Hector A. Cafferata Jr Elementary School

leadership

analysis

students

Florida

college and career

mission

school improvement

striving   achievement   ambitious

family and community involvement

teaching   learning   relationships

needs assessment

success

areas of focus

resources   instruction

supportive environment

strategic planning

collaboration   vision   growth

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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

Hector A. Cafferata Jr Elementary School

250 SANTA BARBARA BLVD N, Cape Coral, FL 33993

http://hac.leeschools.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	99%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

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 instill in each child a sense of self worth, independence, and responsibility, which will enable each student to become a life-long learner, and productive, cooperative citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cafferata Elementary School seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success through differentiated instruction that allows for individual differences and learning styles. Our school promotes a safe, orderly, caring, and supportive environment. We strive to have our parents, teachers, and community members actively involved in our students' learning.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kurtz, Jason	Principal	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. Michael Licata – Assistant Principal Ana LaMotta – Reading Peer Collaborative Teacher Jeanette Walsh – Math Peer Collaborative Teacher Jennifer Medero – Primary Literacy Specialist Carey Hall – Intervention Math Teacher Stephanie Alzate – Primary Instructional Coach Madeline Badillo - Intervention Teacher for ELL students Jordan Gibbs – Guidance Counselor - supports the mental health and attendance Dr. Marcus Jenkins- Behavior Specialist 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.
Licata, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Hall, Carey	Instructional Coach	
Walsh, Jeanette	Instructional Coach	
Medero, Jennifer	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.*
0

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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
48

Total number of students enrolled at the school
692

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	107	126	114	116	98	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	692
Attendance below 90 percent	4	25	20	24	16	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	30	13	22	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Course failure in Math	0	17	8	15	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	27	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	26	11	16	26	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				52%	57%	57%	55%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	56%	58%	46%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	50%	53%	50%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	62%	63%	48%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				50%	65%	62%	36%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	54%	51%	28%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				32%	52%	53%	44%	54%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	55%	-16%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	48%	61%	-13%	62%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	55%	62%	-7%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	58%	-20%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	32%	50%	-18%	53%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady. and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/9.7	21/29.6	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/9.1	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/11.8	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3/4.8	18/25.4	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/9.1	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	4/23.5	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16/16.2	34/31.8	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1	1/10	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/2.8	5/13.2	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/3.1	11/10.3	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/10	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	4/23.5	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14/19.7	30/38.5	30/38
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/7.1	0/0	1/6.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/12.5	2/12.5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2/2.9	17/22.4	25/31.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/6.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/12.5	4/25

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30/37.5	42/47.7	43/49.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/18.2	2/16.7	2/16.7
	English Language Learners	1/11.1	2/16.7	4/33.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0	10/11.5	27/31.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/9.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	2/16.7

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26/33.3	32/40	39/47.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/8.3	2/15.4	1/7.1
	English Language Learners	3/27.3	3/25	1/8.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11/14.3	22/27.2	32/38.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/16.7	2/15.4	3/21.4
	English Language Learners	1/10	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	16/22.2	33/45.2	39/54.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/9.1	2/16.7	2/20
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/18.2	2/18.2

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15	14	18	13	46						
ELL	29	46	50	33	38		19				
BLK	46			52							
HSP	43	46	41	40	38	47	31				
MUL	43			64							
WHT	54	19		53	52		52				
FRL	44	41	44	44	41	35	36				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	356
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	46
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Overall, our school has been on a decline since 2016-17 in almost all areas of student achievement. Our ELL learners continue to underperform other sub groups and we have identified that math is an area of FOCUS for us across all grade levels..

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math (-13% proficiency since 15-16) and ELA (-14% proficiency since 16-17) are two areas that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Student demographics have changed significantly over the last several years and instructional methodologies that were successful in the past are no longer working. Instruction in ELA and Math needs to be improved. this will be accomplished with backwards designed planning, increased focus on interventions, and reteaching based on student achievement data.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

We experienced the most improvement in Science proficiency with an increase from 32% to 38%.

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

We implemented a STEM elective rotation and hired a Science Coach to assist teams in utilizing data to drive instruction.

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

All students will receive interventions based on individual student needs during a 45 min intervention block in all grade levels. Instruction will be driven through review of progress monitoring data to ensure that students are afforded the opportunity for reteaching of standards that have not yet been mastered. In addition, all teams will participate in grade level PLC's facilitated by Peer Collaborative Teachers to assist with planning and instruction.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

In order to accelerate learning teachers will receive additional professional development in the areas of backwards design, data-analysis, BEST standards (K-2), SEL and SIOP.

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

The following additional services will be implemented to help ensure sustainability: increased resources and support in primary grades to close gap and ensure early intervention prior to tested grades, after school enrichment and remediation opportunities and improved progress monitoring systems.

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 64% proficient in 16-17 to 38% proficient in 20-21. We are below the district average and the state average. In 20-21 only 6% of ELL learners were proficent.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of science proficiency of all 5th grade students from 32% to 50% and 5th grade ELL students from 6% to 12% as measured by the FY22 Science FSA.
Monitoring:	Outcomes will be monitored utilizing our Exemplar standards data tracker. Data will be reviewed and disaggregated during school-wide and grade level PLC meetings.
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. 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 .
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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 utilizing P-Sell. 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 exemplar 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. Fidelity of standards based instruction will be monitored by walk-throughs done by principal and mastery of the formatives given.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our school is 8% below the district average in math proficiency and the ELL subgroup is 7% percent below the district average. 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 ELL subgroup. Math proficiency needs to be a priority in our improvement plan because data analysis shows a drop in math proficiency form KG to 5th grade. Last year less than 40% of 5th grade students were considered proficient in Math.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of math proficiency of all students from 46% to 55% and ELL students from 24% to 46% as measured by the FY22 Math FSA.
Monitoring:	Outcomes will be monitored utilizing our Exemplar standards data tracker. Data will be reviewed and disaggregated during school-wide and grade level PLC meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Kurtz (jasonwku@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Coginitively 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. Staff will continue to participate CGI professional development.
2. Teachers will be given time to plan together and the math coach will facilitate instructional learning walks so that other teachers can learn.
3. One PD day a month will be a problem -solving professional development training for the entire staff based on CGI.
4. The CGI participants will meet monthly as a Math Committee to help support teachers and influence instruction across grade levels.
5. 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.
6. 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.

7. High yield instructional strategies will be taught to teachers and used in the classroom to foster rigor and student engagement

8. Our school will use a system to promote instruction that builds transferable vocabulary to access grade level complex text.

9. Our school will progress monitor weekly in PLC's using exemplars (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.

10. A data dashboard will be used to progress monitor quarterly i-Ready 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:	In 2016-17 60% of students made learning gains in ELA. The percentage has dropped to 41% in 2020-21. All sub groups are below the state and district average. ELL students comprise 28% of the student population and only 20% of ELL students made learning gains in ELA in 2020-21.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of ELA proficiency of all students from 46% to 55% and ELL students from 32% to 46% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	Outcomes will be monitored utilizing our Exemplar standards data tracker. Data will be reviewed and disaggregated during school-wide and grade level PLC meetings.
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 exemplar 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 exemplars. The principal will monitor the fidelity of standards based instruction through walk-throughs.

Person Responsible	Jason Kurtz (jasonwku@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Academic Engaged Time (AET) is tied to student achievement. Attendance plays a large role in increasing AET puzzle. The global pandemic has led to increased rates of absenteeism and quarantines. This equates to days of lost instruction. Cafferata has experienced a year over year decrease in rate of attendance since 19-20 of almost 2%.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the percentage of chronically absent students from 11.7 % to 7% as measured by the CASTLE early warning system by May 2021.
Monitoring:	Attendance Committee and admin will monitor Average Daily Attendance Rates.
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

1. Establishment of attendance committee made up off Info Specialist, Resource Teachers, Admin, School Counselor and Social Worker.
2. Attendance Committee will meet monthly.
3. Attendance data display board by class and recognition system for classrooms with 100% attendance.
4. Attendance drive for chronically absent students to include home visits and support for families.
5. Attendance incentive for chronically absent students.

Person Responsible	Jason Kurtz (jasonwku@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, the discipline data from 19-20 of the school to discipline data fell into the very high category when compared to other Florida schools with both incidents and suspensions higher than the state average. Administration with PBIS team will monitor discipline referral and suspension data and the implementation of the Capturing Kids Hearts training staff attended in June 2021.

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.

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

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

All faculty and staff are involved in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

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: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00