

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Thonotosassa Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Thonotosassa Elementary School

10050 SKEWLEE RD, Thonotosassa, FL 33592

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Anthony Montoto

Start Date for this Principal: 4/15/2019

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

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Thonotosassa Elementary School

10050 SKEWLEE RD, Thonotosassa, FL 33592

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	89%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	D	D	D	D

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 instruction, 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 rigor, differentiated and scaffolded instruction, 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 4/15/2019, Anthony Montoto

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (37%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	50	50	57	58	62	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	326	
Attendance below 90 percent	19	14	14	12	27	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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		12
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	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	12	
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	

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	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%
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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	46
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

2018-2019 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 2017-2018 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.

2018-2019 Grade 4 students performed at 25% proficient in mathematics. 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. 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?

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. Maintain retention of highly effective/effective teachers
2. Continue to maintain and build a positive culture among teachers and students
3. Ensure established school-wide expectations and procedures maximize instructional time
4. Refine systems of targeted instructional support and progress monitoring
5. Continue to increase student engagement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Description: Increase student achievement by prioritizing engagement in relevant/on grade level curriculum (or higher) during whole and small group instruction.</p> <p>Rationale: According to the Opportunity Myth, academic achievement increases when students are deeply engaged in high-quality instruction and have the opportunity to work on grade-level assignments. Previous years' state assessment data indicates a large number of students working below grade level. Our goal is to strengthen teacher instructional practices which allow students to engage in critical thinking about grade level content and tasks that are aligned to the complexity level of the standard. This will increase students' proficiency in demonstrating the FL and NGSS Standards within each content area.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>80% of teachers will engage students in standards-based instruction and grade-level assignments at the complexity level of the standard or higher as evidenced by learning walk data by October, 2020.</p> <p>100% of teachers will engage students in standards-based instruction and grade-level assignments at the complexity level of the standard or higher as evidenced by learning walk data by December, 2020.</p> <p>All sub-groups performing below the Federal Index Target of 41% proficient or higher will increase to 45% of students proficient in ELA and Mathematics (18-19 Data: Students with Disabilities - 29%, ELL - 35%, Black Students - 27%, Hispanic Students - 34%, and Economically-disadvantaged Students - 38%).</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anthony Montoto (anthony.montoto@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Within weekly PLC's and facilitated planning sessions, teachers will 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 successfully engaging in the work of grade level standards. Teachers will collaborate with instructional coaches and administration to develop strategies to increase student performance and provide reteaching, to support students in mastery of grade level standards. Professional growth opportunities in content knowledge and pedagogy will be provided by instructional coaches through coaching cycles and job-embedded professional development. Progress monitoring data will be collected through District Baseline and Mid-year Assessments, as well as District monthly assessments, and adjustments to systems and support will be made based on progress monitoring data. Additional progress monitoring will occur through Achieve3000, I-Ready Fall, Winter, and Spring Diagnostics as well as Lesson Progress and Growth-Monitoring for ELA and Mathematics.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>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.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Action Step 1 - Review and Refine Structures and Expectations for PLCs

- Review and adjust master schedule to ensure common planning times for all grade level content areas (traditional & virtual instruction)

- Review and refine the structure and expectations of content PLCs
- Protocols will be developed to include DuFour's PLC framework and how teachers will be supported with effective teaching methods for standards-based instruction
- By the end of pre-planning week, content teams will collectively analyze existing structures and expectations for before, during, and after PLCs and make modifications as needed
- By the end of pre-planning week, content teams will define roles and responsibilities of team members
- Progress Monitoring - Administration will attend PLCs to monitor implementation and will clearly communicate expectations through the review of PLC protocols, and lesson plans, student assessment data, formal/informal observations, and individualized feedback to teachers through Office 365

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

Action Step 2 – Provide Needs-Based Professional Development

- Leadership Team will develop and facilitate a Summer Institute for teachers/instructional personnel to attend to provide a "Deep Dive" into our instructional priorities for the 2020-2021 school year
- Utilize Reading Coach/Reading Resource teachers and hire Math Coach to provide ongoing needs based job-embedded Side by Side Professional Development to increase content knowledge and develop best practices. Coaching cycles will be implemented by content area coaches for all teachers within the first two months of the school year; next step individualized coaching provided based on a system of tiered support.
- Individual feedback will be communicated to teachers by administration/content coaches
- Purchase teacher resources, supplies and technology to support professional development and instruction
- Administration/leadership team will provide ongoing progress monitoring through classroom walkthrough data and student assessments that demonstrate evidence of learning, and progress of teacher coaching plans

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

Action Step 3 - Build Teacher Capacity

- Leadership team will develop criteria for look fors centered around student engagement in standards-aligned instruction and grade-level assignments at the complexity level of the standard or higher
- Leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to collect data on implementation of instruction planned during PLCs and facilitated planning sessions as well as the application of ongoing professional development designed to provide strategies to accelerate student achievement
- Trend data will be communicated to teachers (whole school, content, grade level) by administration
- Individual feedback will be communicated to teachers by administration and content coaches
- Administration will use walkthrough data to tier teachers based on established criteria and identify support needed; develop coaching plans as needed
- Administration/leadership team will provide ongoing progress monitoring through classroom walkthrough data and student assessments that demonstrate evidence of learning, and progress of teacher coaching plans

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

Action Step 4 - Provide Targeted Student Support through Reading Tutor

- Close achievement gaps by providing targeted small group instruction
- Hire reading tutor to provide targeted small-group standards-based instruction with scaffolding and differentiation as needed to demonstrate proficiency in the ELA FL Standards; the reading tutor will

collaborate with the Reading Coach and Administration to identify students in need of additional support and determine the most effective instructional strategies for small groups; prioritize targeted subgroups of students (Students with Disabilities, ELL Students, Black Students, Hispanic Students, and Economically-disadvantaged Students).

- Administration, in collaboration with the leadership team will provide ongoing progress monitoring through classroom walkthrough data and analyzing trends in performance on assessments that demonstrate students' evidence of learning

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

Action Step 5 - Providing Targeted Student Support through Additional Instructional Personnel

Close achievement gaps by providing targeted small group instruction

- Hire 4 Paraprofessionals to support grades 1 - 5 in working to close achievement gaps based on the research presented in the Opportunity Myth. The paraprofessionals, along with instructional staff, will assist daily primary and intermediate teachers in the instructional priorities of having high expectations, grade appropriate assignments, and targeted small group instruction to address identified student needs. The paraprofessionals will support in the creating and maintaining the instructional momentum of the identified grades in all content areas with a focus on reading and math; prioritize targeted subgroups of students (Students with Disabilities, ELL Students, Black Students, Hispanic Students, and Economically-disadvantaged Students).

- Administration, in collaboration with the leadership team will provide ongoing progress monitoring through classroom walkthrough data and analyzing trends in performance on assessments that demonstrate students' evidence of learning

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

Action Step 6 - Providing Targeted Student Support through Parent and Family Engagement

Close achievement gaps by providing meaningful activities to improve student achievement

- Conduct meaningful activities to provide the communication and support necessary to assist and build the capacity of all families and staff in planning and implementing effective parent and family involvement activities to improve student academic achievement and school performance

- Administration, in collaboration with the leadership team will provide ongoing progress monitoring through classroom walkthrough data and analyzing trends in performance on assessments that demonstrate students' evidence of learning as well as evaluations of Parent and Family Engagement programs and activities

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Administration will work with the leadership team, teachers, and staff to address any additional schoolwide improvement priorities. This includes school health and safety, mental health, teacher recruitment and retention, parent and family engagement, and community stakeholder involvement in the continuous improvement initiatives in our school.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Student services personnel will be responsible for providing ongoing conferencing with students (one to one and/or small group), weekly grade-level lessons (Good Morning Guidance), and lead in facilitating the RTI process, PSLT and CST. In addition, student services in consultation with a teacher liaison will oversee the implementation of PBIS and Restorative Practices by providing coaching cycles, classroom observations, and modeling lessons for teachers/staff. Professional Development opportunities will be available to teachers/staff using feedback provided from teachers/staff through quarterly Interest Surveys created by Student Services. Student Services along with the teacher liaison will implement an initial coaching cycle for Restorative Practices "Circles" for all intermediate teachers within the first two months of the school year. Student Services will be a resource to provide daily to weekly feedback and coaching on the implementation of PBIS and Restorative Practices. Student Services will collect ongoing data, assist teachers with behavior concerns, and be a psychological/emotional support for intermediate teachers. The coordination of supports within our stakeholder community to address the physical, emotional, and psychological well-being of our students and teachers will positively impact school culture and student achievement.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$168,502.87
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG		\$13,063.49
			<i>Notes: Instructional personnel will teach 4th and 5th grade students an enrichment activity in Lego Building 2 days per week for 1.5 hours each day for 18 weeks at \$27.00 per hour. What: Lego Learning Projects and Activities When: 2 days per week after school for 90 minutes each day for 18 weeks Where: Media Center in a designated room for Maker Space Lego Building Why: Lego building projects enhance students problem solving capabilities as well as peaking student interests. Students will work collaboratively with peers and teachers to create functional/working projects through the use of Legos. This initiative will reach the skills of students across the different subjects. In addition, this initiative is aligned with our school's Instructional and Cultural Priorities. For the past three years, our school has received a state grade of a D. This initiative will support our turnaround efforts.</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$64,000.09

			<i>Notes: Writing Resource Teacher-The writing resource will be responsible for providing ongoing needs based Side by Side Professional Development, along with assistant principal in writing, in assisting teachers with conferencing with students. In addition to weekly planning with teachers, an initial writing coaching cycles will be implemented by the writing coach for all Writing teachers within the first two months of the school year. Tiered teachers will receive follow up writing coaching based on a system of tiers (Tier 1 - weekly, Tier 2 - biweekly, Tier 3 - once per month), The writing coach will provide, daily to weekly, feedback and coaching on best practice of writing strategies and pedagogy, ongoing data analysis, and participate in all weekly Professional Learning Communities in the area of Writing. Writing Resource will facilitate six 1-hour training session for 30 instructional personnel in implementing the strategies discussed in the Patterns of Power book.</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$5,420.81
			<i>Notes: Writing Resource Teacher Retirement 8.47%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$3,968.01
			<i>Notes: Writing Resource Teacher FICA 6.2%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$928.00
			<i>Notes: Writing Resource Teacher Medicare 1.45%</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$326.40
			<i>Notes: Writing Resource Teacher Workers Comp .51%</i>			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$12,160.02
			<i>Notes: Writing Resource Teacher Health Ins 19%</i>			
	5100	150-Aides	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$16,023.00
			<i>Notes: Paraprofessionals - will support the primary and intermediate grades in working to close the achievement gaps based on the researched information of the Opportunity Myth. The paraprofessionals, along with instructional staff, will assist daily primary and intermediate teachers in the instructional priorities of having high expectations, grade appropriate assignments, and academically working with small groups of students. The paraprofessionals will support grades 1st, 2nd grade and intermediate. The paraprofessionals will support in the creating and maintaining the instructional momentum of the identified grades in all content areas with a focus on reading and math.</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$1,357.15
			<i>Notes: Para-Retirement 8.47%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$993.43
			<i>Notes: Para-FICA 6.2%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$232.33
			<i>Notes: Para-Medicare 1.45%</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$81.72
			<i>Notes: Para-Workers Comp .51%</i>			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$3,044.37

			<i>Notes: Para-Health Ins 17.7%</i>			
	5100	520-Textbooks	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG		\$275.70
			<i>Notes: 10 copies @ \$27.57 each of the book - A Fresh Look at Phonics, Grades K-2: Common Causes of Failure and 7 Ingredients for Success (Corwin Literacy) by Wiley W. Blevins " Reading Resource will facilitate/collaborate with primary teachers during PLC and planning implementing the strategies discussed in the book.</i>			
	5100	520-Textbooks	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG		\$890.00
			<i>Notes: 10 copies @ \$89.00 each of the book Math in Practice by Heineman Math Coach will facilitate/collaborate with primary teachers during PLC and planning implementing the strategies discussed in the book.</i>			
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG		\$17,100.00
			<i>Notes: All instructional staff members will have a designated one hour extra a week to plan with instructional coaches. During their planning time, they will plan for standards aligned lessons to be highly engaging and meet the needs of all learners. The extra planning time is budgeted for a total of 19 weeks to be used throughout the year. Average teacher planning rate: \$30.00/hr Total number of instructional staff members: 30 Total number of weeks for additional planning: 19 Total: \$17,100</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG		\$8,876.74
			<i>Notes: General supplies for teachers to create highly engaging and standards aligned lessons. Materials can include but are not limited to chart paper, markers, copy paper, cardstock, toner, pens, pencils, stick notes, folders and materials to display student work and data.</i>			
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG		\$17,328.00
			<i>Notes: 47 laptops will be purchased to be used by students for daily instruction. Students will use the laptops to access engaging, standards based lessons, purchased subscriptions and have the ability to check out the laptops for use when not in the school building. Cost per laptop: \$359.68 x48 total: \$7193.60</i>			
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,250.00
			<i>Notes: Professional Development for 30 staff at \$15 hr x 5 hours</i>			
	6300	220-Social Security	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG		\$139.50
			<i>Notes: Professional Development FICA 6.2% for 30 staff at \$15 hr x 5 hours</i>			
	6300	220-Social Security	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG		\$32.63
			<i>Notes: Professional Development Medicare 1.45% for 30 staff at \$15 hr x 5 hours</i>			
	6300	240-Workers Compensation	4361 - Thonotosassa Elementary School	UniSIG		\$11.48
			<i>Notes: Professional Development Workers Comp .51% for 30 staff at \$15 hr x 5 hours</i>			
Total:						\$173,280.00