

Manatee County Public Schools

James Tillman Elementary Magnet School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

James Tillman Elementary Magnet School

1415 29TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

<https://www.manateeschools.net/tillman>

Demographics

Principal: Marla Massi Blackmore

Start Date for this Principal: 8/17/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: F (30%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&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 Manatee 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

James Tillman Elementary Magnet School

1415 29TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

<https://www.manateeschools.net/tillman>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">84%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
| Grade | B | B | B | B |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

District Mission Statement:

Manatee County Public Schools will educate and develop all students today for their success tomorrow.

School Mission Statement:

James Tillman Elementary will educate all children and affirm their right to learn.

By June 2020, 50% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA, Mathematics and Science measured by state assessments through grade-appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade level standards.

Provide the school's vision statement.

District Vision Statement:

Manatee County Public Schools will be an exemplary student-focused school system that develops lifelong learners to be globally competitive.

School Vision Statement:

James Tillman Elementary will ensure all students will become resourceful, independent thinkers who set and achieve goals as well as problem solve, and thereby becoming positive and productive citizens. This is accomplished by a commitment to engaging students through instruction that is researched-based, differentiated, and imbeds instructional best practices. This commitment will ensure the development of confidence socially and academically, promote risk-taking, encourage initiative, and meet the unique needs of all students.

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 |
|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Massi-Blackmore, Marla | Principal | The Leadership Team will meet monthly and recap what we have been discussing in data teams. The team will also monitor the fidelity of the core reading instruction and acceleration. The Leadership Team will also conduct faculty book studies, lead committees, and lead school-wide professional development and/or any training related to effective instruction. |
| Kubal, Megan | Assistant Principal | |
| Walsh, Traci | Dean | |
| Bradley, Jill | Instructional Coach | |
| Gonzalez, Jennifer | Dean | |
| Rivera, Tin | Teacher, ESE | |
| Williams, Tamekia | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Pinheiro, Cristina | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/17/2020, Marla Massi Blackmore

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.*

27

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: F (30%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&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 | 78 | 105 | 95 | 101 | 84 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 546 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 41 | 22 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |

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 | 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 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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 | 108 | 119 | 90 | 118 | 91 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 636 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 35 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 19 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |

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 | 6 | 4 | 12 | 25 | 20 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |

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 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 108 | 119 | 90 | 118 | 91 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 636 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 35 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 19 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |

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 | 6 | 4 | 12 | 25 | 20 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |

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 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 35% | 52% | 57% | 24% | 50% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 50% | 57% | 58% | 53% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 57% | 55% | 53% | 69% | 53% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 68% | 63% | 63% | 53% | 55% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 70% | 68% | 62% | 84% | 59% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 60% | 53% | 51% | 79% | 47% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 38% | 48% | 53% | 14% | 42% | 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 | 29% | 51% | -22% | 58% | -29% |
| | 2018 | 33% | 49% | -16% | 57% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 40% | 56% | -16% | 58% | -18% |
| | 2018 | 32% | 51% | -19% | 56% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 28% | 52% | -24% | 56% | -28% |
| | 2018 | 33% | 52% | -19% | 55% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 60% | 60% | 0% | 62% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 56% | 8% | 62% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 67% | 65% | 2% | 64% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 60% | 61% | -1% | 62% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 63% | 60% | 3% | 60% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 58% | 3% | 61% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 34% | 48% | -14% | 53% | -19% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 32% | 49% | -17% | 55% | -23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 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 | 16 | 31 | 39 | 42 | 57 | 57 | 17 | | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 53 | 71 | 67 | 75 | 75 | 38 | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 53 | 54 | 64 | 66 | 63 | 33 | | | | |
| HSP | 30 | 48 | 63 | 67 | 68 | 57 | 38 | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 53 | | 81 | 100 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 30 | 49 | 59 | 65 | 70 | 59 | 33 | | | | |
| 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 | 16 | 55 | 68 | 45 | 66 | 74 | 6 | | | | |
| ELL | 21 | 49 | 60 | 69 | 76 | | 20 | | | | |
| BLK | 28 | 52 | 58 | 56 | 70 | 64 | 20 | | | | |
| HSP | 26 | 53 | 71 | 69 | 77 | 62 | 30 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 60 | | 76 | 70 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 55 | 63 | 64 | 74 | 59 | 29 | | | | |
| 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 | 12 | 61 | 72 | 20 | 73 | 76 | | | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 66 | 82 | 59 | 85 | 85 | 6 | | | | |
| BLK | 18 | 42 | 56 | 41 | 79 | 79 | | | | | |
| HSP | 23 | 58 | 81 | 58 | 86 | 80 | 19 | | | | |
| MUL | 40 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | | | 75 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 22 | 53 | 68 | 52 | 84 | 82 | 11 | | | | |

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) | TS&I |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 62 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 440 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|----------------------|--|
|----------------------|--|

| Students With Disabilities | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
|-----------------------------------|--|

| | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 40 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|----------------------------------|--|
|----------------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 58 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 54 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 71 |
| 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 | 53 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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.

ELA Proficiency is the lowest. However, the ELA Proficiency has been increasing for all subgroups in the last three years. The 19-20 District and school-based ELA data noted an increase to over 40%.

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

The Lowest 25% ELA Gains had a drop of 7%. However, ELA proficiency went up 3%. The 19-20 District and school-based ELA data noted an increase to over 40%.

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.

The largest gap compared to the state average was in ELA Proficiency with a -29% in Grades 3. There was around a 25% of Grade 3 students that enrolled with various data points indicating reading level two or more years below grade level. School continues to strengthen all grade levels (especially primary) with balance reading instruction that embeds all five areas of reading (phonemic awareness, phonological awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension; The Six Systems :Surface and Deep Structures).

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

The most improved component was Science Proficiency, which was a gain of 23%. All grade levels will collaboratively plan and implement lessons using non-fiction text that support the science standards in the ELA Block and Extended Reading. The 19-20 District and school-based ELA data noted an increase to over 50%.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

All Subgroups were met except for the SWD by one percentage point. The SWD earned a 40% (required score is a 41%). All teachers (ESE and General Edu.) will continue to plan and teach grade level standards. Resource and Full-Time ESE students will continue to receive support within their class through push-in and/or inclusion (with support by the ESE Teacher or ESE Paraprofessional). Professional Development will focus on Tier Instruction and the strategy of Responsive Student-Driven Instruction.

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

1. Purposeful Standard-Based Instruction
2. Instructional Delivery Framework
3. Responsive Student-Driven Instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Purposeful Standard-Based Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Lack of school-wide instruction cohesiveness and effectiveness in Tier I instruction. This is based on data from; Teacher Evaluation System, PMRN (K), District Benchmark Assessments, DRA 2.0, Next Steps, Fountas and Pinnell Running Records, Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with grade-level rubrics, lesson plans, I-Ready, Grade Level Planning Meeting documentation.

Measurable Outcome:

By June 2020, 50% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA, Mathematics and Science measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade level standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

An Instructional Leadership Team member will facilitate weekly collaborative planning with grade-level teams, which include ESE and ELL instructors, as well as present school-wide Professional Development that is based on current data. This work will ensure students receive consistent effective standards-based instructional delivery in all academic areas.

Various data will be collected: Teacher Evaluation System, PMRN (K), District Benchmark Assessments, DRA 2.0, Next Steps, Fountas and Pinnell Running Records, Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with grade-level rubrics, lesson plans, I-Ready, Grade Level Planning Meeting documentation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

School-wide data, over the four years, has shown that purposeful and facilitated planning has made a positive impact on students' abilities in comprehending the grade-level standards. It is during the planning sessions the practice of explicit teaching of the thinking strategy will continue to be reinforced.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will be provided with planning opportunities that will occur both before and after the students' school day.
2. Highly Effective/effective teachers will facilitate initial and on-going professional development for the instruction delivery framework (GRR) for all grades K-5 to include productive struggle and student accountability to grade-level work.
3. Highly Effective/effective teachers will facilitate the planning of the instruction delivery framework (GRR) for all grades K-5 to meet the needs of grade levels with the inclusion of ESE and ELL.
4. Provide research-based classroom materials and supplies that support student learning in the instructional framework.
5. Provide a consultant for professional development specifically in the skill of "Thinking Strategies" for reading instruction.

Person Responsible

Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

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

Area of

Focus Instructional Delivery Framework

Description and Rationale: Lack of comprehensive understanding of the Florida State Standards and grade level outcomes for the standards.

Measurable Outcome:

By June 2021, 50% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA, Mathematics, and Science measured by state assessments through grade-appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade-level standards.
 Student achievement will improve in all core content areas through targeted support in the planning and delivery of purposeful standard-based instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

An Instructional Leadership Team member will provide instructional modeling and support within the classrooms at each grade level. Additionally, members of the Instructional Leadership Team will present school-wide Professional Development that is based on current student data. This work is to ensure all students receive consistent and effective standards-based instructional delivery in all academic areas and at all grade levels. The various data that will be continuously monitored to measure the effectiveness of said strategies:
 Teacher Evaluation System, PMRN (K), District Benchmark Assessments, DRA 2.0, Next Steps, Fountas and Pinnell Running Records, Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with grade-level rubrics, lesson plans, IReady, and Grade Level Planning Meeting documentation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

School-wide data has shown that with purposeful instructional delivery, the students' comprehension of grade-level standards has been positively impacted. It is through the explicit teaching of the thinking strategy that the students are able to work toward meeting and or exceed the grade-level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will participate in collaborative planning sessions grounded in grade-level standards both before and after the students' school day.
2. Highly Effective/effective teachers will facilitate professional development for comprehensive knowledge of Florida Standards, responsiveness to student work/data, and how to effectively provide intentional and deliberate feedback.
3. Provide research-based classroom materials and supplies that support student learning in the instructional framework.

Person Responsible

Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus

Responsive student-driven Instruction is a researched-based approach to both teaching and discipline which focuses on engaging academics, developmental awareness, positive community, and effective management.

Description and Rationale:

This evidence-based approach is associated with higher quality instruction that has led to students' increase in achievement levels in both reading and mathematics in addition to improved school climate.

Lack of deliberate feedback and goal setting with students after analysis of various data. Lack of teacher response to students' specific academic needs.

By June 2021, 50% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA, Mathematics, and Science measured by state assessments through grade-appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade-level standards.

Measurable Outcome:

Responding specifically to students through small group instruction and individual conferencing will be strategy-based and designed to address, reteach, and enrich the current standards being taught in class, which in turn increases student achievement. Measurable outcomes will be through student writing (K-5), District Benchmark Assessments, DRA 2.0, Next Steps, Fountas and Pinnell Running Records, Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with grade-level rubrics, lesson plans, I-Ready, and Grade-Level Planning Meeting Documentation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teacher response to student data in small and one-on-one instruction. Professional Development will be provided to explicitly teach instructors the words and actions needed to guide students through strategic next steps for each academic area.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Student data indicated by various District and State assessments resulted in small increases in all academic areas except mathematics, which did not result in closing the gap.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development will be implemented for data analysis
2. Through grade-level collaborative meetings facilitated by an Instructional Leadership Team member, the plan for the next steps for response teaching (strategic grouping/conferencing) will be developed and implemented.

Person Responsible

Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus | Application of the Positive Behavior Intervention System |
| Description and Rationale: | Lack of consistency with the application of the Positive Behavior Intervention System. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Professional development and follow up activities addressing PBIS goals and expectations, specific behavioral positive feedback, and motivational materials. By June 2021, 10% of student referrals will decrease from 2018-2019 referral data evidenced by district disciplinary reports. Due to Covid, data from 2019-2020 will not be used to measure goal because of not a full year on campus. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Quarterly review of report cards, ClassDoJo App data, Recognition Assembly data and FOCUS data will provide next steps and ensure the implementation of the Positive Behavior Intervention System. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Teacher Evaluation System, FOCUS data for referrals, Data for PBIS Assemblies, etc. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. PBIS training and school-based support framework to increase academic areas.

Person Responsible Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Parent Involvement Lack of home support to reinforce researched-based best practices for all academic areas at home. |
| Measurable Outcome: | By June 2021, a 10% increase of parent involvement will be evidenced by numbers of parent participation (SAC, events, conferences, etc.), feedback (surveys) and communication (phone/text). |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Quarterly review of ClassDoJo App data, Recognition Assembly data, SAC attendance, School-wide Events attendance, and various survey data will provide next steps and ensure an increase in Parent Engagement. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Established parent workshop dates, parent attendance, Title I training for PI, numbers of parent surveys returns, ClassDoJo App responses, homework and standard-based student data. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standard-based parent workshops which include childcare, professional development for literacy, mathematics and science school/home resources and strategies, and translator for workshops.
2. Newsletters, surveys and homework that outline standards in real world application for families.

Person Responsible Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The 2018-2019 FSA subgroups results documented all subgroups except SWD meeting or above the required percentage of 41% or higher. The SWD earned a 40% (required score is a 41%). Due to the lack of 2019-2020 FSA results, all subgroups will be closely monitored.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2020, 50% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA, Mathematics and Science measured by state assessments through grade-appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade level standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: All teachers (ESE, ESOL Teacher and General Edu.) will continue to plan and teach grade level standards. ESOL and Resource and Full-Time ESE students will continue to receive support within their class through push-in and/or inclusion (with support by the ESE Teacher or ESE Paraprofessional). Professional Development will focus on Tier Instruction and the strategy of Responsive Student-Driven Instruction. All subgroups will be monitored by the Instructional Leadership Team and provide professional development on instructional delivery and responsive to student data in a provide timely feedback. All subgroups will be be provided grade-level Tier I and Tier II.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies align with current researched-based practices, ESE and ESOL strategies, explicit teacher "think alouds" through the GRR Model of standard-based instruction and responsive instruction (explicit feedback to students). Evidence of effectiveness will include but not limited to: Teacher Evaluation System, District Benchmark Assessments, DRA 2.0, Fountas and Pinnell Running Records, Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with grade level rubrics, lesson plans, I-Ready, and Grade Level and Planning Meeting Documentation.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ESE , ESOL Resource and General Edu. Teachers will plan and teach grade level standards through inclusion and/or push-in.
2. Professional Development will focus on Tier 1 and II Instruction and Responsive Student-Driven Instruction.

Person Responsible Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

The PFEP attached outlines how Tillman Elementary plans to build positive relationships with all stakeholders.

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 | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |