

Manatee County Public Schools

James Tillman Elementary Magnet School



2021-22 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	25

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: 8/1/2016

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

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>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 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;">81%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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 2021, 55% 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Massi-Blackmore, Marla	Principal	
Kubal, Megan	Assistant Principal	
Walsh, Traci	Dean	
Gonzalez, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Bradley, Jill	Reading Coach	
Reilly, Elizabeth	Instructional Media	
O'Brien, Tayler	Teacher, K-12	
Bloski, Kasey	School Counselor	
Williams, Tamekia	SAC Member	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/1/2016, 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.*

3

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

570

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

9

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

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	95	76	104	99	80	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	48	45	29	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181

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	3	0	0	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	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/7/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	0
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in Math	0	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
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

2020-21 - 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	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	

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				35%	52%	57%	32%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	57%	58%	53%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	55%	53%	64%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				68%	63%	63%	64%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				70%	68%	62%	73%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	53%	51%	62%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				38%	48%	53%	31%	49%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	29%	51%	-22%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	56%	-16%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2021					
	2019	28%	52%	-24%	56%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	65%	2%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	60%	3%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	34%	48%	-14%	53%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

This data is collected from District I-Ready (YTD) collection for First and Second. Third, Fourth and Fifth Grade data is based on District Qtr. 1 and Qtr. 2 data and Qtr. 3 will be reporting FSA results.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16/13%	26/23%	48/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/13%	20/24%	34/39%
	Students With Disabilities	3/9%	6/18%	9/27%
	English Language Learners	2/7%	2/7%	6/21%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/9%	23/21%	35/30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/9%	18/22%	28/32%
	Students With Disabilities	2/6%	3/9%	6/18%
	English Language Learners	3/10%	1/4%	4/14%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21/19%	32/29%	49/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/15%	21/25%	31/39%
	Students With Disabilities	2/10%	2/11%	5/28%
	English Language Learners	3/13%	6/27%	6/27%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12/11%	26/24%	49/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/9%	17/20%	31/39%
	Students With Disabilities	2/10%	4/22%	7/39%
	English Language Learners	1/4%	5/23%	6/27%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25/21%	34/30%	30/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/31%	18/23%	20/25%
	Students With Disabilities	3/9%	2/7%	5/17%
	English Language Learners	4/14%	3/10%	5/17%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36/34%	63/59%	60/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/30%	43/56%	43/54%
	Students With Disabilities	2/6%	11/39%	8/27%
	English Language Learners	8/28%	18/62%	17/57%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9/9%	20/20%	36/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/19%	18/25%	24/32%
	Students With Disabilities	5/15%	4/12%	6/17%
	English Language Learners	9/23%	15/40%	19/45%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	37/41%	40/44%	59/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/41%	30/42%	43/56%
	Students With Disabilities	8/24%	7/21%	15/42%
	English Language Learners	20/51%	22/56%	28/65%

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		21/21%	21/21%	35/35%
	Economically Disadvantaged		21/29%	24/33%	19/25%
	Students With Disabilities		2/7%	1/4%	2/7%
	English Language Learners		5/17%	5/16%	5/15%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		50/54%	51/54%	58/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged		13/18%	34/47%	38/51%
	Students With Disabilities		1/3%	8/29%	9/30%
	English Language Learners		5/17%	15/48%	18/56%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		34/38%	34/37%	31/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged		24/34%	24/32%	18/25%
	Students With Disabilities		3/12%	8/28%	2/7%
	English Language Learners		6/21%	10/31%	5/16%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

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	21	55	87	41	57	53	4				
ELL	31	57	86	67	71	73	16				
BLK	29	67		56	67		45				
HSP	36	58	87	69	79	79	21				
MUL	50			64							
WHT	46			78							
FRL	33	56	89	61	72	64	25				
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				

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

Pending state data

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Pending state data

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

Pending state data

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Pending state data

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

Pending state data

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

Pending state data

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.

Pending state data

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

Pending state data

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Instructional Delivery Framework
Description and Rationale: Lack of comprehensive understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards, Florida State Standards and grade level outcomes for the B.E.S.T and FL standards.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, 55% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA, Mathematics, and Science measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade-level of the B.E.S.T. and Florida State Standards. Student achievement will improve in all core content areas through targeted support in the planning and delivery of purposeful standard-based instruction.

Monitoring: 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 of the B.E.S.T. and Florida State Standards.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: 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, and Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with grade-level rubrics.

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 of the B.E.S.T. Standards, Florida State 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 the B.E.S.T. and Florida State 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)

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

Area of Focus Purposeful Standard-Based Instruction
Description and Rationale: Lack of school-wide instruction cohesiveness and effectiveness in Tier I instruction for the B.E.S.T. and FL standards.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, 55% 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.

Monitoring: 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 for the B.E.S.T. and FL standards..

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

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

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 of the B.E.S.T. and FL 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 of the B.E.S.T. and FL standards. with the inclusion of ESE and ELL.
4. Provide research-based classroom materials and supplies that support student learning in

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 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. 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.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, 55% 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.

Monitoring: 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, Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with grade-level rubrics, lesson plans, I-Ready, and Grade-Level Planning Meeting Documented by lesson plans.

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 Description and Rationale: Application of the Positive Behavior Intervention System
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 2022, 10% of student referrals will decrease from 2020-2021 referral data evidenced by district disciplinary reports.

Monitoring: 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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidenced-based strategies implemented will parent communication (Class Dojo App, ConnectEd calls and text, newsletter, and parent letters and invites), and staff PD of current PBIS strategies and effective behavioral feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher Evaluation System, FOCUS data for referrals, Data for PBIS Assemblies, ClassDojo data, parent sign-ins, surveys, and parent evaluations, etc.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Lack of home support to reinforce researched-based best practices for all academic areas at home.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, a 10% increase of parent involvement will be evidenced by numbers of parent participation (SAC, events, conferences, etc.), feedback (surveys) and communication (phone/text).

Monitoring: 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.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Established parent workshop dates, Title I training for PI, parent surveys for input, and ClassDoJo App communication.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Parent workshop sign-in and evaluation, numbers of parent surveys returns, ClassDoJo App responses, the percentage of homework returned and percentage of increased academic data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standard-based parent workshops which include childcare, professional development for literacy (B.E.S.T. Standards, mathematics and science school/home resources and strategies, and translator for workshops.
2. Sign-in data, evaluations, surveys and homework that outline standards in real world application for families.

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

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lack of students holding themselves and each other accountable for their words, behavior, and performance. Lack of self/social awareness, empathy, respect, and of actions of choices. Lack of student empowerment to contribute to positive in and outside of school.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, the referral rate for conflict will decrease by 15% evidences by district reports.
Monitoring:	Semester District SEL student, staff and parent data, and PBIS data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	District provided surveys; PBIS/CharacterStrong Data, and fidelity of the PBIS PD schedule. Through schoolwide SEL, Tillman stakeholders will create an equitable learning environment that empowers all students to achieve their potential to effectively engage in school and community.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tillman stakeholders will foster self/social awareness, empathy, respect, and actions of choices by teaching and practicing social and emotional competencies. By integrating SEL into schoolwide practices and instruction, Tillman stakeholders will teach skills and facilitate opportunities to contribute positively in and outside school.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be given explicit instruction on definitions that are embedded in the Social Emotional Learning (SEL) curriculum.
2. Staff will receive PD opportunity on SEL curriculum. Students will be taught SEL lessons.
3. Tillman stakeholders will embed the Learner Profile and SEL attributes into daily communication and interactions.

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

#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

While James Tillman has earned to be eliminated from state Low 300 list, the ELA proficiency rate is still below 50%.

Measurable Outcome:

By June 2022, 50% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade level standards.

Monitoring:

This Area of Focus will be monitored by various data collected: Teacher Evaluation System, PMRN (K), District Benchmark Assessments, DRA 2.0, Next Steps, Running Records, Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with grade-level rubrics, lesson plans, I-Ready, Grade Level Planning Meeting documentation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidenced-based strategies consists but not limited to: explicit instruction integrating reading and writing standards that progress together with the use of grade-level engaging texts for writing that embeds the strands of Foundations, Reading, and Vocabulary. Teachers will be provided professional development, collaboratively plan with ILT (Reading Coach) and teach explicit instruction of Decoding (Reading) and Encoding (writing) and being responsive to student work. The analyzing of student work will drive instruction for K-5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Student data indicated by various State and District assessments resulted in huge and/or consistent Learning Gains and Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% group. While small increases in the ELA proficiency was earned in 3rd-5th on State Testing and District assessments for K-5, the gap is not closed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development will be implemented for Foundational, Reading, and Vocabulary instruction, B.E.S.T. and FL Standards and how to analyze student data.
2. Through grade-level collaborative meetings facilitated by an Instructional Leadership Team member, which includes the Reading Coach, planning and the teaching of explicit instruction of Decoding (Reading) and Encoding (writing) will be implemented as well as the focus of the "we" in the Gradual Release Model.

Person Responsible

Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

James Tillman incident ranking is Very Low based on the data from the Safe Schools. James Tillman is ranked 217 out of 1, 395 elementary schools statewide. While the Drug/Public is high, Violent and Property Incidents are Very Low. All James Tillman stakeholders will continue to implement the various strategies documented in the School Improvement Plan and the District Safety and Security Department to maintain the positive ranking.

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.

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.

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

The James Tillman's PFEP outlines how James Tillman Elementary plans to build positive relationships with all stakeholders.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00