

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Thonotosassa Elementary School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>19</b> |

# Thonotosassa Elementary School

10050 SKEWLEE RD, Thonotosassa, FL 33592

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Anthony Montoto

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: D (37%)<br>2017-18: D (39%)<br>2016-17: D (36%)<br>2015-16: C (49%)<br>2014-15: D (36%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |

| ESSA Status  | CS&I |
|--|------|
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |      |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>19</b> |

## Thonotosassa Elementary School

10050 SKEWLEE RD, Thonotosassa, FL 33592

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 91%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 64%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | D       | D       | D       | C       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Thonotosassa Elementary promotes student achievement by engaging and empowering students in a supportive and caring environment. Through quality standards-based lesson planning, we challenge students to become problem solvers and future community leaders. The percent of our students making gains on standardized testing will increase annually through our focus on differentiated instruction, rigor, and progress monitoring.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

We will all achieve success through hard work and good character. Working together, Thonotosassa will be a top performing school.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name             | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities                                     |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Montoto, Anthony | Principal           | Mr. Montoto is responsible for the overall operation of the school. |
|                  | Assistant Principal |   |

### Early Warning Systems

#### Current Year

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 57          | 62 | 60 | 69 | 61 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 380   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 20          | 17 | 10 | 15 | 14 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 93    |
| One or more suspensions         | 1           | 0  | 8  | 5  | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 37    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 49 | 58 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 164   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 49 | 58 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 164   |

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 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**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 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

28

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 7/1/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 23 | 11 | 21 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 83    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 2  | 5  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 16 | 24 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66    |

**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           | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |

**Prior Year - Updated****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 23 | 11 | 21 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 83    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 2  | 5  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 16 | 24 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66    |

**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           | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 24 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

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

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 31%    | 52%      | 57%   | 40%    | 52%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 45%    | 55%      | 58%   | 43%    | 55%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 44%    | 50%      | 53%   | 38%    | 51%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 32%    | 54%      | 63%   | 30%    | 53%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 42%    | 57%      | 62%   | 32%    | 54%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 37%    | 46%      | 51%   | 33%    | 46%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 29%    | 50%      | 53%   | 38%    | 48%      | 51%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         |         |         |         | Total    |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       |          |
| Number of students enrolled     | 57 (0)                            | 62 (0)  | 60 (0)  | 69 (0)  | 61 (0)  | 71 (0)  | 380 (0)  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 20 (0)                            | 17 (23) | 10 (11) | 15 (21) | 14 (10) | 17 (18) | 93 (83)  |
| One or more suspensions         | 1 (0)                             | 0 (2)   | 8 (5)   | 5 (2)   | 11 (3)  | 12 (4)  | 37 (16)  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 49 (0)  | 58 (0)  | 57 (0)  | 164 (0)  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 49 (16) | 58 (24) | 57 (26) | 164 (66) |

### Grade Level Data

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

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

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 30%    | 52%      | -22%                       | 58%   | -28%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 28%    | 53%      | -25%                       | 57%   | -29%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 33%    | 55%      | -22%                       | 58%   | -25%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 39%    | 55%      | -16%                       | 56%   | -17%                    |

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -6%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 27%    | 54%      | -27%                       | 56%   | -29%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 39%    | 51%      | -12%                       | 55%   | -16%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -12%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -12%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 37%    | 54%      | -17%                       | 62%   | -25%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 35%    | 55%      | -20%                       | 62%   | -27%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 25%    | 57%      | -32%                       | 64%   | -39%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 40%    | 57%      | -17%                       | 62%   | -22%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -15%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -10%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 34%    | 54%      | -20%                       | 60%   | -26%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 25%    | 54%      | -29%                       | 61%   | -36%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -6%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 25%    | 51%      | -26%                       | 53%   | -28%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 37%    | 52%      | -15%                       | 55%   | -18%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -12%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 7        | 43     | 40          | 10        | 40      | 31           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 21       | 45     |             | 25        | 30      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 28       | 41     |             | 22        | 28      | 27           | 16       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 27       | 44     |             | 27        | 38      | 20           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 37       | 49     | 58          | 43        | 54      |              | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 27       | 43     | 44          | 29        | 40      | 37           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 9        | 27     |             | 14        | 45      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 8        | 33     |             | 17        | 23      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 28       | 32     | 40          | 24        | 52      |              | 28       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 25       | 38     |             | 29        | 26      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 75       |        |             | 42        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 43       | 46     |             | 43        | 55      |              | 58       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 34       | 42     | 38          | 34        | 47      | 32           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD                                       | 17       | 50     |             | 26        | 39      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 21       | 35     |             | 21        | 29      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 35       | 40     |             | 25        | 25      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 28       | 29     |             | 23        | 25      |              | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 47       | 50     |             | 38        | 41      |              | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 38       | 40     | 40          | 25        | 29      | 33           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data

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

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | CS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 39   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 5    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 55   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 315  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 29   |
| 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                                       | 35   |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| 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                                | 27  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 34  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            |     |
| 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                                | 38  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

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

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

Grade 4 students measured 25% proficiency in Math. Teacher mobility creating vacancies where substitute teachers were responsible for delivery of core instruction. Instruction lacked complexity of grade level standards. Student learning was not differentiated to meet the needs of various performance levels.

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

Grade 5 student performance in science decreased from 39% proficient in 2018 to 29% proficient in 2019. This is a 10% decrease in science performance from the 2018 FCAT NGSS results. Teacher mobility creating vacancies where substitute teachers were responsible for delivery of core instruction. Instruction lacked complexity of grade level standards. Student learning was not differentiated to meet the needs of various performance levels.

#### 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.

Grade 4 student performance in math demonstrated 25% proficient. This is a 39% difference in proficiency when compared to the state's average of 64% proficient. Teacher mobility creating vacancies where substitute teachers were responsible for delivery of core instruction. Instruction lacked complexity of grade level standards. Student learning was not differentiated to meet the needs of various performance levels.

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

Grade 5 student proficiency in math increased from 25% in 2018 to 34% in 2019, which is a gain of 9% proficient. This increase in performance is likely due to a increase in teacher retention. In addition, systems of support were provided to teachers to assist with planning, unpacking standards and implementation of standards-based lessons. Teachers participated in data analysis during weekly math PLC's with math resource personnel to guide instruction.

#### Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Number of students performing at Level 1 in both ELA and math.  
 Number of students suspended out of school.  
 Number of students who attended less than 90% of the school year.

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

1. Teacher retention
2. Establishing a positive culture among teachers and students
3. Developing school-wide expectations and procedures to maximize instructional time
4. Establishing systems of instructional support and progress monitoring
5. Increase student engagement

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | Standards-based lessons, with task alignment, at complexity level of the grade level standard in English/Language Arts and Mathematics.  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Academic achievement increases when students are engaged in high-quality instruction and have the opportunity to work on grade-level content during lessons. Teacher instructional practices that allow students to engage in critical thinking about grade level content and tasks that are aligned to the complexity level of the standard increase students' proficiency in demonstrating the FL Standards for ELA and Mathematics.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | <p>Increase the percent of students achieving proficiency as measured by the FSA ELA (Level 3 or higher) from 31% proficient during the 2018-2019 school year to 45% proficient or higher during the 2019-2020 school year.</p> <p>Increase the percent of students achieving proficiency as measured by the FSA Mathematics (Level 3 or higher) from 32% proficient during the 2018-2019 school year to 45% proficient or higher during the 2019-2020 school year.</p>  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Anthony Montoto (anthony.montoto@hcps.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Teachers will collaborate with instructional coaches and administration to engage in data chats and the development of strategies to increase student performance, providing reteaching as needed, to support students in mastery of grade level standards. Weekly PLC's will provide structured support for teachers to analyze current student performance data to identify strengths and needs, design instruction with the appropriate level of scaffolding, and select high quality instructional materials to ensure students are successful in engaging in the work of grade level standards. Professional growth opportunities to support teachers in content knowledge and pedagogy will be provided by instructional coaches through coaching cycles and job-embedded professional development. Ongoing progress monitoring to assess effectiveness of systems of support will occur regularly and data-based decisions and adjustments will be made as needed.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Regular collaboration with instructional coaches, colleagues, and administration to analyze data, identify needs and design quality instruction will ensure teachers are empowered to provide students with access to grade-appropriate standards. This work in PLC's, coaching cycles, and job-embedded professional development will maximize opportunities for our students to excel as a result of engaging in standards-based lessons, quality teaching, and high expectations in every classroom.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create a master schedule that allows time for grade-level teams to engage in PLC's with instructional coaches and administration.</li> <li>2. Provide teachers and instructional support personnel with professional development on designing and communicating clear learning targets to students (during Preplanning - August 2019).</li> <li>3. Administration will collaborate with instructional coaches to develop a timeline to provide teachers with coaching cycles to enhance content knowledge and pedagogy.</li> <li>4. Teachers, instructional coaches and administration will collaborate in the development of an assessment schedule to determine data to be used for progress monitoring.</li> <li>5. Gather baseline data on student performance relative to grade-level standards (prior year FSA data, I-Ready Diagnostic, Beginning of Year Assessments, Formatives, DRA's, Running Records, and Performance Assessments aligned to grade-level standards).</li> <li>6. Support small group and differentiated instruction through the use of Leveled Literacy</li> </ol> |

Intervention as well as other supplemental materials and resources.

7. Administrators and content coaches will support teacher planning efforts with the provision of additional time.

8. Korey Collins, from the Ron Clark Academy, will provide 3 PD sessions for our teachers.

9. Create Professional Development Impact Progress Monitoring Plan to evaluate the action steps outlined above. Evidence of implementation will be collected utilizing the following:

- Classroom walk-through data provided as feedback to individual teachers via Office 365.
- Minutes from grade level PLC work to include data analysis and standards-based planning sessions
- Documentation via state walk-throughs
- Documentation via district and school walk-throughs
- Modifications made during standards-based planning of provided resources captured on Office 365
- Formal and informal observation data

**Person Responsible** Anthony Montoto (anthony.montoto@hcps.net)

| #2  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | School Culture   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Students, teachers, staff members, parents and other stakeholders will feel safe, respected and supported while on campus.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | The results from the SCIP survey support that we need to build a more trusting environment as only 24% faculty and staff reported an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect. The 2019 - 2020 SCIP survey will reflect an increase in trust and respect by 25% to 49%.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Anthony Montoto (anthony.montoto@hcps.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Implement team building activities, weekly PLC's, quarterly surveys, establish and maintain norms for working in collaborative groups, increase communication among all stakeholders   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Increase teacher retention and positive working environment which ultimately increases student achievement.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement team building during preplanning and create a schedule of ongoing team building during faculty meetings and PLC's.</li> <li>2. Create and implement regularly scheduled PLC's and team planning monitored with fidelity.</li> <li>3. Create and administer quarterly surveys to assess the climate of trust and respect.</li> <li>4. Review quarterly survey results during ILT and plan for adjustments.</li> <li>5. Utilize PBIS online tracker to support positive student choices.</li> <li>6. Send a group of teachers as school representatives to the Ron Clark Academy.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Anthony Montoto (anthony.montoto@hcps.net)   |

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities** (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

1. Teacher retention
2. Establishing a positive culture among teachers and students
3. Developing school-wide expectations and procedures to maximize instructional time
4. Establishing systems of instructional support and progress monitoring
5. Increase student engagement

**Part IV: Title I Requirements****Additional Title I Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

Thonotosassa will employ two paraprofessionals to serve as Parent Liaisons, with both positions partially funded through TSSSA, who will be pivotal for monitoring the progress and facilitating connections between stakeholders (students, parents, teachers) and community resources. These individuals will connect students with the services, monitor their progress, and facilitate any adjustments needed during the relationship. Parent Liaisons will also focus on increasing the number of partnerships and deepening the level of community involvement with between the school and its stakeholders. Services will also be provided by the school's Student Support Team, consisting of School Counselors, Social Worker, and School Psychologist. They will provide students with the emotional support or items they need to promote their health and well-being so they can focus on their academic development. These individuals will be key members of the team for school-wide implementation of Restorative Practices. They will work closely with the administrative staff, resource teachers, and Parent Liaisons to be sure the program is being utilized with fidelity.

**PFEP Link**

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

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

The School Board of each Florida district is required by state law to establish a comprehensive program for student progression that is based on an evaluation of each student's performance including an assessment of how well the student masters the performance standards approved by the state board. The district's program for student progression is based on mastery of the English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies standards. (F.S. 1008.25)

The HCPS Student Progression Plan includes information on initial placement, reporting student progress, reading remediation, academic acceleration, grade promotion and retention, graduation requirements, transfer credits, student recognition, accommodations, dual enrollment, and extended learning opportunities.

For complete information, please visit our Student Progression Plan at: <http://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/docs/>

00/00/21/33/studentprogressionplan.pdf

HCPS utilizes a variety of strategies for assisting students as they transition from one school to another.

HCPS employs multiple strategies for preparing children for entry into kindergarten. Over 6,000 children participate in one of several preschool programs offered by the School District (Head Start, VPK and PreK-ESE). Developmental screenings are available for all families prior to entry into kindergarten through Child Find, a service within the Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS). Additionally, the district works closely with School Readiness providers to share information.

HCPS utilizes multiple strategies for preparing students for their next school, including transitioning from elementary to middle school, middle school to high school, or simply moving to a new school mid-year. Examples include:

- Bring 6th/9th graders back early for orientation
- Train a cadre of student ambassadors to help orient other students
- Parent information and/or education opportunities
- Hold articulation meetings between 5th and 6th grade teachers
- Campus visits
- Shadow days
- Middle school students visit, tutor and or perform at elementary schools
- High school students visit, tutor, or perform at middle schools.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

To ensure efficient and systematic allocation and use of resources, the school's PSLT/ILT utilizes an RtI/MTSS framework to improve learning for all. Resources allocated support a continuum of academic and behavioral supports, ensuring all students have fluid access to instruction (varying intensity levels matched to most appropriate available resources)

Analyze student outcomes and make data-driven decisions:

- What is the problem?
- Why is it occurring?
- What are we going to do about it?
- Is it working?

Assess the implementation of the SIP:

- Does the data show positive student growth?
- Are we making progress toward the SIPs intended outcomes?
- What can we do to sustain what's working?
- What barriers to implementation are we facing?
- What should be our plan of action?

Annually, schools take inventory of resource materials, staff, and funds allocated to determine necessary resource materials and personnel available to meet the needs of students. Resource maps identify gaps, ensuring resources are available and allocated for use by all.

To ensure support systems, small group, and individual needs are met, the PSLT:

- Reviews school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs across the school and all grade levels;
- Supports the implementation of high quality instructional practices during core and intervention blocks;
- Reviews progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains;

Communicates school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

The PSLT meets regularly (bi-weekly/monthly). The PSLT meeting calendar is structured around the district's assessment calendar, ensuring opportunities to review assessment outcome data and engage in the problem solving process for appropriate data-driven decisions. Team members include administrator(s), guidance counselor(s), school psychologist, ESE specialist, content area coaches/specialists, PLC liaisons, others as needed

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

HCPS strategies to advance college and career awareness include: Career interest inventory offered to students through Florida Shines; District College Nights; District Financial Aid Nights; Postsecondary representative visits at high schools; Fieldtrip opportunities for career awareness; Fieldtrip opportunities to technical colleges; and Opportunities for students to take courses within their area of interest at their high school, via virtual school, and through dual enrollment.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

na

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Standards-based lessons, with task alignment, at complexity level of the grade level standard in English/Language Arts and Mathematics. |   |                |     | \$195,866.91 |
|---|----------|---|---|----------------|-----|--------------|
|   | Function | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20      |
|   | 6400     | 330-Travel  | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$10,000.00  |
|   |          |   | Notes: Leadership Team will attend EL Education 2019 National Conference. One Vision Three Dimension curriculum gets students excited about learning through great books, compelling topics and ownership of their learning. At the same time, teachers get a vision of the instructional practices that support a Common Core-aligned classroom and the tools to create it. Cost breakdown- air travel to Atlanta @350.00 pp= \$1750, 3 hotel rooms for 3 nights @ \$250=\$2250 , registration fees @ \$1000 pp= \$5000; \$30/person/day for meals= 90.00 pp= \$450, and transportation to and from hotel to airport. \$125 pp= 625. |                |     |              |
|   | 5100     | 520-Textbooks   | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$50,283.70  |
|   |          |   | Notes: Reading Curriculum Materials and Supplemental Resources Level Literacy Intervention Kit for grades K-5. Quote available.   |                |     |              |
|   | 6300     | 120-Classroom Teachers  | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$51,316.13  |
|   |          |   | Notes: Additional Planning Time for teachers to plan rigorous instruction including opportunities for differentiation, collaborative learning experiences, higher order questioning which will be linked to student learning. T-Pay hours for 45 teachers @ 2 hours a week for 19 weeks @ \$35/hr=\$59,850.00.  |                |     |              |

|          |               |                                       |  |                |     |                    |
|----------|---------------|---------------------------------------|--|----------------|-----|--------------------|
|          |               |                                       | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School  |                |     | \$0.00             |
|          |               |                                       | <i>Notes: Materials and Supplies for Professional Development</i>  |                |     |                    |
|          |               |                                       | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School  |                |     | \$0.00             |
|          |               |                                       | <i>Notes: Substitute teachers for professional development, teacher planning support, and side by side coaching cycles</i>       |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 120-Classroom Teachers                | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School  | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$56,378.26        |
|          |               |                                       | <i>Notes: Writing Resource Teacher</i>   |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 210-Retirement                        | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$4,775.24         |
|          |               |                                       | <i>Notes: .8.47% of Writing Resource Teacher</i>   |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 220-Social Security                   | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$3,495.45         |
|          |               |                                       | <i>Notes: 6.2% of Writing Resource Teacher FICA</i>  |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 220-Social Security                   | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$817.78           |
|          |               |                                       | <i>Notes: 1.45% of Writing Resource Teacher Medicare</i>   |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 230-Group Insurance                   | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$9,978.95         |
|          |               |                                       | <i>Notes: 17.7% of Writing Resource Teacher</i>  |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 240-Workers Compensation              | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$287.53           |
|          |               |                                       | <i>Notes: .51% of Writing Resource Teacher</i>   |                |     |                    |
|          | 6300          | 210-Retirement                        | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$4,346.48         |
|          |               |                                       | <i>Notes: Additional Planning Time T-Pay hours for 45 teachers @ 2 hours a week for 19 weeks @ \$35/hr = \$59,850</i>            |                |     |                    |
|          | 6300          | 220-Social Security                   | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$3,181.60         |
|          |               |                                       | <i>Notes: FICA - Additional Planning Time T-Pay hours for 45 teachers @ 2 hours a week for 19 weeks @ \$35/hr = \$59,850</i>     |                |     |                    |
|          | 6300          | 220-Social Security                   | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$744.08           |
|          |               |                                       | <i>Notes: Medicare - Additional Planning Time T-Pay hours for 45 teachers @ 2 hours a week for 19 weeks @ \$35/hr = \$59,850</i> |                |     |                    |
|          | 6300          | 240-Workers Compensation              | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$261.71           |
|          |               |                                       | <i>Notes: Additional Planning Time T-Pay hours for 45 teachers @ 2 hours a week for 19 weeks @ \$35/hr = \$59,850</i>            |                |     |                    |
| <b>2</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: School Culture</b> |  |                |     | <b>\$10,300.00</b> |
|          | Function      | Object                                | Budget Focus   | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20            |
|          | 5100          | 510-Supplies                          | 4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$10,300.00        |

|               |  |                     |
|---------------|--|---------------------|
|               | <i>Notes: Per 5% of sup cap: Classroom supplies for teacher use for direct instruction with students</i> |                     |
| <b>Total:</b> |  | <b>\$211,952.13</b> |