

Collier County Public Schools

Naples Classical Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Naples Classical Academy

10270 IMMOKALEE RD, Naples, FL 34120

naplesclassical.org

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Collier County School Board on 8/16/2023.

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.

Our mission is to train the minds and improve the hearts of young people through a content-rich classical education in the liberal arts and sciences, with instruction in the principles of moral character and civic virtue.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to have a citizenry worthy of the legacy of our country's founders and the continuation of our American experiment, developed through a classical, great-books curriculum designed to engage the student in the highest matters and the deepest questions of truth, justice, virtue, and beauty.

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
Garcia, Ronald	Principal	<p>The head of school is the school's academic leader and lead teacher. His or her overarching role will be to maintain the integrity of the classical charter school's culture and effective learning environment. To accomplish this, the Head of School will administer and supervise every aspect of the school's daily instructional and academic functions and will set the example for all students, teachers, and staff to maintain a constant scholarly atmosphere of civility, trustworthiness, respect, and concern for one another.</p> <p>In addition, the Head of School will be responsible for the educational leadership of teachers and will understand, demonstrate the use of, and implement the school's curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment to maximize educational achievement for all students, and work collaboratively to ensure working and learning climate for all teachers and students that is safe, secure and respectful.</p> <p>The Head of School's essential duties and responsibilities are as follows:</p> <p>Leadership Implementing and actively modeling, promoting and nurturing the mission, vision and core virtues, providing reports regularly to Optima and the board of directors. Maintaining a school atmosphere of academic excellence, civility, trustworthiness, respect, fairness, and equality. Building collaborative relationships among faculty, staff, and families of the school.</p> <p>Instructional Planning, implementing, and evaluating the school instructional program based on the student needs, the curriculum guide and Florida Standards. Setting instructional priorities and goals. Ensuring alignment of curriculum with state standards. Reviewing teacher lesson plans and instruction to ensure compliance with standards, the school's mission, and the charter contract. Assuring that all academic components of the school's charter are being met.</p> <p>Administrative Recruiting high quality instructional faculty for the school as needed. Planning, implementing, supervising, and evaluating all other academic programs, i.e. extra-curricular and co-curricular. Determining staffing needs including selection, supervision, professional development and evaluation of school instructional personnel. Managing state assessment procedures and compliance. Ensuring the school is operating within the set instructional budget. Overseeing the proper academic record keeping processes. Maintaining records such as but not limited to student test scores, attendance records, overseeing IEPs, and all other reports as needed for efficient operation of the school and compliance with federal, state and local requirements. Enforcing the policies and procedures of the organization as set by Optima and the board of directors, including the student code of conduct. Developing and implementing school rules and regulations in keeping with the policies and procedures. Attending and participating in meetings of the board and its committees as</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	----------------	---------------------------------

requested.
 Maintaining knowledge of charter school laws and statutes.

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.

Development of the SIP involved Ms. Elizabeth Kirschner, Mr. Ronald Garcia, Ms. Amanda Davis, and the school's governing board.

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))

The principal and academic administrative team will implement, monitor and revise the plan as needed to ensure continuous improvement.

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)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	16%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* 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: C
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	3	26	17	6	8	8	7	12	14	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4	4	15
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	30	19	14	11	8	5	18	10	115
Course failure in Math	0	5	12	7	9	5	9	2	4	53
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	1	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	10

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	8	5	2	3	1	5	5	5	34

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

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

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 school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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*	64	58	53	64	62	55			
ELA Learning Gains				47					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39					
Math Achievement*	69	63	55	57	45	42			
Math Learning Gains				37					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39					
Science Achievement*	56	55	52	53	59	54			
Social Studies Achievement*	80	76	68	74	56	59			
Middle School Acceleration	42	62	70	56	51	51			
Graduation Rate		56	74		54	50			
College and Career Acceleration		63	53		73	70			
ELP Progress	53	58	55	17	66	70			

* 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](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	39	Yes	2	
ELL	38	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	65			
HSP	55			
MUL	96			
PAC				
WHT	64			

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	58			

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	33	Yes	1	
ELL	26	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	49			

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	64			69			56	80	42			53
SWD	34			38			22	60			4	
ELL	24			41			31				5	53
AMI												
ASN	64			80							2	
BLK	67			63			64				3	
HSP	53			57			51	64			6	64
MUL	100			92							2	

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	68			76			58	90	45		7	30
FRL	51			60			55	64			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	64	47	39	57	37	39	53	74	56			17
SWD	35	34	30	38	33	38	21					
ELL	29	30	31	19	28	18	33					17
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	38		50	38							
HSP	58	50	43	42	36	35	51	75	38			
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67	45	37	65	36	40	57	75	68			
FRL	60	48	40	46	34	42	56	63	48			

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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	56%	52%	4%	50%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	71%	60%	11%	54%	17%
07	2023 - Spring	68%	52%	16%	47%	21%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	47%	2%	47%	2%
09	2023 - Spring	64%	50%	14%	48%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	65%	-5%	58%	2%
06	2023 - Spring	65%	51%	14%	47%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	56%	13%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	69%	70%	-1%	54%	15%
07	2023 - Spring	74%	75%	-1%	48%	26%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	67%	4%	59%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	74%	7%	61%	20%
08	2023 - Spring	75%	52%	23%	55%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	70%	5%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	42%	45%	-3%	44%	-2%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	62%	-9%	51%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	59%	8%	50%	17%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	54%	61%	-7%	48%	6%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	69%	12%	63%	18%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	68%	14%	66%	16%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	66%	-1%	63%	2%

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.

Both ELL and ESE students performed below the 41% Federal Index. ELL is the lowest (26). This is due to NCA being a first year school and students and teachers adjusting to the new curricula.

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

NA - new school

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.

ELL had the greatest gap. This is due to NCA being a first year school and students and teachers adjusting to the new curricula. Also, the majority of these students came to NCA below grade level.

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

NA - new school

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

1. 115 Course failures in ELA
2. 101 students missing more than 10%

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

1. ELL
2. ESE

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

Based on FY22 FSA data, the ESE and ELL subgroups are below 41% in ELA and Math. The OVERALL Federal Index – All Students was 48%, while ESE was 33% and ELL 26%. Both subgroups will meet the minimum of 42% FY23.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in the ESE subgroup will increase in ELA proficiency by 9% and ELL will increase by 16%.

Monitoring:

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

Instructional coaches, deans and the head of school will monitor during walkthroughs and formal and informal observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ronald Garcia (garcir18@collierschools.com)

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.)

The use of evidence-based engagement strategies (scaffolding and explicit, systemic instruction) will be embedded in professional development for Singapore Math and Access Literacy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows engagement is correlated with academic success. With ESE and ELL students performing below 41% in both reading and math, it appears that engagement could be an issue. With NCA being a new school, there are additional reasons academic scores would be lower than normal (teachers and students learning new curricula, etc), but engagement plays a significant part.

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.

No description entered

Person Responsible: Ronald Garcia (garcir18@collierschools.com)

By When: The scores should increase by the 22-23 school year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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 academic program will introduce and seek to instill virtues of character in the lower grades through these pillars of character education: responsibility, respect, courage, courtesy, honesty and citizenship. Instruction in the classical virtues (prudence, justice, temperance, and fortitude) will be introduced in the upper grades as a continuance of the elementary character program and a necessary support of the classical curriculum.

While schools should always have the worthy goal of improving student learning outcomes and concrete methods of self-evaluation, NCA believes the greater goal is to produce students who communicate effectively, are virtuous, possess cultural literacy, and are active and productive members of American society. In order to accomplish this valuable goal, we utilize a carefully selected curriculum and time-honored instructional methods that may not fit the standard definition of “innovative”, but whose results speak volumes. These methods are the cornerstone of classical education and support mastery of the State Standards. Naples Classical Academy will emphasize an education in the humanities, the sciences, and the arts in several current and research-based curricula and programs, and incorporate methods and features which will serve students well throughout their lives, during their K-12 years and beyond.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school will achieve an overall satisfaction rating of a minimum of 80% for each group of participants - parents, students and faculty.

Monitoring:

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

Academic administrators will monitor the culture through walk throughs, classroom observations, and student, parent and faculty survey data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ronald Garcia (garcir18@collierschools.com)

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.)

The academic program will introduce and seek to instill virtues of character in the lower grades through these pillars of character education: responsibility, respect, courage, courtesy, honesty and citizenship. Instruction in the classical virtues (prudence, justice, temperance, and fortitude) will be introduced in the upper grades as a continuance of the elementary character program and a necessary support of the classical curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Interventions are consistent with the school's charter application and mission.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Any funds received for school improvement will include review by school administration for allocation to specific areas according to interventions detailed on the SIP.