

2023–24 Local Control and Accountability Plan Annual Update

The instructions for completing the 2023–24 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Annual Update follow the template.

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name	Contact Name and Title	Email and Phone
Hollister Prep	Caprice Young, Superintendent and Chief Executive Officer	caprice.young@navigatorsschools.org , (408) 843-4107

Goals and Actions

Goal

Goal #	Description
1	Create a Culture of Excellence within the school community (students, staff, and parents) to foster a positive school climate, promote a sense of belonging, and nurture social, emotional, and academic growth. We believe these strategies will lead to a gain of three points on the DFS on all subtests of SBAC for all student subgroups by 2024.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Staff Surveys	70% of staff feel proud to tell people where they work and 70% would recommend working at Navigator to a good friend.	96% of staff feel proud to tell people where they work and 82% would recommend working at Navigator to a good friend.	96% of staff feel proud to tell people where they work and 86% would recommend working at Navigator to a good friend.	90% feel proud. 76% would recommend	At least 96% of staff feel proud to tell people where they work and 86% would recommend working at Navigator to a good friend.
Parent Surveys	70% of parents feel their child is safe and supported on campus and 70% are satisfied with their child's academic results.	94% of parents feel their child is safe and supported on campus and 86% are satisfied with their child's academic results.	86% of parents feel their child is safe and supported on campus and 92% are satisfied with their child's academic results.	91% of parents feel their child is safe and supported on campus and 96% are satisfied with their child's academic results.	At least 86% of parents feel their child is safe and supported on campus and 92% are satisfied with their child's academic results.
Student Surveys	70% feel proud to belong to HPS most or all of the time, 70% feel that adults at the school cared about them most or all of the time, and 70% agree that they felt safe at school	57% feel proud to belong to HPS most or all of the time, 75.5% feel that adults at the school cared about them most or all of the time, and 76.5% agree that they felt safe at school	71% feel proud to belong to HPS most or all of the time, 82% feel that adults at the school cared about them most or all of the time, and 74% agree that they felt safe at school	72% feel proud to belong to HPS most or all of the time, 94% feel that adults at the school cared about them most or all of the time, and 93% agree that they felt safe at school	At least 71% feel proud to belong to HPS most or all of the time, 82% feel that adults at the school cared about them most or all of the time, and 74% agree that they felt safe at school
Suspension Rates	Less than 2%	Less than 2%	1.30%	2%	Less than 2%
Student Attendance Rates, as a measure of student engagement.	Average of 96%	Average of 94%	93%	95.05%	96%
Chronic Absenteeism	Less than 10%	14.20%	14.40%	11.20%	Less than 10%
Expulsion Rates	<.5%			0%	

Goal Analysis

An analysis of how this goal was carried out in the previous year.

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

There were no substantive differences between the planned actions and implementation. We were able to successfully utilize the various actions we included in our LCAP to help create the culture of excellence within the school community.

- In Action 1, HPS was able to successfully staff their leadership team and bi-lingual office staff, all of whom worked hard to maintain a positive school culture.
- In Action 3, HPS leadership team was able to implement staff and student circles to build social emotional learning.
- In Action 4, HPS was able to maintain a safe climate for students and staff by keeping the facilities in good repair, as shown on the latest Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT).
- In Action 5, HPS received services from the Support Office and staff felt supported and proud to work at Navigator, as shown in our staff survey results (90% felt proud).
- In Action 6, HPS held weekly Valor circles with students to improve the social and emotional learnings of our students. The MTSS team meets weekly to review data from the student SEL surveys and reach out to those students who need extra support.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

Most of the cost associated with this goal was within 10% of the originally budgeted amount, with the exception of the expenses associated with Action 4. In this action, our originally planned budget was \$649,092 and our actual estimated expenditures are \$567,664 (13% decrease). This was due to some vacancies in the planned staffing from some periods throughout the year.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

When reflecting on the successful achievement of our metric targets, we see that many of our actions were implemented with substantial success, although we did not meet all targets completely. We therefore see these actions as partially effective.

- The goal for chronic absenteeism was less than 10% and we missed the goal with a rate of 11.2%, down from 14.4% the previous year. We continue to work on our chronic absenteeism by hiring an Attendance Specialist and continued family outreach.
- The goal for average daily attendance was 96%, and this was also missed but by less than 1%. The attendance rate was an increase from the previous year when attendance was 93%. The Attendance Specialist will continue to work with leadership to ensure the rate continues to increase and chronic absenteeism decreases.
- The goal for the staff survey was 96% of staff feel proud to work at Navigator and 86% of staff would recommend Navigator to a friend. This goal was not met with 90% of staff who feel proud and 76% who would recommend Navigator to a friend. Although we are proud of our high outcomes in this area, our goal was not reached, so we will continue to team-build with our staff and will have regular check ins with them to ensure they are feeling heard and seen.

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, desired outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

We will continue to foster a culture of excellence in our school by learning from the 23-24 goals & actions for our plan for 2024-2027. Specifically, we are targeting academic excellence in Goal 1 of the upcoming LCAP, with a variety of actions associated with additional metrics to push towards improvement over the next 3 years.

Goal #	Description
2	All students will receive Data-Driven Instruction in Common Core State Standards (CCSS), Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) and other California State Standards (ELD, Social Studies) from appropriately credentialed teachers and staff.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
SBAC scores in Mathematics Distance from Standard (DFS) for all students and all subgroups will increase annually by +3	SBAC Math +3 from prior year DFS	Not available	This metric was not met due to learning loss from the pandemic	52.84% Met or Exceeded the standard for Math from the 22 - 23 CAASPP; most current state data available from the caaspp-elpac.ets.org state website DF +3 from California State Dashboard: 1.8 Points Above Standard	SBAC Math +3 from 2022-23 DFS

SBAC scores in English language arts Distance from Standard (DFS) for all students and all subgroups will increase annually by +3	SBAC ELA +3 from prior year DFS	Not available	This metric was not met due to learning loss from the pandemic	68.39% Met or Exceeded the standard for ELA from the 22 - 23 CAASPP; most current state data available from the caaspp-elpac.ets.org state website DF +3 from California State Dashboard: 35.5 Points Above Standard	SBAC ELA +3 from 2022-23 DFS
English Learner Progress	English Learner Progress metrics were changed this year. New baseline will be set with the actuals from 2020-21 dashboard.	Not available	70.5% making progress towards English language proficiency	43% from the California Dashboard for 2023 the English Learner Progress	At least 70.5% making progress towards English language proficiency
SBAC scores in Science Distance from Standard (DFS) for all students and all subgroups will increase annually by +3	SBAC Science +3 from prior year DFS	Not available	Not available	36.21% Met or Exceeded the standard for Science from the 22 - 23 CAASPP; most current state data available from the caaspp-elpac.ets.org state website	SBAC Science +3 from 2021-22 DFS

Teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject areas and for the pupils they are teaching.	100%			100%	
Every pupil has sufficient access to standards-aligned instructional materials.	100%			100%	
HPS will implement the academic content and performance standards adopted by the state board.	100% of classrooms			100%	
HPS will implement designated and integrated ELD strategies to enable English learners to access the CCSS and the ELD standards for purposes of gaining academic content knowledge and English language proficiency.	100% of classrooms			100%	
Reclassification Rate	29.41%	29.41%	20%	33.73% Based on students RFEP'd against total EL students enrolled for 22 - 23 school year, most current data.	30%

HPS students will have access to a broad course of study.	100%			100%	
---	------	--	--	------	--

Goal Analysis

An analysis of how this goal was carried out in the previous year.

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

- The goal was implemented as planned. Students received data-driven instruction from appropriately credentialed teachers and staff.
- In Action 1, all teachers were appropriately assigned, trained and credentialed and used data driven instruction.
 - In Action 2, Teachers in Training served as substitute to provide our teachers time for coaching and collaboration with partner teachers.
 - In Action 3, Small Group Instructors provided small group instruction to students using data driven instruction at the appropriate level for the students.
 - In Action 4, English Learners were provided access to CCSS and ELD standards for instruction. Staff were provided professional development and increased planning time in order to implement ELD standards into instructional time.
 - In Action 6, all standards aligned instructional materials that were needed were purchased at the beginning of the school year.
 - In Action 7, physical education was provided to grades K through 8.
 - In Action 8, Grades K through 3 each had an additional small group instructor instructing small groups to mitigate learning loss from the pandemic.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

- There were a number of material differences between planned expenditures and estimated actual expenditures:
- For Action 2, the Estimated Actual Expenditures were \$251,357 , while the Budgeted Expenditures were \$395,933. This is a decrease of 37%. This was due to a number of vacancies throughout the year in the Teachers in Training positions, who fill in for teachers when they are participating in school day trainings.
 - For Action 3, Estimated Actual Expenditures were 21% higher than budgeted (~\$97,000) due to additional staff added to help reduce learning loss.
 - For Action 6, Instructional Materials, there were lower costs (~\$64,000 or 61%) due to over-estimating the quantity and cost of materials needed this year for classroom instruction.
 - For Action 7, Physical Education, there were higher costs (~\$23,000 or 18%) due to the teaching credential associated with the person hired to fill this role (the position was originally budgeted for a classified staff person).

- For Action 8, Learning Loss Mitigation, there were lower costs (~\$43,000 or 46%) due to unfilled positions for a portion of the year.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

While we did meet most of our metric goals, we are finding the learning loss due to the Pandemic is still prevelant. We will continue to mitigate learning loss so we can meet our SBAC metrics in the future. The results of the 23-24 SBAC are not yet available, however we do have 22-23 data.

- The goal for math, ELA and science SBAC was +3 percent from the 2018-19 SBAC scores. While we did not meet this goal, our scores were still well above the state scores with 52.84% of students being proficient in math, 68.39% proficient in ELA, and 59% proficient in Science.

- English Learner Progress was down from the previous year, from 70.50% of students making progress to 43% making progress. An ELD coordinator is being hired to take the lead to ensure our English Learners are successful in school and in life.

-The goal for our reclassification rate was 30%. This goal was met and exceeded with a reclassification rate of 33.73% up from the 20% the previous year.

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, desired outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

We will continue to staff all classrooms with properly credentialed teachers, small group instructors, and teachers in training. We will focus on improving our ELD progress rate by implementing five activities outlined in Goal 1, Action 5 of our new 2024-27 LCAP.

Goal #	Description
3	Provide weekly coaching and feedback to all staff to support continuous improvement for teaching and student learning.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
Coaching Log/Meeting Records	Weekly coaching for teachers an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for teachers an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for teachers an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for teachers an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for teachers an average of 20 times a school year
Coaching Log/Meeting Records	Weekly coaching for small group instructors an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for small group instructors an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for small group instructors an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for small group instructors an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for small group instructors an average of 20 times a school year
Coaching Log/Meeting Records	Weekly coaching for administrators an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for administrators an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for administrators an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for administrators an average of 20 times a school year	Weekly coaching for administrators an average of 20 times a school year

Goal Analysis

An analysis of how this goal was carried out in the previous year.

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

The Actions for this Goal were implemented as planned. School leadership staff prioritized their calendaring at the beginning of the school year to ensure weekly 30-minute academic coaching meetings for each instructional staff member. School leadership staff also prioritized calendaring of weekly staff observation times. All school leadership received professional development at the beginning of the year on Navigator’s coaching structure so that they were adequately prepared to lead academic coaching meetings.

- In Action 1, school leadership provided weekly coaching to all teachers, Teachers in Training and Small Group Instructors to continuously improve instruction for students and growth for staff.
- In Action 2, the Director of Schools provided weekly coaching to the Principal, and the Director of Student Services provided weekly coaching to Special Education Resource Teachers.

Additionally, Navigator prioritized in-the-moment coaching for all staff members, as well as group coaching when there was a common need, as we have found both strategies to be best practices in meeting their larger goal of supporting continuous improvement for teaching and student learning. These additional actions will continue in the coming years.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

There were no explicit costs associated with this Goal.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

The coaching actions at the school site were effective. Navigator will also continue to prioritize in-the-moment coaching for all staff members, as well as group coaching when there is a common need, as we have found both strategies to be best practices in meeting their larger goal of supporting continuous improvement for teaching and student learning.

-The goal of coaching for all staff was a success with 100% of staff reaching an average of 20 times during the school year.

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, desired outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

We will continue to provide weekly coaching to all staff at Navigator, as it is one of our main priorities in continually improving. This is reflected in Action 7 of Goal 1 for the 2024-27 LCAP.

Goal #	Description
4	Ensure equitable access to curriculum, programs, and pathways for student success through a multi-tiered system of supports.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
% of All Students placed in inclusive environment	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% of Students not meeting standards who are offered intervention support	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Goal Analysis

An analysis of how this goal was carried out in the previous year.

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

There were no substantive differences in the planned goals and actions and actual implementation. We were able to continue with our MTSS team of leadership, counselors, educational specialists and a school psychologist. The special education team ensured that all students in need of services were provided with specialized services.

- In Action 1, with support from the Director of Student services and the Resource Teacher, Special Education Paraprofessionals provided an inclusive instructional setting by providing appropriate "push in" support in the classrooms. At times, a 1:1 ratio was needed and provided by the Special Education Paraprofessional.
- In Action 2, a .60 FTE School Psychologist (slightly more than the originally planned 0.5 FTE) provided intervention support for students who were determined to need support.
- For Action 3, although Summer school has not happened for 2023-24 yet, summer school is planned to take place for four weeks from June to July.
- In Action 4, students were provided food service for breakfast, lunch and snacks at no cost to them. The food service staff made sure that all students had equitable access to nourishing food.
- In Action 5, through staffing and independent contractors, students were able to receive speech therapy, occupational therapy, and counseling, receiving specialized support for identified needs. An attendance specialist was hired to decrease chronic absenteeism and provide family outreach.
- In Action 6, staff was trained at our summer training, Navi 201, in designated and integrated ELD strategies. EL students were provided additional intervention support by area of need.
- In Action 7, the Community Schools Coordinator provided support for foster students who had specific needs.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

Estimated Actual Costs were largely as budgeted for this Goal, although two actions varied from plan:

- For Action 2, the Psychologist was increased from 0.5 FTE to 0.6 FTE, increasing the cost by ~\$9,000 or 11%.
- For Action 4, Food Services personnel were budgeted at ~\$86,000 but funds were not needed for this resource, saving 100% of planned expense.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

We were effective in the specific actions and were able to exceed our goal of 99% inclusivity for our special education students.

- 100% of students were placed in an inclusive environment.
- 100% of students who were not at grade level received intervention support.

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, desired outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

We will continue to provide specialized services to all students and exceed our goal of 99% inclusivity for our special education students and exceed the goal of 99% for intervention, as targeted in Goal 1, Action 4 of the new 2024-27 LCAP.

Goal #	Description
5	Use cutting edge instructional technology to encourage student engagement, increase staff effectiveness to improve student learning, and prepare students for the future.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for 2023–24
% of Students with a 1:1 I-pad ratio	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% of Students with access to adaptive applications to support personalized learning	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Customer Satisfaction rates: IT job tickets resolved satisfactorily	93%	93%	94%	96%	At least 94%

Goal Analysis

An analysis of how this goal was carried out in the previous year.

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

There were no changes to the planned actions and goals during implementation. The full time site administrator for IT was able to support staff and students with their technology needs.

- In Action 1, a full time IT Admin was present on site to provide staff and students with IT support.
- In Action 2, Illuminate was used for student assessment and reporting for data driven student support. Tableau software was utilized to enhance data reporting so that staff could easily identify the needs.
- In Action 3, all students were provided a 1:1 iPad device used for blended learning applications.
- In Action 4, all staff was provided up-to-date technology for lesson planning, instruction and, when necessary, meetings.
- In Action 5, high speed internet was provided throughout the campus to accommodate the use of technology for learning.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

Estimated Actual Costs were largely as budgeted for this Goal, although two actions varied from plan:

- For Action 2, the assessment software cost less than anticipated, for a savings of ~\$10,000 or 67%.
- For Action 4, high-speed internet was largely paid for through the Federal e-Rate program, which was not originally in the budget. This resulted in a savings of \$24,000 or 90.5%.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

The actions we implemented were effective.

- The goal was 100% of students having an iPad; this goal was met.
- The goal was 100% of students having access to adaptive applications to support personalized learning; this goal was met
- The goal was 93% customer satisfaction (IT job tickets resolved satisfactorily). This goal was exceeded with a satisfaction rating of 96%.

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, desired outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

We will continue to have a technology focus for our students and staff, although given the success of this goal and the full integration of technology excellence into the school, it will not be included in the Goals and Actions of the 2024-27 LCAP.

A report of the Total Estimated Actual Expenditures for last year's actions may be found in the Annual Update Table. A report of the Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services for last year's actions may be found in the Contributing Actions Annual Update Table.

Instructions

For additional questions or technical assistance related to the completion of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) template, please contact the local county office of education (COE), or the California Department of Education’s (CDE’s) Local Agency Systems Support Office, by phone at 916-319-0809 or by email at LCFF@cde.ca.gov.

Complete the prompts as instructed for each goal included in the 2023–24 LCAP. Duplicate the tables as needed. The 2023–24 LCAP Annual Update must be included with the 2024–25 LCAP.

Goals and Actions

Goal(s)

Description:

Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Measuring and Reporting Results

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Metric:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Baseline:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Year 1 Outcome:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Year 2 Outcome:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Year 3 Outcome:

- When completing the 2023–24 LCAP Annual Update, enter the most recent data available. Indicate the school year to which the data applies.

Desired Outcome for 2023–24:

- Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Timeline for completing the “**Measuring and Reporting Results**” part of the Goal.

Metric	Baseline	Year 1 Outcome	Year 2 Outcome	Year 3 Outcome	Desired Outcome for Year 3 (2023–24)
Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.	Enter information in this box when completing the 2023–24 LCAP Annual Update.	Copy and paste verbatim from the 2023–24 LCAP.

Goal Analysis

Using actual annual measurable outcome data, including data from the Dashboard, analyze whether the planned actions were effective in achieving the goal. Respond to the prompts as instructed.

A description of any substantive differences in planned actions and actual implementation of these actions.

- Describe the overall implementation of the actions to achieve the articulated goal. Include a discussion of relevant challenges and successes experienced with the implementation process. This must include any instance where the LEA did not implement a planned action or implemented a planned action in a manner that differs substantively from how it was described in the adopted LCAP.

An explanation of material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and/or Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services.

- Explain material differences between Budgeted Expenditures and Estimated Actual Expenditures and between the Planned Percentages of Improved Services and Estimated Actual Percentages of Improved Services, as applicable. Minor variances in expenditures or percentages do not need to be addressed, and a dollar-for-dollar accounting is not required.

An explanation of how effective or ineffective the specific actions were in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle.

- Describe the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific actions in making progress toward the goal during the three-year LCAP cycle. “Effectiveness” means the degree to which the actions were successful in producing the desired result and “ineffectiveness” means that the actions did not produce any significant or desired result.
 - In some cases, not all actions in a goal will be intended to improve performance on all of the metrics associated with the goal.
 - When responding to this prompt, LEAs may assess the effectiveness of a single action or group of actions within the goal in the context of performance on a single metric or group of specific metrics within the goal that are applicable to the action(s). Grouping actions with metrics will allow for more robust analysis of whether the strategy the LEA is using to impact a specified set of metrics is working and increase transparency for educational partners. LEAs are encouraged to use such an approach when goals include multiple actions and metrics that are not closely associated.

- o Beginning with the development of the 2024–25 LCAP, the LEA must change actions that have not proven effective over a three-year period.

A description of any changes made to the planned goal, metrics, desired outcomes, or actions for the coming year that resulted from reflections on prior practice.

- Describe any changes made to this goal, expected outcomes, metrics, or actions to achieve this goal as a result of this analysis and analysis of the data provided in the Dashboard or other local data, as applicable.
 - o As noted above, beginning with the development of the 2024–25 LCAP, the LEA must change actions that have not proven effective over a three-year period. For actions that have been identified as ineffective, the LEA must identify the ineffective action and must include a description of the following:
 - The reasons for the ineffectiveness, and
 - How changes to the action will result in a new or strengthened approach.

California Department of Education
November 2023