

Polk County Public Schools

Navigator Academy Of Leadership Davenport



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Navigator Academy Of Leadership Davenport

495 HOLLY HILL RD, Davenport, FL 33837

<http://navigatoracademypolk.com>

Demographics

Principal: Valeria Blandino

Start Date for this Principal: 7/8/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	38%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Navigator Academy Of Leadership Davenport

495 HOLLY HILL RD, Davenport, FL 33837

<http://navigatoracademypolk.com>

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)
Combination School KG-8	No	16%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	80%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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 Navigator Academy of Leadership K-8 is to enable students to be independent learners and leaders by developing each child's intellectual curiosity and thirst for discovery through a cross-curricular integration of Science, Math, Art, Reading and Technology. By nurturing their minds to be SMART critical thinkers and problem solvers, our students will be well-rounded CEOs of their own learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Navigator Academy of Leadership K-8 will develop life-long learners through a relevant and engaging cross-curricular approach to Science, Math, Art, Reading and Technology. Our SMART focus, coupled with a narrowed focus on advanced leadership skills, will allow students to acquire content knowledge as well as the necessary skills to ensure college and career readiness.

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
Ward, Tiffany	Principal	Staffing the school with certified and qualified teachers and staff. Working with parents, community partners, and stakeholders. Oversee the instructional program and analyze data to drive instruction and interventions. Track ongoing progress towards student achievement. Provide feedback on lessons in an effort to professionally develop teachers. Work with the Governing Board. Manage the day to day operations of the school. Responsible for developing and maintaining a positive school culture
Shoupe, Lori	Assistant Principal	Oversee school discipline taking on a proactive and reflective approach to student behavior. Implement student recognition programs. Track data collected for Tier 1, 2 and 3 to help teachers with data chats. Work with ESE teachers to help with MTSS process for students needing evaluations. Working with parents, community partners, and stakeholders. Oversee the instructional program and analyze data to drive instruction and interventions. Track ongoing progress towards student achievement. Provide feedback on lessons and lesson plans in an effort to professionally develop teachers.
Branneky, Brindy	Instructional Coach	Maintain a constant and consistent coaching cycle with teachers to provide a feedback loop. Model lessons and instructional strategies. Assist and host professional development for teachers. Assist with overseeing the instructional program and analyze data to drive instruction and interventions. Assist in tracking ongoing progress towards student achievement. Provide feedback on lessons and lesson plans in an effort to professionally develop teachers.

Demographic Information**Principal start date**

Monday 7/8/2019, Valeria Blandino

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.*

8

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

41

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	38%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	

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 .	

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	123	82	72	98	86	89	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	660
Attendance below 90 percent	19	8	5	11	6	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	2	3	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	1	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	6	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
December iReady 2019 Reading Data	66	55	44	37	49	49	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	373
December iReady 2019 Math Data	85	65	48	70	58	53	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	441

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	3	4	3	10	11	13	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/24/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA or Math	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	

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		

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

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	0%	61%	61%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	54%	0%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	61%	62%	0%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	52%	0%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	52%	56%	0%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	79%	78%	0%	68%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
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					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
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
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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	

Subgroup Data

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.

Using the December iReady Data, 41% of our students were below grade level in vocabulary. In addition to this, 59% of our students were below grade level in their reading foundational skills (Phonics, Phonological Awareness and High Frequency Words). Math iReady December Data showed that 72% of our students are below grade level in Math. 68% of students are deficient in Numbers and Operations and 72% are deficient in geometry. We feel that some of the contributing factors include that we have a large ESOL population and that many of our students have come to us lacking in foundational skills and fluency in both Reading and Math.

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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

Using iReady ongoing data for Reading instructional lessons, 76% of our students passed their reading lessons with at least 70% proficiency. Using iReady ongoing data for Math instructional lessons, 85% of our students passed their reading lessons with at least 70% proficiency. We implemented in-class Tier 2 interventions for students performing below grade level in Reading and Math and used our curriculum resources to help differentiate instruction. ESOL students were pulled out weekly to assist in English language development in vocabulary, foundational reading skills, and conversational English. We provided after school tutoring to our lowest performing students. Data from our ELA unit tests and Math topic tests from our curriculum were tracked to evaluate lessons, instruction, and student mastery of concepts. Finally, 45 minutes of weekly iReady instructional lessons was implemented and incentives were put in place to encourage children to go beyond the 45 minutes a week to help fill in learning gaps in Reading and Math.

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

We have a large ELL and ESE population that need additional instructional interventions and support to close the achievement gap and demonstrate learning gains.

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

1. Increase percent of students at or above grade level in Reading
2. Increase percent of students at or above grade level in Math
3. Increase ESOL students English language acquisition

4. Increase ESE students making learning gains.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: All students will receive standards-based instruction to increase student achievement in all core content areas. Using a hands-on approach, students will experience rigor and relevance in core lessons aligned to grade level standards. Through differentiated instruction, we will also be able to address their individual needs through remediation and enrichment. Our 2019 iReady data did show significant learning gaps in Reading and Math, especially in the foundational skills. We need to simultaneously close the gap while teaching grade level standards through the use of DI and interventions.

Measurable Outcome: As a result of our instructional approach aligned to standards-based instruction, at least 51% of our students will earn a level 3 or higher in the Reading and at least a 50% in the Math 2021 FSA and at least 56% will earn a level 3 or higher in the Science FCAT and Civics EOC. Our subgroups will demonstrate the most growth as evidenced by FSA learning gains in Reading and Math, especially students in the bottom quartile. We will monitor our students through ongoing formative assessments built into our curriculum as well as RTI data for tiered instructional groups and iReady diagnostic assessments that will take place 3 time during the school year. iReady diagnostic assessments will help track progress and growth and provide data on projected proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Ward (tiffany.ward@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: From the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year, we will have a system for tracking assessment and data so that we can continuously address the instructional needs of students and fill in any learning gap. Tier 1 (all students) will have their ELA Unit assessments and Math Topic Assessments tracked using a google sheet. All students will take the iReady Diagnostic Assessment to help us identify areas of strength and weakness in Reading and Math skills. Using this, we will develop interventions and tiered instructions. Students in Tier 2 will be pulled into small groups and interventions provided using resources for our curriculum. This data will be tracked for Tier 2 students at least once every two weeks. Tier 3 students will receive the same intervention as Tier 2 and will also have additional iReady lessons and growth monitoring weekly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Given our large ESOL and ESE population and the fact that many of our students have come to us lacking the basic skills, ongoing progress monitoring of all students is essential in properly aligning instructions to standards and student needs. In addition to this, tracking data will help us further develop our teachers professionally to help them with standards-based instruction, remediation and enrichment.

Action Steps to Implement

Ongoing classroom walkthroughs and observations with feedback provided to the teacher

Person Responsible Tiffany Ward (tiffany.ward@polk-fl.net)

Coaching teachers on instructional strategies and interventions, monitoring pacing guides and lessons, and providing feedback to teachers. Developing rigorous instruction in the classroom

Person Responsible Brindy Branneky (brindy.branneky@polk-fl.net)

Review and track data and have data chats with teachers. Ensure that data chats are being held with students.

Person Responsible Lori Shoupe (lori.smith@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We have a large population of ELL students. Many students are still developing as English Language Learners and struggle to read and comprehend grade level material. Even some students who have exited the ESOL program still struggle with comprehension of grade level material.

Measurable Outcome: As a result of differentiated instruction, implementation of ESOL accommodations, and ESOL pull-out interventions, at least 60% of our ELL students will demonstrate and increase in English Language Proficiency as demonstrated by the Spring 2021 WIDA. In addition, at least 50% of our ELL students will demonstrate learning gains in the ELA 2021 FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lori Shoupe (lori.smith@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: ELL students are at a disadvantage as lessons are at grade level and standards-based. These students need additional support to fill in learning gaps, especially those created by their limited English proficiency. Therefore, ELL students will be pulled by a certified ELL teacher at least 1 time a week for 45 minutes for ELL interventions using research-based curriculum which includes progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Specific and intentional instruction and interventions focused on foundational reading skills which include explicit instruction in phonics, word study, vocabulary and high frequency words will facilitate students in their English language acquisition.

Action Steps to Implement

ELL teacher will pull each ELL student for a minimum of 45 minutes a week for explicit instruction in phonics, word study, vocabulary and high frequency words using resources and research-based intervention material. A log will be kept and maintained to document these interventions and data will be maintained for these students to track progress using intervention curriculum.

Person Responsible Lori Shoupe (lori.smith@polk-fl.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus	We have a large population of students with disabilities. So much so that we have hired 2 full-time ESE teachers to service our SWD. Many of our SWD struggle to read, comprehend, write, and compute grade level material.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of differentiated instruction, implementation of ESE accommodations, and ESE push-in services, at least 60% of our ESE students will meet their goals as demonstrated on their IEP. In addition, at least 40% of our ESE students will demonstrate learning gains in the ELA and Math 2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Ward (tiffany.ward@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ESE students are at a disadvantage as lessons are at grade level and standards-based. These students need additional support to fill in learning gaps, especially those that are a result of their disability. Therefore, ELL students will receive small group instruction and additional instructional support by certified ESE teachers with the frequency delineated on their IEP.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We believe that an inclusionary approach with push-in ESE services and support is the most effective way of helping students with grade level standards-based mastery while helping fill in the learning gap. Many times, ESE students benefit from smaller group instruction as well as closer monitoring and support. This is achieved by our push-in schedule for support facilitation as required on their IEP will help support ESE students by closing the gap and increasing student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

ESE teacher will pull each ESE student into a small group inside the classroom and/or reduce the teacher-student ratio for whole group and small group lessons. A log will be kept and maintained to document these ESE services and data will be maintained for these students to track progress towards student achievement and progress towards meeting their IEP goals.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will have a more proactive approach with monitoring attendance to ensure that support and interventions are in place to help decrease truancy and attendance issues as it adversely effects student learning and achievement. We will carefully track retained students as well as students in Tier 3 and quickly begin the MTSS process.

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.

Navigator Academy of Leadership Davenport works closely with the City of Davenport and Haines City and have built multiple business partnerships in the local community. Our culture begins with our philosophy and implementation of the Leader in Me where we infuse the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People throughout our instructional program and curriculum. We believe that all children have an inner gift and it is in collaboration with parents that we can help a child develop academically, emotionally, and socially. We empower our students to make right choices, reflect, and adjust. We believe our parents are our biggest allies and we have many events where we include parents and families both during and after school.

Our teachers and staff are a key factor in the school's culture. We actively search for teachers that have a positive growth mindset. We work collaboratively with our teachers, offer professional development and coaching to improve instructional practice. We care for our teachers and invest in them both professionally and personally in order to establish this sense of family.

Finally, we assess and monitor our school culture through staff and family culture surveys throughout the year.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$20,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	690-Computer Software	8007 - Navigator Academy Of Leadership Davenport	General Fund		\$20,000.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of iReady Reading and Math Diagnostic as well as progress monitoring and instructional lessons.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	520-Textbooks	8007 - Navigator Academy Of Leadership Davenport	General Fund		\$500.00

			Notes: Reading REWARDS by Sopris West for grades 4-7 intensive reading intervention for ELL students includes workbooks and teacher editions.
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$20,500.00