School District of Osceola County, FL

Neocity Academy School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Neocity Academy

195 NEOCITY WAY, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Osceola County School Board on 10/10/2023.

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.

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, 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
Ullmann, Julia	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule Standardized Assessments Advanced Placement Assessments Professional Development Summer Instructional Programs Master Calendar Collaborative Teams/PLCs After-School Programs & Extracurriculars Coordinate Clubs & Organizations Threat Assessment Process DOE Data Validation & Grade Reporting Advanced Placement & Capstone (Curriculum) MTSS Team Member Serve as Local Education Agency Representative, When Necessary Other Duties as Assigned
Jasmin, Kristina	Assistant Principal	Student Admissions Advisory Program New Teacher Onboarding & Support Professional Development Student Discipline Attendance Interventions Positive Behavior Supports & Interventions Collaborative Teams/PLCs Student Transportation Facilities Graduation MTSS Team Member Serve as a Local Education Agency Representative, When Necessary Other Duties as Assigned
Motta, Jonathan	Other	Coordinate & Support the Implementation of Bulb Digital Portfolios Coordinate & Build Capacity for Student Internships Coordinate the Individual Learning Plan MTSS System Coordinate the Presentation of Learning Coordinate Research Interventions Coordinate any Student Exhibitions of Work Coordinate Freshmen Orientation Programs Coordinate Program of Study Advisory Boards Proctor Standardized Assessments, When Necessary MTSS Team Lead Serve as Local Education Agency Representative, When Necessary Supervise Students on Campus Other Duties as Assigned

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ponzoa, Yvette	Principal	Schoolwide Operations Strategic School Improvement School Budget and Finances Recruitment, Hiring and Retention Professional Development Students with Disabilities (IEPs & Section 504) Gifted Education Collaborative Teams/PLCs Graduation Data & At-Risk Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Emergency Management Plans Community Relations & Partnerships University & Industry Partnerships Other Duties as Assigned
Rodriguez Lugo, Veronica	Dean	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 Coordinate Positive Behavior Supports & Interventions Coordinate Emergency Drills Coordinate Student Discipline MTSS Team Member Serve as Local Education Agency Representative, When Necessary Supervise Students on Campus Other Duties as Assigned

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.

The process of SIP development includes a review of relevant data (Including student achievement, state assessments, climate and culture surveys, and internal monitoring tools), with input from the school administration team, and the school advisory council. The leadership team (principal, assistant principals, data and assessments coordinator, and experiential learning coordinator) reviewed assessment data, graduation data, discipline and attendance, and results of teacher and student surveys to determine the instructional priorities for the upcoming school year. With input from the district leadership, the SIP was refined and formulated. SIP is brought forward before SAC consisting of parents, teachers, students, and community members to elicit their feedback and suggestions. Ultimately SIP is approved by the SAC during the initial yearly meeting. Community involvement in the school's decision-making and academic goals is evident in partnership with NeoCity organizations and

companies such as BRIDGE and IMEC. Parents's involvement and input in the SIP is done through a collaborative MTSS process where the MTSS coach coordinates the interventions and supports with the academic team and parents/caretakers.

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))

SIP progress will be monitored through monthly MTSS and stocktake meetings. During the MTSS meetings, the MTSS coach reviews students' academic progress, involves parents, teachers, and the guidance team and adjusts the interventions and supports to students in all tiers. Based on the outcomes of the MTSS meetings, adjustments to the SIP will be made to align with the improvement goals, such as the level of interventions. Stocktake meetings occur monthly (the second Thursday of the month). The stocktake team consists of the principal, two assistant principals, the data and assessment coordinator/ dean, an ESE/gifted support teacher, and the experiential learning coordinator. During the monthly meeting, the school improvement areas and goals are reviewed, including the progress and all relevant data. Leadership team members report on the progress of their assigned areas and present a problem of practice if there is one. If needed, SIP is revised based on the assessment data (such as progress monitoring or STAR).

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	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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)	English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A

School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

The "Grade Level" label spans columns K through 8.

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*	97	46	50	95	45	51	94		
ELA Learning Gains				74			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				86			82		
Math Achievement*	100	27	38	86	37	38	95		
Math Learning Gains				57			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			75		
Science Achievement*		63	64	90	32	40			
Social Studies Achievement*		61	66		39	48			
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	100	86	89		54	61			
College and Career Acceleration	95	60	65		60	67			
ELP Progress		46	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](link).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	98
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	555
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

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				
ELL	100			
AMI				
ASN	100			
BLK	100			
HSP	98			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	97			

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%
FRL	97			

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				
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	88			
HSP	79			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	77			

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	97			100						100	95	
SWD												
ELL	100			100							2	
AMI												
ASN	100										1	
BLK	100										1	
HSP	99			100						94	4	
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	94			100						94	4	
FRL	97			100						91	4	

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	95	74	86	86	57	67	90					
SWD												
ELL	80	47										
AMI												
ASN	100	83										
BLK	100	76										
HSP	95	72	82	92	52							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	94	74	86	78	61							
FRL	91	71	79	88	57							

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	94	71	82	95	60	75						
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	100	71										
BLK	93	79										
HSP	94	75	83	93	54							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	94	70	86	94	64							
FRL	88	67	78	94	60							

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	95%	47%	48%	50%	45%
09	2023 - Spring	99%	43%	56%	48%	51%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	36%	64%	48%	52%

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

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.

Based on the 2022-23 school data the lowest component was ELA achievement in grade 10 - 95.2% (5 students didn't pass PM 3 out of 104).
Several factors contributed to last year's low performance. One factor is behavior issues and discipline of the students who did not pass PM3. Another factor is students' attendance in interventions (which we call "research period"). Students were not consistently attending the interventions when directed by the teacher and MTSS coach. Another contributing factor is that 3 out of 5 students who did not pass PM3 also received low scores on the previous year's FSA. Since PM3 in April/May of 2023, 2 students who did not pass PM3 met their graduation requirement via concordant score by taking and passing the SAT assessment.

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

Compared to the previous school year date, all components showed an incline. State-tested areas include ELA grade 9, ELA grade 10, and geometry. In comparison, the achievement on ELA 9 and ELA 10 in 2021-22 was 84.6% compared to the 2022-23 ELA grade 9 achievement 99%, and ELA grade 10 achievement of 95.2%. When comparing math achievement (geometry), 2021-22 achievement was 85.7%, and for the school year 2022-23, geometry achievement was 100%.

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.

Based on the school year 2021-22 FLDOE school report card, NeoCity Academy exceeds state and national achievement averages in all subject areas.

ELA - state achievement - 53.2%, NeoCity Academy - 84.6%
Mathematics - state achievement - 53.1%, NeoCity Academy - 85.7%.
Acceleration - state 74%, NeoCity Academy - 100%

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

The mathematics (Geometry) achievement component of the school data showed the most improvement. In the 2021-22 school year, the achievement was 85.7%. In comparison, in the 2022-23 school year geometry achievement was 100%. Some of the actions that the school took in the area of math achievement included the change in the math department (replacing the geometry teacher), adding 'Journey to calculus' remediation for all incoming 9-graders and other students who show the need for math remediations, and more targeted interventions during the research period.

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

One potential area of concern for the 2023-24 school year is ELA achievement in grades 9 and 10. Due to the new teachers in both grade levels, and one of them in the first year of teaching, there might be areas of deficiency to address student needs and prepare them for FAST testing. Another concern for ELA achievement is the initial level of students identified at PM1. With the high scores in the beginning of the school year the capacity to maintain the proficiency levels is limited.

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

Our highest priorities for the school year 2023-24 include:
Equitable Grading Practices
Inquiry-Driven Teaching and Learning
Acceleration opportunities through CTE and AP testing

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 Intervention

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.

Currently, the intervention process which is mostly done during the research period lacks structure. It was designed to be used for academic purposes, both enrichment and remediation, directed by teachers but with student autonomy. For the upcoming school year (2023-24) the focus of interventions will be on ELA in both grades 9 and 10 based on the progress monitoring 1 data.
PM1 grade 9 data - achievement distribution 2%/12%/24%/35%/28%.
PM1 grade 10 data - achievement distribution 4%/16%/16%/37%/27%.
When looking at student counts, in grade 9 - out of 116 students, 17 scored level 1 and 2 on PM1, in grade 10 - out of 110 students 22 scored level 1 and 2. These 39 students will be placed in MTSS for reading intervention.
Additionally, 3 students in grade 11 did not meet their ELA reading graduation requirements. A contributing factor to the area of focus is the fact that both ELA 9 and 10 teachers are new to school or to teaching.

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

Based on PM1, ELA support will be provided in research (levels 1 and 2). The goal is to have 100 of students in grades 9 and 10 score proficient in ELA FAST progress monitoring 3.

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

The goal will be monitored through the following:
MTSS process (monthly meetings)
State assessments (PM2, Star)
iObservations/Nest/inquiry-based tool (when administrators observe teachers and research periods)
Educlimber
Stocktake monthly meetings and data review.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan Motta (jonathan.motta@osceolaschools.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.)

During the research period (interventions), students will receive support in a small group setting.

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

Findings suggested a moderate overall effect for small-group reading interventions (weighted g = 0.54). Interventions were more effective if they were targeted to a specific skill (g = 0.65), then as part of a comprehensive intervention program that addressed multiple skills (g = 0.35). There was a small correlation between intervention effects and group size (r = 0.21) and duration (r = 0.11). Small-group interventions led to a larger median effect size (g = 0.64) for elementary-aged students than for those in middle or high school (g = 0.20), but the two confidence intervals overlapped. (Matthew S. Hall, Matthew K. Burns, Meta-analysis of targeted small-group reading interventions, Journal of School Psychology,

Volume 66, 2018, Pages 54-66,
ISSN 0022-4405, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2017.11.002.)

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.

Review previous /current year data

Person Responsible: Jonathan Motta (jonathan.motta@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Teachers developed and got approved department remediation/support/research plan

Person Responsible: Yvette Ponzoa (yvette.ponzoa@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Research interventions 6-8 weeks cycles following ELA testing schedule - PM1, STAR, PM2, STAR, PM3.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Motta (jonathan.motta@osceolaschools.net)

By When: PM1 - September 21-31 STAR - October 16-19 PM2 - December 4-15 STAR - March 1-7 PM3 - May 2-3

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

The area of focus is developing teacher leadership potential. The data is based on teacher surveys and Panorama. Based on the October 2022 Insight Survey - 64% of the teachers stated that "The teacher evaluation process helps identify my strengths and weaknesses:" and 64% of teachers stated that " In the past six months, I have practiced teaching techniques with a peer or instructional expert outside my own classroom".

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

The outcomes for this area of focus will include maintaining high scores on the Insight survey (above 80%) by the time the Insight survey is administered, and improve the lowest scores (64%) to the 80% or above by May of 2024.

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

The area of focus will be monitored through the following:
One-on-one meetings (check-ins) with teachers conducted twice per quarter (by administration)
Teacher feedback form (internally created)
Teacher survey/panorama
Follow-up questions from the Insight Survey

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julia Ullmann (julia.ullmann@osceolaschools.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.)

Increasing teacher leadership opportunities within the School Leadership Team to refine PLT processes and school-wide inquiry practices and SBG (standards-based grading).
Providing teachers with leadership opportunities can improve teacher motivation and ownership in our systems. In addition, it can build teachers' confidence in their own abilities and teach them to motivate, lead, and encourage their teacher peers.
We will review and revise the PLT process with the refocusing of staff training.

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

We have worked purposefully to include our teachers in developing and implementing 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).

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

<table>
<tr><td>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.</td></tr>
</table>

Conduct an internal assessment of professional development needs and leadership interest

Person Responsible: Kristina Jasmin (kristina.jasmin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September, 2023

Recruit teacher leaders for the 23-24 leadership cohort. Teacher-leader selection is focused on selecting a balance of visionaries and strong instructional practitioners.

Person Responsible: Kristina Jasmin (kristina.jasmin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October, 2023

Teacher leaders develop and lead professional development based on strategies that are identified as exemplars in our classrooms

Person Responsible: Kristina Jasmin (kristina.jasmin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Every 9 weeks starting in October 2023.

Develop strategy walks to provide exemplars of effective instructional strategies.

Person Responsible: Kristina Jasmin (kristina.jasmin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Third 9 weeks.