

The School District of Lee County

Hector A. Cafferata Jr Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

Hector A. Cafferata Jr Elementary School

250 SANTA BARBARA BLVD N, Cape Coral, FL 33993

<http://hac.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Jason Kurtz

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

Hector A. Cafferata Jr Elementary School

250 SANTA BARBARA BLVD N, Cape Coral, FL 33993

<http://hac.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">89%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">72%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Cafferata Elementary School is to ensure that each student achieves his/her highest potential as we instill in each child a sense of self worth, independence, and responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cafferata Elementary School will be a school of excellence that seeks to create a challenging learning environment and encourages high expectations for success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kurtz, Jason	Principal	<p>Leadership Team Dr. Jason Kurtz - Principal - Facilitator of Leadership Team; Provides instructional leadership among entire staff and that will ensure continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement. Provide organizational leadership to include personnel, budget, purchasing safety, public relations, plant operations, food services, and transportation that will support high performance expectations for all stakeholders. Julee Duttko – Assistant Principal Laura Jordan – Reading Peer Collaborative Teacher Jeanette Walsh – Math Peer Collaborative Teacher Jennifer Medero – Intervention Reading Teacher Carey Hall – Intervention Math Teacher Erica Littman – Intervention Reading Teacher/Parent Involvement Madeline Badillo - Intervention Teacher for ELL students Amanda Kendrick – Guidance Counselor - supports the mental health and attendance Dr. Marcus Jenkins- Behavior Specialist</p> <p>The Leadership Team meets bi-weekly as a PLC. All stakeholders are involved as we discuss the data and causes of students lack of mastery. All stakeholders share in the responsibility of treating all aspects of the learner.</p>
Duttko, Julee	Assistant Principal	<p>Assist the Principal in ensuring continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement, customer satisfaction, performance management, and compliance. Assist the Principal in the overall administration and operation of the school. Assume full responsibility of the school when the Principal is absent from the building.</p>
Hall, Carey	Instructional Coach	
Jordan, Laura	Instructional Coach	
Medero, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Littman, Erica	SAC Member	
Kendrick, Amanda	School Counselor	
Walsh, Jeanette	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
 Wednesday 8/12/2020, Jason Kurtz

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	91	85	100	94	102	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	5	7	6	5	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	3	13	12	11	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	1	10	7	5	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	11	8	5	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 10/24/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	101	110	135	103	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	687
Attendance below 90 percent	20	8	8	14	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	7	4	5	5	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	9	11	37	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	23	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	7	2	3	31	17	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	4	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	101	110	135	103	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	687
Attendance below 90 percent	20	8	8	14	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	7	4	5	5	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	9	11	37	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	23	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	7	2	3	31	17	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	4	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	52%	57%	57%	62%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	56%	58%	60%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	50%	53%	56%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	62%	63%	55%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	65%	62%	50%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	54%	51%	31%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	52%	53%	64%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	55%	-16%	58%	-19%
	2018	49%	53%	-4%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
05	2019	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
	2018	48%	52%	-4%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	48%	61%	-13%	62%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	57%	58%	-1%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	62%	-7%	64%	-9%
	2018	48%	58%	-10%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	38%	58%	-20%	60%	-22%
	2018	34%	57%	-23%	61%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	32%	50%	-18%	53%	-21%
	2018	41%	52%	-11%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	30	30	21	26	21	5				
ELL	44	47	63	46	47	33	23				
BLK	58	47		36	53	45	35				
HSP	52	49	50	49	48	35	34				
WHT	51	43	41	50	52	50	30				
FRL	46	43	50	43	48	39	19				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	33	38	28	30	19	21				
ELL	44	67	67	59	46	31					
BLK	61	38		39	23						
HSP	53	51	50	50	34	31	36				
MUL	70			70							
WHT	52	42	44	45	38	32	57				
FRL	52	47	52	50	36	28	36				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	26	45	33	28	35	18					
ELL	45	61		41	56						
BLK	74	67		55	50						
HSP	61	53	50	57	51	33	61				
WHT	58	68	68	51	49	29	74				
FRL	59	65	63	49	45	34	52				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	387
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The Science data component showed the lowest performance. Science has had a multiple year decline in performance trends. Our science proficiency dropped 10% from last year from 44% to 32% proficient.

Contributing Factors:

- * Science is not taught with fidelity to the standard in K-4.
- * 62 students in grade 5 were level 1 or 2A readers and the teachers struggled with finding the time needed to remediate the reading skills and get quality science instruction in. Science was integrated into the reading block for these students and that is not enough to score proficient on the Science exam.
- * Grade 3-5 struggled to find the amount of time needed to teach science to the depth needed.

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

Science showed the greatest decline from the 18-19 school year.

Contributing Factors:

- * Science is not taught with fidelity to the standard in K-4.
- * 62 students in grade 3-5 were level 1 or 2A readers and the teachers struggled with finding the time needed to remediate the reading skills and get quality science instruction in. Science was integrated into the reading block for these students and that is not enough to score proficient on the Science exam.
- * Grade 5 struggled to find the amount of time needed to teach science to the depth needed.

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.

The Math component showed the greatest gap compared to the state, specifically grade 5 who was -22% below the state average.

- * High number of ESE students
- * Lack of understanding of the depth of the standard
- * Tips and Tricks instruction
- * Need for professional development to teach math for deep understanding

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

While our math proficiency was below the state, the overall proficiency rate stayed the same as the 17-18 school year. The area that improved the most was our math learning gains and the math learning gains of the lowest 25%. In both areas, we increased by 14%.

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

We are concerned about the percentage of students scoring a level 1 on the state assessments.

ELA

* Gr. 3 = 19%

* Gr. 4 = 14%

* Gr. 5 = 28%

MATH

* Gr. 3 = 30%

* Gr. 4 = 17%

* Gr. 5 = 34%

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Science Proficiency
4. Student Attendance
5. Bridging the achievement gap between the SWD subgroup and the school average in reading and math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our science proficiency has dropped from 61% proficient three years ago, to 32% proficient in 18-19. We are 18% below the district average and 21% below the state average.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the percentage of science proficiency of all 5th grade students from 32% to 50% as measured by the FY20 Science FCAT.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jason Kurtz (jasonwku@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Science education has transitioned from conveying facts-based knowledge to a model of learning that is based on active, student-directed inquiry. The writers of A Framework for K–12 Science Education (2012) proposed that students actively use science and engineering practices and apply crosscutting concepts to deepen their understanding of core ideas. Students engage in this three-dimensional learning by asking relevant questions, solving genuine problems, and acquiring tools to use in their future careers and lives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In phenomena-based instruction, learners make sense of intriguing phenomena using science practices, themes, and facts. As students learn new information and develop new skills, they construct explanations for the phenomena they are investigating and solve problems applying their new understanding. Students will figure out why and how an event happens rather than simply learning facts and details about it. Students' interactions with phenomena encourage them to make sense of the events.

Teachers have been trained to actively engage students in the integration of practices and content. There will be an emphasis on coherent progressions of learning outcomes, intertwining practices and content, flexible integrated classroom instruction. Teachers will employ a variety of instructional methods promoting learning through inquiry. Teachers will use the 5E learning cycle model using the McGraw Hill Inspire Science .

Action Steps to Implement

1. Dedicated time for science instruction has been made a priority in the curriculum schedule. In addition, once a week, grade 5 teachers will dedicate an additional 45 minutes on a Wednesday to go back and review the 3rd and 4th grade priority science standards.
2. Using the McGraw Hill Inspire Science, we will:
 1. Introduce students to a phenomenon that is relevant and interesting.
 2. Develop a class focus question.
 3. Develop initial models to make predictions about what they think will happen or to try to explain the phenomenon.
 4. Students will design and carry out investigations to gather data.
 5. Use their findings (evidence) to elaborate on the ideas represented in their initial models and make revisions.

6. Explore theoretical ideas to clarify their understanding of the science involved and learn more about our science solutions.
7. Use their findings (evidence) to elaborate on the ideas represented in their modified models and then make additional revisions.
8. Share their models with one another and develop a class (consensus) model.
9. Apply what they have learned to a novel, but related phenomenon or problem to show their understanding.
3. Progress Monitoring will be done using the data from summative assessments teachers give. In addition, we will enter the quarterly district assessment into our data dashboard. The student standard data will be analyzed in PLC's quarterly and adjustments made to the Science Intervention Block to fill in the holes our students have.
4. Extended Day Science will be offered to students 2x a week to provide additional support for our bubble students.
5. Fidelity of standards based instruction will be monitored by walk-throughs done by principal and mastery of the formatives given.

Person Responsible Jason Kurtz (jasonwku@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our school is 14% below the state average and 13% below the district average in math proficiency. Our SWD subgroup is 20 - 30 percent below the school average. All sub groups are below the state and district average, so we are targeting all students in our measurable outcome, with an extra emphasis on the SWD subgroup. Math proficiency needs to be a priority in our improvement plan because our EWS data shows that 97 students failed the ELA and/ or Math course they were enrolled in. In grades 3-5, we had 128 students score a level 1 on the FSA ELA and/or Math assessment.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the percentage of math proficiency of all students from 48% to 55% as measured by the FY20 Math FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jason Kurtz (jasonwku@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Cognitively Guided Instruction is a widely implemented and successful professional development program that focuses teacher's attention on student thinking. CGI focuses on helping students learn about mathematics by focusing on number and operations through the practice of problem solving and communication in the mathematical domains of operations and algebraic thinking, number and operation in base ten, number and operations - fractions, the number system, and expressions and equations. The CGI program strives to incorporate scientific knowledge of how children learn mathematics into instructional practice by providing teachers with principled frameworks for analyzing mathematics problems and related student thinking. The long-term goal of the professional development program is for teachers to develop and internalize conceptual models of student thinking and use these models to engage in practical inquiry in their classrooms so that learning becomes generative and student understanding of mathematics increases.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Cafferata Elementary is part of the treatment group of this study being done by FSU. The opportunity to participate in this program is provided by a grant from the United States Department of Education, Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) program through a research grant entitled Foundations for Success: Development Effective Mathematics Educators through Cognitively Guided Instruction. The CGI strategy will eliminate the tips and tricks methods and enhance teachers ability to facilitate math standards for depth of understanding. This strategy is a proven strategy for ELL and SWD subgroups as well. Schools that were part of phase 1 and 2 of the study have shown significant gains in comparison to the control group. Cafferata is part of phase 3 of the study.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Four Lead Teachers and one Math Coach have completed year one of the CGI training and are starting year two of the program. An additional 8 teachers started the program this summer with 4 days of training and will receive an additional 2 days in the fall and 2 in the spring. The principal has also begun the training.
2. Three of the teachers that have finished year one of the program are resource teachers this year and will co-teach with non-trained teachers to help improve understanding of math in our children.
3. The principal and math coach will lead a PLC for the 13 teachers involved in the CGI training to facilitate and encourage growth.
4. Teachers will be given time to plan together and the math coach will facilitate instructional learning walks so that other teachers can learn.
5. One staff meeting a month will be a problem -solving professional development training for the entire staff based on CGI.

6. The 13 CGI participants will meet bi-monthly as a CGI PLC.
6. Additional teachers will sign on for the training next summer to grow our capacity.
7. The Leadership Team will meet weekly to coordinate the school's multi-tiered system of supports; examine reasons students disengaged, and ensure that students receive needed supports.
8. Curriculum Maps and instructional guides will be used by all teachers and be used to assist with the PLC work and monitoring standards based instruction.
9. High yield instructional strategies will be taught to teachers and used in the classroom to foster rigor and student engagement
10. Our school will use a system to promote instruction that builds transferable vocabulary to access grade level complex text.
11. Our school will progress monitor weekly in PLC's using formative and summative assessments (standards checks. Teacher and students will track their level of proficiency using scales developed for priority standards. Standards mastery will be tracked through the district formatives in PLC's. The Math PCT will be responsible for tracking this data.
12. A data dashboard will be used to progress monitor quarterly STAR data and calculate teacher grades quarterly based on the school grade equation. Support will be adjusted quarterly based on the data dashboard calculations.

Person Responsible Jason Kurtz (jasonwku@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Three years ago, Cafferata had 60% of their students making learning gains in reading. The percentage dropped to 46% in 17-18, and stayed at 46% again in 18-19 which shows we have not made progress.

All sub groups are below the state and district average, so we are targeting all students in our measurable outcome, with and extra emphasis on the SWD subgroup.

Our EWS data shows that 97 students failed the ELA and/ or Math course they were enrolled in. In grades 3-5, we had 128 students score a level 1 on the FSA ELA and/or Math assessment.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the percentage of ELA proficiency of all students from 52% to 57% as measured by the FY20 Math FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jason Kurtz (jasonwku@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will participate in professional development and employ close reading strategies with their students. Close reading requires readers to determine the meaning of a high quality texts through in depth text analysis. Additionally, students deficient in phonics will receive intensive instruction (effect size .70, Hattie)

Writing to Read: It is important to revisit Steve Graham and Michael Hebert's (2010) Writing to Read, which gives strong evidence that writing, an essential skill itself, also improves reading comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will model and instruct students through close reading to utilize metacognitive strategies (effect size .60, Hattie), repeated readings (effect size .75, Hattie), cognitive task analysis (effect size 1.29, Hattie). Close reading also encompasses instruction across key idea and details, craft and struct, and integration of knowledge, in addition to vocabulary, discussion, writing tasks which are all critical components of development in the English Language Arts. Additionally, students deficient in phonics will receive intensive instruction (effect size .70, Hattie)

Researchers have emphasized the strong connection between reading and writing, both in theory and in practice. Multiple studies have demonstrated that writing can improve comprehension. What has been less clear is what particular writing practices research supports as being effective at improving students' reading. To determine those practices, Graham and Hebert (2010) undertook an in-depth meta-analysis of experimental and quasi-experimental studies that examined the effectiveness of writing practices on improving students' reading in grades 1 -12.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The ELA Peer Collaborative Teacher will provide professional development to teachers on how to use close reading strategies and then model lessons for teachers in the classroom. The ELA PCT will coach and mentor teachers in this strategy.
2. Students that are deficient in phonics will be provided with intense phonics instruction during the intervention period and/or during suspension of specials. Our Tier 3 students will need both.
3. Grade Level PLC's will be led by an ELA content expert.
4. The Leadership Team will meet bi-weekly to coordinate the school's multi-tiered system of supports; examine reasons students are disengaged, and ensure that students receive needed supports.

5. Curriculum Maps and instructional guides will be used by all teachers and be used to assist with the PLC work and monitoring standards based instruction.
6. Our school will use a system to promote instruction that builds transferable vocabulary to access grade level complex text.
7. Our school will progress monitor bi-weekly in PLC's using formative and summative assessments (standards checks. Teacher and students will track their level of proficiency using scales developed for priority standards. A data dashboard will be used to progress monitor quarterly STAR data and calculate teacher grades quarterly based on the school grade equation. Support will be adjusted quarterly based on the data dashboard calculations.
8. ELA PCT will track the fidelity of standards based instruction through the mastery of the district formatives. The principal will monitor the fidelity of standards based instruction through walk-throughs.
9. Teachers will receive 5 days of writing training during the 19-20 school year. Weekly walk-throughs will be done to look for evidence of the following:
 - * Students can back up an answer with text evidence
 - * Students can identify the main idea/theme in a passage and use the information for written responses.
 - * Students can identify how a text is organized and use the structure in writing.
 - * Students can identify the author or characters point of view and be able to write about it.
 - * Students can use every piece of multi-media in the text to determine main idea, theme, or perspective and use it as evidence in their writing.
 - * Students can determine whether an author is trying to make a point and if so, write about it using the evidence.

Person Responsible Jason Kurtz (jasonwku@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In November of 2018 ,we created and implemented a discipline plan for our school. We had a significant decrease in our referrals by training teachers on classroom managed behavior through Love and Logic training. The teachers were responsible for the restorative practices in their room such as a Safe Seat, Buddy Room or a Break to the I.S.S. (In School Support Room). These practices were documented in the Intervention Log on CASTLE before writing a referral on the student. The referral could not be processed if the intervention steps had not been used to redirect the student. 129 referrals were written in 2018-2019 school year. Our students need to be in the classroom to maximize instructional outcomes yet need to feel the classroom is a nurturing environment.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 19-20 school year, Cafferata Elementary will reduce the referral rate by 15% . This will reduce our referrals from 462 to under 393 referrals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jason Kurtz (jasonwku@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Classroom strategies are maximized when they are implemented by a multi-tiered behavior framework. Expectations that are clearly defined and followed are directly linked with effective instruction, a decrease of disruptions and allow students to be proactive instead of reactive. Restorative Practices create a new culture for communication in the school. Behavior contracts where the teacher and student collaborate on a solution gives the student ownership of their future consequences to his/her behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By using the Intervention Log to document what strategies or practices have been used and what caused the behavior we are able to track and assist the student. The opportunity to sit in the Safe Seat is taken by the student and they dictate how long they need to be in their own space. This correlates with The Zones of Regulation allowing the student to self regulate and take control of their emotional behavior.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement the seven principles of the "Energy Bus". Students are learning that they are responsible for their actions and that they control the outcome of their day. School wide implementation daily on the morning news, in the classrooms and culture of the school. Negative energy is transformed and a nurturing environment is provided by identifying the behaviors that are not productive in a school setting.
2. Team consisting of Behavior specialist, school counselor, In School Support Specialist, Administration, MTSS specialist and administration meet to discuss trends in behavior as well as data on students.
3. Administration, Behavior Specialist and In school support personnel will have access to intervention logs being submitted and will be able to assist in those classrooms to support the teacher.
4. Behavior Specialist will push into the classroom with the student to implement learning strategies.
5. Teachers and students will continue to use "The Zones of Regulation" - A framework to foster self regulation and emotional control especially in the primary grades and our SF/SE students. Assistant Principal will track the use of Zones of Regulation while doing walkthroughs.
6. PBIS- Students will receive certificates when they show a character trait from the seven principles such as a Ready to learn attitude, Stopping a Bully , Loving their Passengers or Creating a Positive Vision. Tokens will be awarded to students who are responsible, respectful and have a Ready to Learn Attitude. The students may purchase items from our PBS store in the morning.

Person Responsible Jason Kurtz (jasonwku@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A shift in the culture and climate of the school allowed us to meet our teacher/administrator attendance goal with a decrease in teacher/administrator absences for the 18-19 school year. As staff attendance continues to improve with our school wide training of the "Energy Bus" it will provide support to serve others. Students are more likely to come to school on a daily basis when they have made a connection with their teacher and they are consistent in their daily operations. The relationships built at school determine the success of the student. Communication between school and families about the importance of attendance is necessary for reducing chronic lateness and absenteeism. At the elementary level, chronic absence is typically associated with poor performance in core academic areas. Currently, 128 students are performing at a level one. In grades 3-5, sixty four students have failed a course

Measurable Outcome: Decrease the percentage of chronically absent students (below 90%) from 13.7 % to 10% as measured by the CASTLE early warning system by May 2020.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jason Kurtz (jasonwku@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: School based attendance interventions for chronically absent students provide support and resources to address individual factors that may be contributing to the loss of instructional time. Interventions allow us to target other factors such as low self- esteem, school anxiety, medical conditions, etc.. Communication with students and families outlining the importance of attendance and the correlation of days missed to loss of instruction will better identify the urgency for the student to come to school. Interventions are shown that this communication will increase attendance by one week per student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: School based attendance interventions allow a team consisting of the teacher, behavior specialist, school counselor, school social worker, nurse and administration to provide support for the student to come to school and by educating the parent on the significant educational outcomes of absenteeism.

Action Steps to Implement

Tier 1 Interventions

-Golden A

One class per grade level will be awarded the Golden A for having the best attendance percentage for the month. Classes with the Golden A can be randomly rewarded.

-ATTENDANCE (spell)

Each time a class has perfect attendance for the day, they will place the next letter in the word ATTENDANCE outside their classroom door. When they spell the word completely, they get honored on the morning news.

Tier 2 Interventions

-Attendance Ambassadors Group

Students that missed 20+ days last school year, and have already missed 2+ days this school year will check in with the Counselor every Monday morning. They will monitor their own attendance and work towards incentives/rewards for being present.

Tier 3 Interventions

-Intensive Supports

Students that missed 20+ days last school year, have already missed 2+ days this school year, will be evaluated to see if there are any other underlying concerns. Ex: mental health concerns, struggling

academically, change in home life. Additional academic and/or mental health supports will be put into place to see if the students attendance will improve.

Person Responsible Jason Kurtz (jasonwku@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

ELA and Math PCT and resource teachers will push in support to classes and interventions will be provided during intervention block for students not meeting standards.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

At the beginning of the school year, families and students will be invited to an open house and the Annual Title I meeting where staff will share the vision, mission, and culture of the school.

Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs' assessment by obtaining feedback through SAC, PTO, Surveys from Parent Involvement Events, Conference Night, and Curriculum Nights. The School Advisory Committee will analyze data for all student groups including regular ed, ESE, gifted, migrant, ELLs, L25, educationally disadvantaged and historically underserved, identifying school needs. Stakeholders will participate as the result of personal invitations from administration, invitations through the school newsletter, School Messenger, Peach Jar, with flexible meeting times.

We will enlist community/business partners by getting input from stakeholders that will be collected through surveys on line surveys and paper surveys after each event in order to allow for all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages and simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data will be used to identify school needs and create a plan.

Stakeholders will be involved in the design, implementation and evaluation of the school wide plan such as creating and reviewing during SAC/Title I quarterly meetings. Members will be surveyed and the SAC will hold a discussion on how to spend 1% set aside for parent involvement, monitoring of plan progress, ongoing review of data). Strategies to increase family engagement are included in the PFEP.

At Hector Cafferata Elementary we build relationships and keep parents informed through special

events held annually such as: Open House, Parent Conference Nights (once a semester), Curriculum Nights, STEM Day, Pastries with People We Love, Parent Education Nights, and other events that bring parents and families together with the staff

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00