0%	47%	-47%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				

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
2021					
2019	0%	62%	-62%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	49%	-49%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	84%	44%	40%	57%	27%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

NWEA was used for the progress monitoring data.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	97	95	97
	Economically Disadvantaged	95	95	97
	Students With Disabilities	100	100	100
	English Language Learners	60	60	67
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66	76	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	71	82	75
	Students With Disabilities	0	100	100
	English Language Learners	33	33	33
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	92	98	96
	Economically Disadvantaged	88	100	96
	Students With Disabilities	100	-	-
	English Language Learners	100	100	-
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-	-	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-
	Students With Disabilities	-	-	-
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-	-	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-
	Students With Disabilities	-	-	-
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-	-	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-
	Students With Disabilities	-	-	-
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	-	-	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-
	Students With Disabilities	-	-	-
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
Biology	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
US History	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
ASN	100	71									
BLK	93	79									
HSP	94	75	83	93	54						
WHT	94	70	86	94	64						
FRL	88	67	78	94	60						

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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
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	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100%
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%	
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%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	86
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	80
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	82
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	77
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Overall our proficiency levels are very high among all measured grade levels. Our subgroup data is attributed to very small populations in EL and SWD categories. Trends are that student proficiency remains high and in most cases increases as we progress through the school year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

We will continue to analyze data in mathematics, particularly in learning gains. Our student group is so small in state tested areas that it remains in focus for our school.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

We continue to use data that we get from NWEA, but more importantly from formative work that is completed in the classroom. We use this data to track student progress toward proficiency on a variety of outcomes.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Learning gains in English Language Arts were our greatest area of growth.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Continuing to analyze data from formative work from our students and making instructional shifts accordingly are the way that we have made academic gains in these areas.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

No further actions are required to accelerate learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We continue to use lesson that are developed by our teachers as exemplars and these drive the professional development that is provided for our staff. Teachers training teachers on lessons that were used for our students has been effective in incorporating additional inquiry based learning strategies.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will continue our process of identifying strategies that work and continue to build capacity in those areas.

Part III: Planning for Improvement**Areas of Focus:**

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>The Leadership Team helps to maintain a cohesive school mission, vision and strategy focused on school achievement. Improvement in this area, rather than the operational management of school, is the main priority of our Leadership Team.</p> <p>Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful in affecting positive change in our school. Our team consists of the Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean of Students, Data and Assessment Coordinator, and Experiential Learning Coordinator.</p> <p>Our insight survey shows areas of opportunity for growth and support with our instructional leadership practices.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	According to our 2020-21 Insight Survey only 41% of instructional staff believed that there were opportunities for leadership growth. We would like to increase this to 75% of instructional staff as measured on this year's Insight Survey.
Monitoring:	We have added this item to our Strategic School Improvement Plan and will receive updates are Leadership Team Meetings quarterly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Meechin (michael.meechin@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increasing teacher leadership opportunities within the School Leadership Team can improve teacher motivation and ownership in our systems. In addition, it can build teacher confidence in their own abilities and teaches them to motivate, lead and encourage their teacher peers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have worked purposefully to include our teachers in the development and implementation of our professional development initiatives. Having our teachers work in teams - they are able to coach each other and share best practices. This collaboration also improves teacher morale, making it more likely that good teachers will remain in the profession (Gates Foundation, 2009).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Our Strategic School Improvement Plan includes a professional development plan that is focused on the targeted use of professional learning community time.
2. Our PLC time is planned and common themes are covered in the content areas by teacher leaders throughout the year.
3. Teacher-leader selection is focused on selecting a balance of visionaries and strong instructional practitioners.
4. Our teachers will be developing and leading professional development based on strategies that are identified as exemplars in our classrooms.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students at NeoCity Academy need to continue to make learning gains in the areas of mathematics, specifically making learning gains on the Geometry FSA. At a school like NeoCity Academy, it is not enough to only focus on achievement levels of students, but also ensure that all students are making adequate learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Less than 5% of students who take the Geometry FSA will experience slide back in their scale score. Slide back is defined as a decrease in the student's scale score.
Monitoring:	We will use progress monitoring tools, including NWEA, to track the progress of our students enrolled in the Geometry Honors course.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Justin Seabolt (justin.seabolt@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Student 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 and make adequate learning gains.

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students at NeoCity Academy need to continue to make learning gains in the areas of literacy, specifically making learning gains on both the ELA 9 and 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 10 will experience slide back in their scale score. Slide back is defined as a decrease in the student's scale score.

Monitoring: We will use progress monitoring tools, including NWEA, to track the progress of our students enrolled in the respective English course.

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 success 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)

#4. 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 45%.

Measurable Outcome: We will ensure that no subgroup falls below 45%.

Monitoring: We will use progress monitoring tools, including NWEA, to track the progress of our subgroups.

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

#5. 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:	2020-21 SEL Climate Survey showed 93% of students answered favorable for school belonging. In 2021-22 this question will be increased by 5%.
Monitoring:	We are using our SEL surveys to compile and track this data.
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 and focus on the problem-solving process tied 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 - giving them voice and choice in their learning.
4. Students are provided outlets throughout the day such as mental health awareness, breathing exercises, yoga and meditation.
5. We will continue to work with students through Canvas to provide resources to focus on the college application, admission and financial aid processes.

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

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 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. 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 2021-22 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 50% pass rate.

Monitoring: We will be using mock exams and the formative assessment data in AP classroom to track student progress.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

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.

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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

All members of our School Leadership Team and our School Counselors, Megan Fellows and Kendall Blancett.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00

5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00