

Polk County Public Schools

Navigator Academy Of Leadership Davenport



2022-23 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	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Navigator Academy Of Leadership Davenport

495 HOLLY HILL RD, Davenport, FL 33837

<http://navigatoracademypolk.com>

Demographics

Principal: Valeria Blandino

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

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	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	38%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	88%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21
Grade	C	

School Board Approval

N/A

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

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Blandino, Valeria	Principal	Principal will serve to create a positive school culture by engaging staff, building capacity, empowering teacher leaders, and celebrating success; while increasing student achievement through the disaggregation of data, purposeful data-driven decision making and collaboration towards the implementation of effective instructional strategies, curricular resources and innovative programs
Suarez, Ivelissa	Dean	The Dean will serve to create a positive school culture by engaging staff, building capacity, empowering teacher leaders, and celebrating success; while increasing student achievement through the disaggregation of data, purposeful data-driven decision making and collaboration towards the implementation of effective instructional strategies, curricular resources and innovative programs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Valeria Blandino

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

882

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

28

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

20

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	85	105	116	93	75	113	111	86	0	0	0	0	880
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	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	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	10	22	34	26	29	0	0	0	0	152
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	32	16	33	37	25	31	0	0	0	0	174
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	10	15	16	8	15	26	22	0	0	0	0	117

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/25/2022

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	109	124	92	73	86	83	90	100	0	0	0	0	0	757
Attendance below 90 percent	18	21	20	7	16	15	42	42	0	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	1	7	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	12	12	14	24	39	43	0	0	0	0	0	148

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	3	3	13	10	11	13	28	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	1	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	109	124	92	73	86	83	90	100	0	0	0	0	0	757
Attendance below 90 percent	18	21	20	7	16	15	42	42	0	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	1	7	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	12	12	14	24	39	43	0	0	0	0	0	148

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	3	3	13	10	11	13	28	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	1	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	51%	55%					61%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	49%							58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%							49%	54%
Math Achievement	44%	37%	42%					61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	59%							56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%							52%	52%
Science Achievement	33%	48%	54%					52%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	53%	59%					79%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	44	46	17	55	54		17			
ELL	33	46	37	35	51	40	25	43			
BLK	38	39	45	37	63						
HSP	44	50	46	43	59	53	35	57	50		
MUL	62	50		42							
WHT	53	50	50	53	61	53	39	80			
FRL	37	42	32	31	52	56	22	36			
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
SWD	8	37	50	9	9	5					
ELL	31	39	44	21	21	25	11	21			
BLK	15	23		23	30						
HSP	42	35	43	31	19	22	24	32			
MUL	54			38							
WHT	50	40	40	42	21		38	45			
FRL	34	39	50	23	15	6	30	27			
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	507
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	51
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

The 2022 Math data showed that the Math Learning Gains increased 37 percentage points and Math Learning Gains for the L25 showed an increase of 34 percentage points from 2021 to 2022. In ELA there was an increase of 5 percentage points in proficiency. ELA 2021 was 41 percent proficient compared to ELA 2022 with 46% of the students in grades 3-5 proficient. ELA overall Learning Gains increased from 34% in 2021 to 49% in 2022; showing an increase of 15 percentage points in ELA Learning Gains. Additionally, ELA Learning Gains for the L25 increased by 3 percentage points. In 2021, ELA Learning gains for the L25 was 43% compared to 46% in 2022. In Science there was an increase of 8 percentage points from 2021 with 25 percent proficient to 2022 with 33 percent proficient.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the 2022 state assessment results ELA proficiency, ELA Learning Gains, ELA Learning Gains in the L25 and Science proficiency are in need of improvement.

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

Contributing factors to this need for improvement include the influx of new students throughout the school year, attendance patterns and students who were on virtual learning during the 2020-2021 school year. Actions to be taken to address this need for improvement include a Parent Orientation Meeting for the parents of the ELL and L25 students. Attendance meetings with parents of students who are consistently absent. In addition to providing extended learning opportunities starting in the Fall of 2022.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data from 2022 state assessments that showed the most improvement is overall Math Learning Gains and Math Learning gains for the L25.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement included data chats, data driven instruction, Math tutoring in 4th-8th grade, targeted i-Ready lessons, strategic planning for Differentiated Instruction. A new action for the 2021-2022 school year that resulted in an improvement in overall Math Learning Gains and Math Learning Gains for the L25 was having the students in school face-to-face allowing for Differentiated Instruction and hands-on learning opportunities.

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

Strategies that will be implemented in order to accelerate learning will include additional push-in support in Math and ELA classrooms, Differentiated Instruction and increase in technology integration 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.

Professional Development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders will include B.E.S.T. Standards for Mathematics, B.E.S.T. Standards for ELA, PD refreshers in i-Ready and new i-Ready resources for ELA and Math.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the coming years will include extended learning opportunities for students, Data chats with teachers and students, create spaces for teachers to share ideas to collaborate in learning and best practices, and parent orientation meetings to build parent capacity.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

After reviewing the 2022 state assessment data; ELA Proficiency in grades 3-8 increased 5 percentage points in 2022 to 46% compared to 41% in 2021. ELA L25 is critical and in need of improvement because there was only an increase of 15 percentage points in 2022 to 49% from 46% in 2021.

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

Standards-aligned instruction using the Florida's B.E.S.T. standards will increase student proficiency in the 2023 F.A.S.T. ELA Assessment.

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

The Administrative Team will monitor the data from F.A.S.T. PM1 and PM2, monitor ELA bi-weekly assessments, conduct Data Chats, attend Common Planning sessions to discuss needs, provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention and tutoring as needed. Student data will be monitored using report groups in i-Ready.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Valeria Blandino (valeria.blandino@navigatoracademy.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Florida's B.E.S.T. standards will be implemented and aligned with student PM1 and PM2 data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

9/1/22-10/11/22: Administering Assessments and analyzing data in a timely manner.

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.

9/1/22-10/11/22: Teachers will provide students with corrective feedback after the administration of assessments (student data chats).

Person Responsible

Valeria Blandino (valeria.blandino@navigatoracademy.com)

9/1/22-10/11/22: Common Planning will be embedded in the Master Schedule to provide teachers time to collaborate, analyze data and develop appropriate lessons.

Person Responsible

Ivelissa Suarez (ivelisse.suarez@navigatoracademy.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

After reviewing the 2022 state assessment data, it was determined that ELA is critical and in need of improvement because there was a small gain of 5 percentage points in proficiency compared to 2021 at 46%. The 2021 ELA L25 increased to 49% in 2022 from 34% in 2021. The small increase in proficiency and the new implementation of the Florida's B.E.S.T. standards shows a need for review and professional development in the Florida's B.E.S.T. standards.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

Standards-aligned instruction using the Florida's B.E.S.T. standards in ELA and Math will increase student proficiency on the 2023 F.A.S.T. ELA Assessment in 2023.

Monitoring:

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

The Administrative Team will provide PD on the Florida's B.E.S.T. standards, monitor the data from F.A.S.T. PM1 and PM2, monitor ELA bi-weekly assessments, Math Topic Assessments, conduct Data Chats, attend Common Planning sessions to discuss needs, provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention and tutoring as needed. Student data will be monitored using report groups in i-Ready.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Valeria Blandino (valeria.blandino@navigatoracademy.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Florida's B.E.S.T. standards will be implemented and aligned with student PM1 and PM2 data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Standards-Aligned Instruction in ELA using the Florida's B.E.S.T. standards combined with collaborative data chats and analysis of data from F.A.S.T. PM1 and PM2, i-Ready diagnostics AP1 and AP2, i-Ready progress monitoring, ELA Bi-weekly assessments and Progress Monitoring

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.

9/1/22-10/11/22 Provide in-house Professional Development to teachers in Kindergarten through 8th grade in the Florida's B.E.S.T. standards.

Person Responsible Ivelissa Suarez (ivelisse.suarez@navigatoracademy.com)

9/1/22-10/11/22--The Administrative Team will conduct walkthroughs daily to monitor class instruction, differentiate instruction and Intervention. During the walkthroughs the Administrative Team will be looking for the implementation of the Florida's B.E.S.T. standards.

Person Responsible Valeria Blandino (valeria.blandino@navigatoracademy.com)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Students in grades K-2 have differentiated instruction time each day during the reading block. Students will meet with the teacher in a small group 2-3 times a week to focus on reading proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Students in grades 3-5 have differentiated instruction time each day during the reading block. Students will meet with the teacher in a small group 2-3 times a week to focus on reading proficiency.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, the measurable outcomes the school plans to achieve for grades K-2 is 55% in ELA.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Using the new FAST assessment systems, the measurable outcomes the school plans to achieve for grades 3-5 is 55% in ELA.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

We will work to increase teacher use of differentiated instruction in the classroom. Teachers will track small group instruction using rotation schedules, data charts and student work folders. We will progressively continue providing teachers with consistent practice with differentiated instruction strategies through professional development.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Blandino, Valeria, valeria.blandino@navigatoracademy.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Gradual Release of Instruction will be used during implementation of curriculum to create student autonomy and efficacy. This will offer students an opportunity to transfer understanding of a subject and synthesis information.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Based on the data only 45% of students in grades 3-5 are proficient in reading.

Research has proven that students need to take ownership in their learning; they will learn through guided practice or help but eventually need to work at mastering ideas and skills on their own which is the basis of this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

Instructional Coaching: In-class modeling by the coaches to train and support teachers' understanding of how to provide appropriate instructional interventions to build students' reading comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, and writing skills.

Blandino, Valeria,
valeria.blandino@navigatoracademy.com

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Our Strengths within School Culture are Relationships, Physical & Emotional Safety and Support, Care and Connections. Our school creates experiences throughout the year to engage with parents and families and ensures they have the necessary information to support their children. Students are supported academically through interventions, differentiated instruction and tutoring opportunities. Students receive emotional/social support through individual and group counseling.

Staff are provided opportunities to take part in activities, shared leadership, collaboration and come together to share celebrations of success. We provide opportunities to both staff and students for ongoing feedback and suggestions to school leaders and we schedule informal conferences with staff and students to garner information about their educational/professional experience at our school. We also ensure information is provided to all stakeholder our Teams page for staff set up by department to connect with one another consistently. We continue to build our skill-set in ensuring our classrooms are highly engaging and foster the highest level of engagement and learning.

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

The stakeholders involved in building a positive school culture and environment are the Principal, Dean of Students, Teachers and Counselor. The principal's role is to monitor and oversee all the school's initiatives and respond to concerns with morale by planning Team-building and morale boosting activities. The Assistant Principals will monitor the programs and assist in ensuring all information is shared with stakeholders in a timely manner. Grade Level chairs assist in providing information to all stakeholders in their grade levels. All stakeholders are responsible for making specific efforts to connect and build relationships with students, parents and families.