

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Navigator Academy Of Leadership Valrico School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Navigator Academy Of Leadership Valrico

1101 E BLOOMINGDALE AVE, Valrico, FL 33596

[no web address on file]

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.

Navigator Academy of Leadership aims to help students become 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 learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a welcoming environment where every student is empowered and inspired to develop agency over learning. Our goal is to create educational studies in a safe and nurturing environment that will include inquiry and exploration.

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
Guertin, Bonnie	Principal	The 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 toward the implementation of effective instructional strategies, curricular resources, and innovative programs.
Blaxton, Danielle	Assistant Principal	The assistant 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.

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.

In July 2022, board members convened for the summer retreat held in Orlando, Florida. The retreat served as an occasion for all stakeholders to engage in the process of ongoing enhancement actively. Participants included Governing authority members, administration, management, teachers, parents, and the relationship manager, all of whom collaborated to uphold Navigator's priorities and propel the drive

for continuous improvement.

A primary focus during this period was directed toward our data-related initiatives. During these deliberations, the team meticulously scrutinized data and initiated the formulation of the school improvement plan. Subsequently, the plan was returned to the schools, where grade-level chairs (teachers) contributed their insights. The crafting of the school improvement plan, in addition to defining the targeted areas for improvement, establishing measurable outcomes, and devising monitoring strategies, was achieved through collective teamwork.

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 administrative team will monitor and analyze the data, and share it with all stakeholders during various meetings. For example, teachers will discuss data during their weekly PLC as well principals give updates at the quarterly Board Meetings.

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-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	12%
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B
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	23	24	35	17	14	17	22	15	10	177
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	7	8	20
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	16	11	16	18	15	100
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	23	21	12	7	7	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	56	31	25	30	39	28	209

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	17	15	15	9	12	5	74

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	4	6	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	56	51	53	58	51	55	59		
ELA Learning Gains				57			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			58		
Math Achievement*	54	50	55	51	41	42	47		
Math Learning Gains				58			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			34		
Science Achievement*	56	48	52	52	48	54	59		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	65	68	71	57	59	76		
Middle School Acceleration	52	70	70	69	51	51			
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress	68	52	55	43	73	70	45		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	558
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	28	Yes	2	1
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	43			
HSP	53			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	41			

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	34	Yes	1	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	53			

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%
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	46			

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	56			54			56	70	52			68
SWD	28			28							2	
ELL	46			50			43	64			6	68
AMI												
ASN	74			68							2	
BLK	45			47			26				4	
HSP	53			50			56	65	47		7	68
MUL	58			50							2	
PAC												
WHT	62			60			65	75	43		6	
FRL	40			47			35	64			5	

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	58	57	43	51	58	56	52	71	69			43
SWD	33	42	24	25	44	41	26					
ELL	38	58	44	43	56	46	27					43
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	40	44	41	42	62	67	22	47				
HSP	56	53	41	46	56	61	53	68	50			43
MUL	67	63		61	70							
PAC												
WHT	63	62	50	55	55	46	64	84	85			
FRL	44	50	41	30	43	67	41	50	50			

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	59	58	58	47	46	34	59	76				45
SWD	22	33	20	17	24			30				
ELL	26	46		23	38							45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	49	55		40	52							
HSP	53	58	50	36	49	43	40	70				41
MUL	79			71								
PAC												
WHT	65	59	54	53	41	27	80	77				
FRL	48	58	69	37	32	29						

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
05	2023 - Spring	61%	53%	8%	54%	7%
07	2023 - Spring	52%	47%	5%	47%	5%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	57%	44%	13%	47%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	54%	1%	58%	-3%
06	2023 - Spring	67%	47%	20%	47%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	46%	46%	0%	50%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	71%	53%	18%	54%	17%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	36%	19%	48%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	42%	55%	-13%	59%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	59%	-23%	61%	-25%
08	2023 - Spring	78%	57%	21%	55%	23%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	53%	-6%	55%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	57%	41%	16%	44%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	47%	6%	51%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	55%	29%	50%	34%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	49%	43%	48%	44%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	64%	6%	66%	4%

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.

F.A.S.T. math data showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors included new standards and curriculum as well as unqualified teachers.

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

Comparing FSA to F.A.S.T data showed the greatest decline in ELA. Contributing factors included un certified teachers with a lack of best practices.

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.

2023 data showed the greatest gap in the component of EIA. Contributing factors included uncertified teachers with a lack of best practices.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was the math lowest 25th percentile learning gains. Identifying and targeting these students was a new action that the school put in place,

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

Attendance data is one area of concern.

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

Attendance
Special Education Subgroup
ELA
Math

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

After reviewing the 2022 state assessment data; ELA Proficiency in grades 3-8 54%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

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

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team will monitor the data from FAST PM1 and PM2, monitor ELA bi-weekly assessment, conduct Data Chats, and attend PLC sessions in order to discuss the needs of our students. A focus will be standards-aligned instruction with a focus put on Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention and tutoring will be provided as needed. Student data will be monitored using report groups in iReady.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bonnie Guertin (bonnie.guertin@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The Administrative Team will provide PD on Florida's B.E.S.T. standards. Walk-throughs will be conducted weekly, as well as handing in lesson plans to check for understanding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lack of teacher certification and experience.

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.

Common Planning will be embedded in the Master Schedule to provide teachers time to collaborate, analyze data and develop appropriate lessons. Fidelity and validity checks will be put in place for MTSS/ RTI.

Person Responsible: Bonnie Guertin (bonnie.guertin@charter.hcps.net)

By When: By the end of the 23-24 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Our learning proficiency for math is 52%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Standards-aligned instruction using Florida's B.E.S.T. standards will increase student proficiency in the 2023 FAST Math assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team will monitor the data from FAST PM1 and PM2, monitor ELA bi-weekly assessment, conduct Data Chats, and attend PLC sessions in order to discuss the needs of our students. A focus will be standards-aligned instruction with a focus put on Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention and tutoring will be provided as needed. Student data will be monitored using report groups in iReady.

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.)

The Administrative Team will provide PD on Florida's B.E.S.T. standards. Walk-throughs will be conducted weekly, as well as handing in lesson plans to check for understanding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lack of teacher certification and experience.

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 Students with Disabilities**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.

Our ESSA subgroup for students with disabilities was.....

Measurable Outcome:

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

Due to the implementation of MTSS/RTI students with disabilities, the subgroup percentage will increase.

Monitoring:

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

Fidelity of program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Blaxton (danielle.blaxton@navigatoracademy.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.)

Research-based Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention tools will be used for these students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lack of teacher certification and experience.

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.

Professional Development on Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction.

Person Responsible: Bonnie Guertin (bonnie.guertin@charter.hcps.net)

By When: End of 23-24 School year.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The first challenge we face is recruiting highly qualified teachers. Finding qualified teachers is a challenge faced by many schools, and statistics support the issue. According to National Center for Education Statistics data, the number of teachers leaving the profession is rising, with nearly 20% of new teachers leaving within their first five years. Additionally, a shortage of qualified candidates for teaching positions is also a concern. Data indicates that as many as 60% of school districts nationwide report difficulty finding qualified candidates for open teaching positions.

According to internal school reports, NAL is also facing this challenge, with 20% of our teachers not certified. Professional staff recruitment will require a focus at our institution. Therefore, we are actively recruiting highly qualified teachers by creating an incentive plan for returning staff, bonuses for teacher-to-teacher recruitment, and a school culture that every teacher wants to be a part of.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the 24-25 school year, teachers' certification will increase.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team will monitor and continue to hire highly qualified teachers throughout the 23-24 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bonnie Guertin (bonnie.guertin@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

By creating collective teacher efficacy NAL will be able to retain our highly qualified teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

John Hattie and his team advocate Collective Teacher Efficacy (CTE) as the “new number one” influence related to student achievement several times, e.g. at the Annual Visible Learning Conference (2016) or the Collaborative Impact Conference 2017. The message seems to be clear: together teachers can achieve more, especially if they collectively believe that they can do so! Research also suggests that high teacher efficacy correlates to teacher retention.

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

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

Student attendance will be one area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall Student attendance will increase during the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Administration and guidance will monitor.....

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Blaxton (danielle.blaxton@navigatoracademy.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.)

Using the Leader in Me program will increase positive culture and therefore will increase student attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Leader in Me is an evidence-based, comprehensive model that builds leadership and life skills in students, creates a high-trust school culture, and lays the foundation for sustained academic achievement.

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.

Leader in Me Lessons

Person Responsible: Danielle Blaxton (danielle.blaxton@navigatoracademy.com)

By When: By the end of the 23-24 school year.

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)).

No funding will be provided.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

n/a

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

n/a

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Monitoring**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 impact student achievement outcomes.

n/a

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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. §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?

n/a

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

n/a

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

n/a

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

n/a

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

n/a

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

n/a

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

n/a

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

n/a

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

n/a

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

n/a

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

n/a

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

n/a

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes