Thonotosassa Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Thonotosassa Elementary School

10050 SKEWLEE RD, Thonotosassa, FL 33592

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Anthony Montoto

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (69%) 2018-19: D (37%) 2017-18: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Thonotosassa Elementary School

10050 SKEWLEE RD, Thonotosassa, FL 33592

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		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. The School District of Hillsbourough County's goal for graduation is 90%. 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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Montoto, Anthony	Principal	
Farmer, Lori	Assistant Principal	
Farinas, Sara	Instructional Coach	
Sheffler, Jennifer	Math Coach	Instructional Coach
Reich, Sherry	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach K-2 ELA

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/2/2022, Anthony Montoto

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

404

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

11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	61	65	67	56	57	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	371
Attendance below 90 percent	37	35	27	25	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	13	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	12	11	17	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	1	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/29/2022

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	58	59	47	66	56	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
Attendance below 90 percent	8	24	18	20	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	19	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	8	7	40	37	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	58	59	47	66	56	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
Attendance below 90 percent	8	24	18	20	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	19	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	8	7	40	37	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	53%	56%				31%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						45%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	80%						44%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	61%	50%	50%				32%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	87%						42%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	79%						37%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	61%	59%	59%				29%	50%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	30%	52%	-22%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	55%	-22%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2022					
	2019	27%	54%	-27%	56%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	37%	54%	-17%	62%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	25%	57%	-32%	64%	-39%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	25%	51%	-26%	53%	-28%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	20	63	69	43	79		42				
ELL	36	87	91	62	87	90					
BLK	34	57		44	65		27				
HSP	31	70		54	88	85	40				
MUL	50			67							
WHT	52	81	82	75	97		87				
FRL	40	70	79	57	85	79	56				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	22	42		17	53		27				
ELL	26			22							
BLK	19			20							
HSP	23	56		27	56		43				
WHT	34	24		46	71		38				
FRL	26	43	60	35	70		42				

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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	76
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	79
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	68
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

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

Overall achievement in ELA improved by 11% from 2019-2022. All subgroups increased in proficiency over the three year span.
In the area of Mathematics, third grade proficiency in 2019 proficiency was 37% and increased to 51% in 2022. Fourth grade proficiency in 2019 was 25% and increased to 78% in 2022. Fifth grade proficiency in 2019 was 34% and increased to 57%. Overall improvement in mathematics achievement was an average increase of 30% over the three-year span due to targeted instruction and strategic planning.
The subgroups for mathematics increased across all demographics from 2021-2022. Thonotosassa did not have a bottom quartile in math for the year 2021; however, in 2022, the bottom quartile for the ELL subgroup was 90%, HSP was 85%, and FRL was 79%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA - Increase overall achievement in ELA: Students in grades 3-5 will increase from 42% to 50% proficiency for the FAST PM3 in Spring 2023.
Math – The greatest need for improvement in mathematics would be to increase overall math achievement, as well as the math achievement levels for SWD (43% proficient) and BLK students (44% proficient), as the achievement for these two subgroups was 14% lower than the proficiency average for all students in grades 3-5.

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

Overall trends show that there were missed opportunities of aggressive progress monitoring, used to address specific students needs.
During the 2022-2023 school year, coaches and teachers will collaboratively plan for aggressive progress monitoring opportunities. Coaches will model, observe, and provide feedback to teachers in regards to aggressive progress monitoring, time on task, and differentiated instruction. In addition, Black

student achievement in Math and Students with Disabilities achievement in ELA and Math needs to be closely monitored so that teachers can respond to student needs. All students will need to be monitored for projected proficiency through informal assessments, as well as district and FAST 1 and 2 to determine areas of need. During weekly PLCs and data chats, school-based stakeholders will create action plans to address misconceptions and unfinished learning using a variety of resources.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA learning gains had an 25% increase from 2019-2022. The bottom quartile increased from 44% to 80% (36% increase over two years).
The most greatest improvement during 2021 to 2022 school year in the area of Mathematics was the ELL subgroup, which went from 22% to 62% proficient. The fourth graders math proficiency increased from 19% to 78%.
Science proficiency had a 32% increase from 2019-2022.

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

In ELA, Math, and Science, PLC time was maximized by using the time to disaggregate data and collaboratively group students. The use of faculty and school personnel was maximized to meet the needs of underperforming students by strategic grouping, lesson planning, and instruction. Coaches and instructional support facilitated additional small groups based on student data. Evidence of new learning in PLC work was implemented in the classroom with fidelity due to consistent walkthroughs and feedback to teachers. In addition, the master schedule included STEM time Tuesdays through Fridays, which allowed math teachers and interventionists to pull additional small groups with other students working on purposeful practice that was monitored closely by classroom teachers.

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

Learning will be accelerated by coaches observe aggressive monitoring and student time on task with feedback provided to teachers. PLCs will provide content knowledge and address shifts in standards as we move from M.A.F.S. to B.E.S.T. Since our F.A.S.T. will be a computer-based assessment, students will be given ample opportunity to use researched based math programs to simulate the testing environment.

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

PD opportunities will be provided through coaching, faculty meetings, and outside instructional support. With new standards and resources for all K-5 teachers in Hillsborough County, teachers need to understand the depth of each standard to know how to address proficiency, as well as where to locate the variety of resources needed for various ELA and Math components and instructional frameworks. The professional development that is foundational to address this need will be embedded in Professional Learning Communities.

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

Through PLCs and PD opportunities, we will build capacity in the school with content knowledge, instructional strategies, knowledge of the standards, data analysis, and research based resources available to HCPS.
To continue to build capacity for this year and beyond, there will be two coaches for each content area (ELA and Math): ELA will have one coach for K-2 and another coach for 3-5. This will also be provided

for math. The strategic use of coaches will allow continuous and timely implementation of strategies and professional development. Teachers in grades K-5 will have equity in receiving coaching and support.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Rationale: According to the Opportunity Myth, academic achievement increases when students are deeply engaged in high-quality standards aligned instruction and have the opportunity to work on grade-level assignments. The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment was 58%. Based on previous years' practice, root cause identified walkthrough and observational data to indicate the following: inconsistent use of aggressive monitoring, varying levels of student engagement in rigorous tasks aligned to the standards, and a need for scaffolded instruction responsive to student needs.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By December 2022, 70% of teachers will utilize aggressive progress monitoring to document and scaffold mastery of BEST standards and implementation of rigorous tasks. By May 2023, 80% of teachers will utilize aggressive progress monitoring to document and scaffold mastery of BEST standards and engagement in rigorous tasks to match BEST standards. This will result in a goal of 50% of students in grades 3-5 scoring at or above proficiency on the FAST ELA Statewide Assessment in May 2023.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Instructional coaches will provide ongoing feedback to teachers centered around the use of aggressive progress monitoring and student time on task. Administration will conduct formal and informal observations to provide regular written feedback through OneNote and the District teacher evaluation protocol along with ongoing collaboration. Teachers will provide work samples, skill-based checklists, anecdotal notes, etc. during PLC's. In grades K-2, District Assessments (Wonders Screeners) will be used to document student mastery of foundational skills. Benchmark assessments will be used to regularly monitor progress. Data-based instructional implications will discussed through data chats and PLC's. FAST #1 and #2 will be analyzed and action plans will be addressed in the same fashion as district assessments, with a focus of analyzing the assessments to determine needs for acceleration and reteaching.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anthony Montoto (anthony.montoto@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Instructional coaches will embed professional learning during PLC's and side-by-side coaching on explicit modeling, time on task, aggressive monitoring, and feedback to students through teacher clarity of success criteria with the goal of transfer to practice and teacher ownership. Instructional coaches will provide ongoing feedback to teachers centered around the impact on student learning. Administration will conduct formal and informal observations to provide regular written feedback through OneNote and the District teacher evaluation protocol along with ongoing collaboration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for**	Aggressive progress monitoring and time on task enables teachers to provide meaningful feedback to students. This provides clarity for the student and reduces the uncertainty between the students' performance and the lesson goals. Hattie's research on student feedback

selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	has an effect size of .75, as it learning oriented and redirects students toward mastery of the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide PD for aggressive monitoring when using evidence- based programs available to instructional support and teachers. Coaches will provide on-going PD through grade levels PLCs, data chats, modeling, and faculty meetings with the BEST benchmarks, Wonders, LLI and IREADY toolbox lessons. In addition, Achieve 3000 representatives will provide on-going PD to teachers on best ways to utilize the programs to accelerate learning.

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

Coaches will provide teachers opportunities for coaching cycles in the areas of aggressive monitoring, differentiated instruction, and other areas of growth.

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

Leadership will use the trends from BPI to coach teachers in needed areas.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Rationale: According to the Opportunity Myth, academic achievement increases when students are deeply engaged in high-quality standards aligned instruction and have the opportunity to work on grade-level assignments. The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized math assessment was 39%. Based on previous years' practice, root cause identified walkthrough and observational data to indicate the following: inconsistent use of aggressive monitoring, varying levels of student engagement in rigorous tasks aligned to the standards, and a need for scaffolded instruction responsive to student needs.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By December 2022, 70% of teachers will utilize aggressive progress monitoring to document and scaffold mastery of BEST standards and implementation of rigorous tasks. By May 2023, 80% of teachers will utilize aggressive progress monitoring to document and scaffold mastery of BEST standards and engagement in rigorous tasks aligned to the standards. This will result in a goal of 70% of students in grades 3-5 scoring at or above proficiency on the FAST Mathematics Statewide Assessment in May 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Instructional coaches will provide ongoing feedback to teachers centered around the use of aggressive progress monitoring and student time on task. Administration will conduct formal and informal observations to provide regular written feedback through OneNote and the District teacher evaluation protocol along with ongoing collaboration. Teachers will provide work samples, skill-based checklists, anecdotal notes, etc. during PLC's. Assessments for monitoring student achievement include the district mathematics Quarterly Monitoring Tool in grades 1-5. Kindergarten math unit assessments will be used to monitor students' mastery of benchmarks. Instructional implications for each of these assessments will be discussed through data chats and PLC's. FAST #1 and #2 will be analyzed and action plans will be addressed in the same fashion as district assessments, with a focus on analyzing the assessments to determine student misconceptions to plan for reteaching and acceleration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lori Farmer (lori.farmer@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Instructional coaches will embed professional learning during PLC's and side-by-side coaching on explicit modeling, time on task, aggressive monitoring, and feedback to students through teacher clarity of success criteria with the goal of transfer to practice and teacher ownership. Teachers will also utilize I-Ready as an evidence-based program to close gaps unfinished learning, as well as accelerate and extend learning. Thonotosassa will utilize STEMScopes with fidelity to ensure our students are receiving high quality standards-based instruction. Core instruction will be strengthened by using The Five Practices of

	Mathematics that encourages student discourse throughout the instructional frameworks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Aggressive progress monitoring and time on task enables teachers to provide meaningful feedback to students. This provides clarity for the student and reduces the uncertainty between the students' performance and the lesson goals. Hattie's research on student feedback has an effect size of .75, as it learning oriented and redirects students toward mastery of the standards. The Five Practices of Mathematics was selected as an instructional strategy because it empowers to anticipate student responses and misconceptions during the planning process so that teachers can be more responsive to student thinking through scaffolded questioning. It enables teachers to utilize student work as exemplars and sequencing the student work in a logical manner so that students are able to connect strategies and multiple representations of the essential learning. This allows foundational concepts to be strengthened while ensuring that the benchmark is taught with depth, complexity and rigor.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Create and update an electronic math data wall for all school-based stakeholders to strategically group and monitor students.

Person Responsible	Lori Farmer (lori.farmer@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Plan and facilitate weekly PLC's focused on unpacking new standards and analyzing the ALD's to ensure we are teaching for proficiency.

Person Responsible	Lori Farmer (lori.farmer@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Conduct data chats in a timely manner following district and state assessments.

Person Responsible	Lori Farmer (lori.farmer@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Provide formal and informal feedback to teachers on a weekly basis focusing our schoolwide instructional priorities of aggressive progress monitoring and student time on task. This will enable coaches to further support student achievement through the coaching to positively impact student learning.

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

In 2022, the following grade levels were not on track for IREADY Spring Diagnostic: 1st grade at 69% and 2nd grade at 72%. Foundational Skills not at grade level in grade 1: phon awareness = 51%, phonics = 58'%, HFW = 55% and grade 2: phon awareness= 26%, phonics = 70%, HFW = 37%. Lack of foundational skills results in a lack of comprehension.

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

In 2022, the following grade levels were not on track for FSA 2022 assessment: grade 3 at 30%, grade 4 at 48%, and grade 5 at 35%. In 2021-2022, the observational data indicated the use of inconsistent use of aggressive progress monitoring, student engagement with rigorous tasks, and scaffolded student support based on student needs. State data shows students underperformed with FSA testing, as a result of the lack of comprehension of grade-level text and clustered questions.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

In Spring 2022 iReady at grade level in kindergarten = 75%, grade 1 = 31%, grade 2 = 29%. In Spring 2023, 50% or more of our K-2 students will be at grade level on the STAR PM3 assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In 2021-2022, students in grades 3-5 performed at 42% for ELA proficiency, 70% for learning gains, and 80% learning gains for the bottom quartile on FSA ELA testing. In 2023, fifty percent of our 3-5 students will be proficient on the FAST PM3 assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Provide PD for aggressive monitoring when using evidence- based programs available to instructional support and teachers. Coaches will provide on-going PD through grade levels PLCs, data chats, coaching cycles, modeling, and faculty meetings with the BEST benchmarks, Wonders, LLI and IREADY toolbox lessons. In addition, Achieve 3000 representatives will provide on-going PD to teachers on best ways to utilize the programs to accelerate learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Montoto, Anthony, anthony.montoto@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

   ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

   ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

   ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

In K-2, teachers will use Wonders lessons in core, IREADY Toolbox and LLI for tier 2 interventions, and SIPPs for tier 3 intervention. In 3-5, for intervention teachers will use LLI resources, IREADY (both teacher instruction and computer-based instruction), and Achieve 3000. For core, resources will be aligned to BEST standards. Practices and programs will be discussed during PLCs and monitoring will occur through walkthroughs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

   ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

   ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All programs utilized are designed to accelerate learning in all areas of ELA. The resources include foundational skills, comprehension, and written communication. They are also address learning deficits to close achievement gaps for students.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Provide PD with evidence- based research programs available to instructional support and teachers. Coaches will provide on-going PD for instructional support with SIPPS, LLI and IREADY toolbox lessons. Achieve 3000 representatives will provide on-going PD to teachers on best ways to utilize the programs to accelerate learning.	Bowman, Barbara, barbara.bowman@hcps.net
Leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to observe transfer from PLC to classroom instruction and provide feedback to teachers.	Montoto, Anthony, anthony.montoto@hcps.net
Coaches will provide teachers opportunities for coaching cycles in the areas of aggressive monitoring, differentiated instruction, and other areas of growth.	Bowman, Barbara, barbara.bowman@hcps.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Thonotosassa Elementary School has identified specific SEL needs among students. Restorative Practices was determined as an intervention to implement to improve and address student needs. Faculty and staff have received professional development on how to best utilize Restorative Practices during daily practices. To increase the overall culture school wide, Thonotosassa Elementary School implements a PBIS system focused on "The Bolts Big Three" school-wide rules: Be respectful, be responsible, be safe. These rules are the guiding principles for all student behavior, and are permeated throughout the school and reinforced daily. This is inclusive of students and all staff members. Progress monitoring is daily and student and teacher recognitions are managed through PBIS Rewards.

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

Stakeholders:

Administration – oversees and monitors progressing of implementation.

Leadership Team – collaborate with teachers to enhance classroom environment and culture

Psychologist – monitors behavior tracking and referrals.

Teachers – reinforce Bolts Big Three and recognize positive behavior.

Students – participate and are accountable for their attitudes and behavior.