The School District of Lee County

# HECTOR A. CAFFERATA JR. K-8 SCHOOL

## 2026-27 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# Table of Contents

SIP Authority ..... 1

I. School Information ..... 2

A. School Mission and Vision ..... 2

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring ..... 2

C. Demographic Data ..... 7

D. Early Warning Systems ..... 8

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review ..... 12

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison ..... 13

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review ..... 14

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review ..... 15

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup ..... 16

E. Grade Level Data Review ..... 19

III. Planning for Improvement ..... 20

IV. Positive Learning Environment ..... 30

V. Title I Requirements (optional) ..... 33

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review ..... 36

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus ..... 37

# School Board Approval

*A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.*

# SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state’s graduation rate.

# SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

# Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year.

# I. School Information

# A. School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement**

The mission of Hector A. Cafferata, Jr. K-8 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**

Hector A. Cafferata, Jr. K-8 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.

# B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

## 1. School Leadership Membership

**School Leadership Team**

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

## Leadership Team Member #1

**Employee's Name**

**Position Title**

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

No Answer Entered

## Leadership Team Member #2

**Employee's Name**

Dr. Jason Kurtz

jasonwku@leeschools.net

**Position Title**
Principal

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Provides overall leadership and direction for the implementation and monitoring of the School Improvement Plan. Ensures schoolwide instructional practices, resources, professional learning, and operational decisions are aligned with identified student achievement goals. Leads the administrative and instructional leadership teams in reviewing data, monitoring progress, and adjusting strategies based on evidence of student learning. Communicates expectations and promotes collective responsibility for continuous school improvement.

## Leadership Team Member #3

**Employee's Name**
Mr. Michael Licata

michaelvli@leeschools.net

**Position Title**
Assistant Principal

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Supports the implementation and monitoring of the School Improvement Plan through instructional leadership, classroom observations, and ongoing collaboration with teachers and leadership team members. Assists with analyzing student achievement, attendance, behavior, and implementation data to identify areas of need and measure progress toward schoolwide goals. Provides feedback and support to instructional staff to strengthen classroom practices and ensure consistent implementation of schoolwide initiatives. Collaborates with the principal to address barriers and refine improvement strategies.

## Leadership Team Member #4

**Employee's Name**
Mr. Richard Perdue

richardwp@leeschools.net

**Position Title**
Assistant Principal

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Supports schoolwide implementation of the School Improvement Plan by monitoring instructional practices, student performance, and school systems that contribute to academic success. Works with teachers and leadership team members to analyze data, identify trends, and develop appropriate

interventions and supports. Conducts classroom observations and provides actionable feedback designed to improve teaching and learning. Assists in monitoring the fidelity and effectiveness of SIP strategies and making adjustments based on student outcomes.

## Leadership Team Member #5

**Employee's Name**
Ms. Ana LaMotta

anaml@leeschools.net

**Position Title**
Peer Collaborative Teacher

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Provides job embedded instructional support to teachers through coaching, modeling, collaborative planning, and analysis of student learning data. Supports Professional Learning Communities in identifying student needs, developing instructional responses, and monitoring the effectiveness of those responses. Assists teachers with implementing research-based instructional strategies aligned with school improvement priorities. Works with the leadership team to identify instructional trends and professional learning needs across the school.

## Leadership Team Member #6

**Employee's Name**
Christina Lampkins

christinaml@leeschools.net

**Position Title**
Leading and Learning Teacher

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Supports the implementation of the School Improvement Plan by facilitating collaborative planning, professional learning, data analysis, and implementation of effective instructional practices. Works directly with teachers and teams to strengthen standards-based instruction, monitor student progress, and identify appropriate instructional adjustments. Helps ensure that schoolwide initiatives are implemented consistently and with fidelity across classrooms. Collaborates with administration and instructional support personnel to evaluate progress toward SIP goals and address identified areas for improvement.

## Leadership Team Member #7

**Employee's Name**

Ms. Jennifer Medero

jenniferm@leeschools.net

**Position Title**
Primary Literacy Specialist

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Provides specialized instructional leadership and support focused on strengthening early literacy instruction and student achievement in the primary grades. Collaborates with teachers to analyze assessment data, identify student needs, plan standards-aligned instruction, and implement evidence-based literacy practices and interventions. Supports teachers through coaching, modeling, collaborative planning, and professional learning related to foundational reading and literacy development. Monitors student progress and assists teams in adjusting instructional supports to advance the literacy goals identified in the School Improvement Plan.

## 2. Stakeholder Involvement

Describe the process for involving stakeholders [including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders] and how their input was used in the SIP development process (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

*Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.*

School Leadership Team gathers input from faculty, staff, parents, and students through surveys and small group discussions. This input is then used to drive school improvement goals, as well as processes and procedures.

## 3. SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the state academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

The progress towards meeting SIP plan goals is monitored by the school's guiding coalition at the school level. Grade level data is monitored by grade level teams. This information is disseminated through email communications/ meetings with faculty and staff, SAC meeting to parents and

community partners and school messenger to parents and guardians.

# C. Demographic Data

| | |
|---|---|
| **2026-27 STATUS**<br>(PER MSID FILE) | **ACTIVE** |
| **SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED**<br>(PER MSID FILE) | **COMBINATION**<br>**KG-8** |
| **PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE**<br>(PER MSID FILE) | **K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION** |
| **2025-26 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS** | |
| **2025-26 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE** | **100.0%** |
| **CHARTER SCHOOL** | **NO** |
| **RAISE SCHOOL** | **YES** |
| **2025-26 ESSA IDENTIFICATION**<br>*UPDATED AS OF 07/09/2026 | **CSI** |
| **ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)** | |
| **2025-26 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED**<br>(SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS)<br>(SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK) | **STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)***<br>**ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)**<br>**BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK)***<br>**HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP)**<br>**WHITE STUDENTS (WHT)**<br>**ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)** |
| **SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY**<br>**2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.* | **2025-26: B**<br>**2024-25: C**<br>**2023-24: B**<br>**2022-23: B**<br>**2021-22: C** |

# D. Early Warning Systems

## 1. Grades K-8

**Current Year 2026-27**

Using 2025-26 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| School Enrollment | 112 | 108 | 89 | 87 | 126 | 110 | 144 | 84 | 39 | 899 |
| Absent 10% or more school days | 11 | 31 | 29 | 16 | 35 | 28 | 32 | 21 | 10 | 213 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 32 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 29 | 32 | 32 | 24 | 29 | 22 | 18 | 11 | 197 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 15 | 14 | 41 | 16 | 23 | 27 | 18 | 11 | 165 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) | 0 | 16 | 3 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4) | | 6 | 7 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

**Current Year 2026-27**

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

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 12 | 16 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 57 |

**Current Year 2026-27**

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students retained:

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained students: current year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)**

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

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| School Enrollment | 67 | 74 | 118 | 134 | 101 | 148 | | | | 642 |
| Absent 10% or more school days | 23 | 12 | 29 | 19 | 23 | 31 | | | | 137 |
| One or more suspensions | | 2 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 4 | | | | 22 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 8 | 11 | 6 | | 2 | 3 | | | | 30 |
| Course failure in Math | 5 | 3 | 6 | 7 | | 5 | | | | 26 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | | | | 37 | 26 | 43 | | | | 106 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | | | | 26 | 23 | 45 | | | | 94 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4) | | | | | | | | | | 0 |

**Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)**

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

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 5 | 6 | 3 | 15 | 13 | 27 | | | | 69 |

**Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)**

The number of students retained:

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained students: current year | | | | 19 | | 3 | | | | 22 |
| Students retained two or more times | | | | | | | | | | 0 |

## 2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

# II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

# A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

The district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

Data for 2025-26 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

| ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT | 2026 | | | 2025 | | | 2024 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† |
| ELA Achievement* | 52 | 52 | 64 | 43 | 49 | 61 | 50 | 48 | 58 |
| Grade 3 ELA Achievement | 46 | 52 | 64 | 36 | 49 | 62 | 47 | 50 | 59 |
| ELA Learning Gains | 65 | 58 | 62 | 48 | 55 | 61 | 57 | 54 | 59 |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 65 | 54 | 55 | 48 | 54 | 55 | 64 | 53 | 54 |
| Math Achievement* | 50 | 51 | 64 | 49 | 48 | 62 | 58 | 51 | 59 |
| Math Learning Gains | 54 | 55 | 61 | 45 | 49 | 60 | 59 | 55 | 61 |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 51 | 48 | 52 | 41 | 46 | 53 | 40 | 52 | 56 |
| Science Achievement | 63 | 52 | 60 | 47 | 46 | 57 | 58 | 49 | 54 |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | 73 | 77 | | 66 | 74 | | 64 | 72 |
| Graduation Rate | | 66 | 77 | | 52 | 72 | | 37 | 71 |
| Middle School Acceleration | | 80 | 79 | | 69 | 75 | | 74 | 71 |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 54 | 61 | | 47 | 56 | | 30 | 54 |
| Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) | | | | | 55 | 61 | | 49 | 59 |

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

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

# B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2025-26 ESSA FPPI | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | CSI |
| OVERALL FPPI – All Students | 56% |
| OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the FPPI | 446 |
| Total Components for the FPPI | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Graduation Rate | |

| ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2025-26** | **2024-25** | **2023-24** | **2022-23** | **2021-22** | **2020-21**** | **2019-20*** |
| 56% | 46% | 55% | 53% | 50% | 45% | |

# C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

**2025-26 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| ESSA SUBGROUP | FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX | SUBGROUP BELOW 41% | NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41% | NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32% |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students With Disabilities | 28% | Yes | 7 | 7 |
| English Language Learners | 50% | No | | |
| Black/African American Students | 32% | Yes | 3 | |
| Hispanic Students | 55% | No | | |
| White Students | 64% | No | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 54% | No | | |

# D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

| 2025-26 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACCEL. | GRAD RATE 2024-25 | C&C ACCEL 2024-25 | ELP PROGRESS |
| All Students | 52% | 46% | 65% | 65% | 50% | 54% | 51% | 63% | | | | | |
| Students With Disabilities | 10% | 5% | 41% | 57% | 10% | 34% | 47% | 21% | | | | | |
| English Language Learners | 44% | 40% | 62% | 60% | 40% | 56% | 46% | 49% | | | | | |
| Black/African American Students | 35% | | | | 29% | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic Students | 51% | 42% | 65% | 65% | 49% | 55% | 50% | 64% | | | | | |
| White Students | 63% | 74% | 66% | | 60% | 54% | 64% | 67% | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 50% | 50% | 63% | 64% | 50% | 52% | 48% | 58% | | | | | |

## 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| | ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACCEL. | GRAD RATE 2023-24 | C&C ACCEL 2023-24 | ELP PROGRESS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 43% | 36% | 48% | 48% | 49% | 45% | 41% | 47% | | | | | 58% |
| Students With Disabilities | 15% | 13% | 35% | 41% | 11% | 34% | 39% | 13% | | | | | 40% |
| English Language Learners | 35% | 33% | 47% | 41% | 44% | 44% | 39% | 40% | | | | | 58% |
| Black/African American Students | 37% | | 71% | | 21% | 21% | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic Students | 46% | 40% | 47% | 39% | 50% | 45% | 38% | 47% | | | | | 59% |
| White Students | 39% | 20% | 49% | 73% | 50% | 53% | 55% | 58% | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 42% | 35% | 46% | 45% | 47% | 43% | 33% | 46% | | | | | 59% |

## 2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| | ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACCEL. | GRAD RATE 2022-23 | C&C ACCEL 2022-23 | ELP PROGRESS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 50% | 47% | 57% | 64% | 58% | 59% | 40% | 58% | | | | | 61% |
| Students With Disabilities | 11% | 0% | 35% | 30% | 18% | 50% | 40% | | | | | | 35% |
| English Language Learners | 43% | 40% | 63% | 69% | 55% | 64% | 52% | 42% | | | | | 61% |
| Black/African American Students | 48% | | 38% | | 24% | 44% | | 40% | | | | | |
| Hispanic Students | 50% | 51% | 56% | 63% | 60% | 63% | 39% | 57% | | | | | 60% |
| White Students | 46% | 33% | 62% | 85% | 57% | 52% | 40% | 64% | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 48% | 48% | 55% | 64% | 56% | 58% | 42% | 53% | | | | | 61% |

# E. Grade Level Data Review – State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested or all tested students scoring the same.

| 2025-26 SPRING | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUBJECT | GRADE | SCHOOL | DISTRICT | SCHOOL - DISTRICT | STATE | SCHOOL - STATE |
| ELA | 3 | 43% | 52% | -9% | 60% | -17% |
| ELA | 4 | 48% | 53% | -5% | 60% | -12% |
| ELA | 5 | 64% | 58% | 6% | 61% | 3% |
| Math | 3 | 44% | 59% | -15% | 66% | -22% |
| Math | 4 | 54% | 60% | -6% | 65% | -11% |
| Math | 5 | 54% | 59% | -5% | 62% | -8% |
| Science | 5 | 63% | 55% | 8% | 60% | 3% |

# III. Planning for Improvement

## A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Most Improvement**

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

While increases in achievement in 2025-26 were seen across subject areas, Math proficiency saw the smallest increase. All students received interventions based on individual student needs during a reading intervention block in all grade levels. Instruction was driven through review of progress monitoring data to ensure that students are afforded the opportunity for reteaching of standards that had not yet been mastered. In addition, all teams participated in grade level PLC's facilitated by Peer Collaborative Teachers to assist with planning and instruction

**Lowest Performance**

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

Students with disabilities continue to demonstrate the lowest performance. These students struggle with mastery of foundational skills and reading comprehension due to their disability.

**Greatest Decline**

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

Overall there was an increase in both achievement and learning gains in ELA, Math and Science. Science showed the largest increase in achievement from 47% to 63% and overall 3rd grade ELA proficiency increased from 36% to 46%. Math proficiency showed the smallest increase from 49% to 50% especially 5th grade. This was due to several factors:
1. The 5th grade cohort were not all in person in KG due to COVID and recieved virtual learning.
2. 41.4% of students are English Language Learners who are in their first few years of the process of acquiring the English Language.
3. The school has been displaced due to Hurricane Ian in September of 2022 and spent its 4th year in a portables

**Greatest Gap**

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.

3rd Grade Achievement in Math has the greatest gap when compared to the state. Only 44% were proficient compared to 66% at the state level. The main contributing factors are school disruption due to Hurricanes and that approximately 44% of students are English Language Learners who are still in the process of acquiring the English language.

**EWS Areas of Concern**

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

Attendance continues to be an area of concern and the team is addressing students who miss a high number of days.

**Highest Priorities**

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

Learning Gains across all demographics
ELL achievement
SWD achievement
Math Achievement
Attendance

# B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

## Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

### ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Students with Disabilities continue to underperform other sub groups. Contributing factors include a high percentage of SWD and the fact that they struggle with mastery of foundational skills and reading comprehension due to their disability. Performance data from the 2025-26 statewide assessment shows that our SWD Subgroup Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) scored 28% which is 13points below the 41% threshold. This significant gap highlights the urgent need to strengthen foundational literacy instruction and increase student proficiency in reading comprehension, fluency, and vocabulary development.

**Measurable Outcome**

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

By May 2027, the FPPI result for the SWD subgroup at Hector A. Cafferata, Jr. K-8 will increase from 28% to at least 41% of the total points available on the statewide assessments.

**Monitoring**

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

The implementation and impact of this Area of Focus will be monitored through a multi-tiered system of progress checks and instructional oversight. Teachers will administer the FAST progress monitoring assessments (PM1, PM2, and PM3) according to the state testing schedule to track overall proficiency growth. In addition, monthly data chats will be conducted with teachers and administration to review student performance data, including classroom-based assessments, IXL diagnostic scores, and formative reading checks aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards.

The leadership team and instructional coaches will conduct regular walkthroughs and fidelity checks to ensure high-quality Tier 1 instruction is being delivered and that intervention groups are aligned to

student needs. Adjustments to instruction and grouping will be made based on student data, with an emphasis on reducing the number of students scoring at Level 1 and increasing the number achieving proficiency.

Evidence of implementation will be documented through PLC meeting notes, intervention logs, lesson plans, and coaching feedback, all of which will be reviewed biweekly to ensure alignment with schoolwide goals. The ESE team will also meet regularly to evaluate student progress and determine next steps for students needing continued support.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**
Dr. Jason Kurtz

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**
Teachers will implement a targeted reading intervention plan that leverages IXL diagnostic data and standards-based planning through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Instructional teams will use assessment data to identify specific reading standards and foundational skill components in which students are not yet proficient. Teachers will collaboratively develop intervention plans focused on these areas, including small group instruction, scaffolded tasks, and progress monitoring tools aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards. The intervention will be continuously refined through data discussions, lesson planning, and administrative collaboration to ensure that each identified need is met with intentional, responsive instruction.

**Rationale:**
This intervention approach was selected because these students receive interventions through their Individualized Educational Plans (IEP), indicating that many were already receiving targeted support but not yet demonstrating sufficient growth. By focusing intervention efforts on specific standards and skill deficits, and embedding this work within the existing PLC structure, the school can ensure that instruction is both focused and flexible. Utilizing IXL Reading data allows for timely, skill-specific insights, enabling teachers to adjust instruction based on student progress throughout the year.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**
No

**Action Steps to Implement:**

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**
Instruction in Foundational Reading Skills

**Person Monitoring:**
Dr. Jason Kurtz

**By When/Frequency:**
Bi-Weekly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**
1. The ELA Peer Collaborative Teacher and Primary Literacy Specialist will provide professional development to teachers on how to use Flamingo Literacy instructional routines and model lessons for teachers in the classroom. The ELA PCT and Lit Specialist 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.

**Action Step #2**
Standards-Based PLC Planning Using IXL and FAST Data

**Person Monitoring:**
Mr. Michael Licata

**By When/Frequency:**
Weekly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**
ESE teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze i-Ready Reading and FAST PM data to identify specific standards needing re-teaching or intervention. Teams will collaboratively plan lessons and groupings aligned to these data points. Administration and the instructional coach will review PLC notes and monitor instructional implementation through classroom walkthroughs and coaching cycles to ensure alignment with the identified instructional priorities.

## Area of Focus #2

Address the school’s highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

### Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned instruction

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

A large percentage of students at Hector A. Cafferata, Jr. K-8 School scored a level 2 on the FAST

Math and Reading. The team has identified that students struggled with higher level questions impacting their achievement.

**Measurable Outcome**

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Increase EOY ELA proficiency on FAST in 3rd-5th grade from 52% to 59%.
Increase EOY Math proficiency on FAST in 3rd-5th grade from 50% to 57%

**Monitoring**

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

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**

Dr. Jason Kurtz

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**

Teachers will participate in professional development and ensure that that they are implementing instructional elements for Marzano's NASOT. This has been shown to increase student achievement (Marzano, 2017).

**Rationale:**

When teachers implement Marzano’s element of establishing and communicating clear learning goals with proficiency scales, students show increased gains in math and reading achievement. This clarity helps students track their own progress and understand expectations (Marzano, 2017). Additionally, Incorporating cognitively complex tasks (e.g., problem-solving, generating and testing hypotheses) into math and reading instruction leads to deeper learning and better academic outcomes. This aligns with Marzano’s focus on developing higher-order thinking as a core instructional strategy (Marzano, 2017).

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement:**

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3

action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**
Marzano NASOT

**Person Monitoring:**
Leadership team

**By When/Frequency:**
Bi-Weekly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**
1. The leadership team will provide professional development to teachers on NASOT and then model lessons for teachers in the classroom. They will coach and mentor teachers in this strategy.
2. Teams will utilize a planning sheet to ensure inclusion of NASOT elements in lessons.
3. Grade Level PLC's will be facilitated by a 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 benchmarks.
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.
8. Leadership Team 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.

## Area of Focus #3

Address the school’s highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

### Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

A large percentage of students at Hector A. Cafferata, Jr. exdid not achieve gains year over year on the FAST Math and Reading in the 2025-26 school year. The team has identified that students struggled with higher level questions impacting their achievement and that teachers did not understand what a gain is.

**Measurable Outcome**

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Hector A. Cafferata, Jr. K-8 will increase its school grade from a letter grade of B to a A in2026-27 as measured by performance on the FL School Grading System.

**Monitoring**

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

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**

Dr. Jason Kurtz

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**

Teachers will participate in professional development and ensure that that they are implementing instructional elements for Marzano's NASOT. This has been shown to increase student achievement (Marzano, 2017).

**Rationale:**

When teachers implement Marzano’s element of establishing and communicating clear learning goals with proficiency scales, students show increased gains in math and reading achievement. This clarity helps students track their own progress and understand expectations. Additionally, the provision of specific feedback is associated with significant improvements in reading and math scores. Feedback helps students make immediate adjustments and deepens their understanding of concepts. Lastly, by incorporating cognitively complex tasks (e.g., problem-solving, generating and testing hypotheses) into math and reading instruction leads to deeper learning and better academic outcomes. This aligns with Marzano’s focus on developing higher-order thinking as a core instructional strategy.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement:**

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**

Progress-monitoring and benchmark alignment

| **Person Monitoring:** | **By When/Frequency:** |
|---|---|
| Leadership Team | Bi-Weekly |

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

1. The Marzano resources team will provide professional development to teachers on NASOT, complete instructional walk throughs, and model lessons for teachers in the classroom. They will

coach and mentor teachers in this strategy.
2. Teams will utilize a planning sheet to ensure inclusion of NASOT elements in lessons.
3. Grade Level PLC's will be facilitated by a 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 benchmarks.
7. Our school will progress monitor bi-weekly in PLC's using exemplar assessments (Benchmark checks). Teacher and students will track their level of proficiency using scales developed for priority benchmarks.
8. Leadership Team 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.

## Area of Focus #4

Address the school’s highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

### Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA required by RAISE (specific questions)

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

A large group of students in 1st and 2nd grade continue to score below the 40%ile on the FAST (STAR) in 2025-26. This is due in part to the high number of English Language Learners who require explicit instruction in foundational & comprehension reading skills, more time to acquire the English Language and an opportunity for extended practice.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

The highest priority for K-2 ELA instructional practice is ensuring that all students master the foundational reading skills.

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

41% of students at Cafferata are English Language Learners who require explicit instruction in foundational reading skills, more time to acquire the English Language and an opportunity for extended practice. The focus on ensuring that all students receive the necessary explicit reading instruction in both foundational and comprehension skills.

**Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)**

Increase EOY percentage of studentys in K-2nd grade scoreing above the 40th percentile from 45% to 50% on STAR Reading.

**Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)**

Increase EOY ELA proficiency on FAST REading in 3rd-5th grade from 52% to 57%.

**Monitoring**

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

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**

Mr. Michael Licata

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**

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:**

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 structure, 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.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**
No

**Action Steps to Implement:**

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**
Explicit instruction in Reading

**Person Monitoring:**
Ana LaMotta and Jennifer Medero

**By When/Frequency:**
Bi-weekly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**
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.

# IV. Positive Learning Environment

## Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Academic Engaged Time (AET) is tied to student achievement. Attendance plays a large role in increasing AET puzzle. The global pandemic and Hurricane Ian have led to increased rates of absenteeism.This equates to days of lost instruction. While attendance improved slightly over the last two school years, with a decrease in chronically absent students from 34.4% to 28.4% this is still an unacceptable number of chronically absent students.

**Measurable Outcome**

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Decrease the percentage of chronically absent students from 28 % to less than 20% as measured in FOCUS by May 2027.

**Monitoring**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Attendance Committee and admin will monitor Average Daily Attendance Rates.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Madalyn Brooks, Social Worker

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**

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:**

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.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement:**

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**
Attendance Intervention Plan

**Person Monitoring:**
Madalyn Brooks, Social Worker

**By When/Frequency:**
Weekly

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**
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.

# V. Title I Requirements (optional)

## A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Dissemination Methods**

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

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

Information regarding the SIP and budget will be shared with stakeholders through SAC meetings, parent involvement events (PTO), monthly school newsletters, and the school website in English and Spanish.
https://hac.leeschools.net

**Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders**

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

List the school's webpage where the school's Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

The school personnel plans to build positive relationships by inviting families in for academic activities as well as fun activities. We will also ask for input and feedback regarding our plans and activities.
https://hac.leeschools.net/our_school/title_i

**Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program**

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

The school plans to strengthen the academic programs by surveying the teachers every quarter to

determine their needs for professional learning and then providing time for teachers to learn from and observe their peers. The school leaders developed schedules to maximize the amount of time for instruction and intervention and minimize transition times.

**How Plan is Developed**

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other federal, state and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

This plan is developed in cooperation with all stakeholder groups through professional development, surveys, and meetings.

# B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

## Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

**Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas**

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

No Answer Entered

**Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce**

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

No Answer Entered

**Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services**

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

**Professional Learning and Other Activities**

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

No Answer Entered

**Strategies to Assist Preschool Children**

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

# VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI, or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6).

**Process to Review the Use of Resources**

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating school funding. The schools are budgeted using multi-faceted methods based on the students' needs. Initially, the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, and % of ESE students for academic support and funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, Education Enrichment, and/or UniSIG plan, as appropriate, there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high-quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Principal supervisors monitor student data and underperforming subgroups through monthly visits and data chats.

**Specifics to Address the Need**

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

Hector A. Cafferata, Jr. K-8 School will utilize available Title I, district, and school-based resources to provide targeted academic support to students within identified ATSI/TSI subgroups. FAST progress-monitoring data, prior-year FAST achievement data, classroom assessments, and ongoing progress-monitoring data will be reviewed to identify specific standards and student groups requiring additional support. Resources will include targeted small-group instruction and intervention, instructional coaching and collaborative planning support provided by the Peer Collaborative Teacher, Leading and Learning Teacher, and Primary Literacy Specialist, supplemental standards-aligned instructional materials, and professional learning focused on evidence-based instructional strategies and differentiation. Student progress will be reviewed through PLCs and leadership/data-team meetings following PM1, PM2, and PM3, as well as through interim classroom and intervention data, and resources and instructional supports will be adjusted throughout the school year based on evidence of student response and progress toward closing identified achievement gaps.

# VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2026-27 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply. **No**

| BUDGET | ACTIVITY | FUNCTION/ OBJECT | FUNDING SOURCE | FTE | AMOUNT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Plan Budget Total | | | | | 0.00 |