James Tillman Elementary Magnet School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 8/23/2022

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: B (60%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: 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	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 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

James Tillman Elementary Magnet School

1415 29TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

https://www.manateeschools.net/tillman

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	80%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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 2023, 50% of the students will score proficient 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
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
Massi-Blackmore, Marla	Principal	Monitoring all Areas of Focus
Kubal, Megan	Assistant Principal	Monitoring all Areas of Focus
Bloski, Kasey	School Counselor	Positive School Culture and Environment monitoring assistance alongside Administration.
Bradley, Jill	Reading Coach	ILT and LLT member; assist with the monitoring of all the Areas of Focus.
Gonzalez, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	ILT and LLT member; assist with the monitoring of all the Areas of Focus.
O'Brien, Tayler	Teacher, K-12	ILT/LLT member; assist with the monitoring of all the Areas of Focus.
Pinheiro, Cristina	Other	ESOL Teacher; assist with the monitoring of all the Areas of Focus.
Reilly, Elizabeth	Instructional Media	ILT/LLT member; assist with the monitoring of all the Areas of Focus.
Williams, Tamekia	SAC Member	Assists Administration with the communication to all James Tillman Stakeholders

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/23/2022, Marla Massi Blackmore

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.*
2

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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
38

Total number of students enrolled at the school
530

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
2

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	66	90	76	103	90	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	9	9	4	7	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	25	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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
Tuesday 9/6/2022

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	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	
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	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	
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	

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	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	
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	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	
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	

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	45%	55%	56%				35%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	65%						50%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						57%	55%	53%
Math Achievement	70%	50%	50%				68%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%						70%	68%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%						60%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	65%	59%				38%	48%	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	29%	51%	-22%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	40%	56%	-16%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	28%	52%	-24%	56%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

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	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	65%	2%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	63%	60%	3%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	34%	48%	-14%	53%	-19%
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	24	58	59	52	65	65	18				
ELL	47	71	56	65	73	57	36				
BLK	35	48	58	60	70	88	18				
HSP	47	73	65	69	74	58	34				
MUL	40			90							
WHT	56	60		80	80		70				
FRL	44	63	63	69	71	63	33				

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				
HSP	30	48	63	67	68	57	38				
WHT	48	53		81	100						
FRL	30	49	59	65	70	59	33				

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	61
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	59

English Language Learners	
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	54
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	60
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	65
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	69
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	59
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?

The trends that emerge from across grade-level consist of the following:
1. While ELA is making progress, there is still a gap measured by the district and state results. While there is a less than 10% gap, there is a significant need to address. The third grade is the largest gap.
2. Regarding math, James Tillman is performing at or above district and state average. A small gap of 2% is acknowledged in third grade.
3. Science results appear to be consistent. Overall, it is consist with the ELA proficiency rate.

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

The data shows that there is a need to maintain as well as increase proficiency within the ELA. The state data shows the proficiency rate from 35%, 36% to 45%.

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

The obstacles the pandemic brought with regards to face-to-face teaching for direct instruction, rich text and the practice of the release in the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model.

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

The most improved component was ELA Proficiency, which was a gain of 9% (45%). This is the greatest ELA proficiency for James Tillman (3rd-41%; 4th- 51%; 5th- 42%). Math exceeded SIP goal and science did increase. James Tillman's ELA proficiency proved to not be in the Low300 for the state a second time in a row.

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

All grade levels, including ESE, collaboratively plan on a weekly basis, and implemented lessons on specific thinking strategies (ex: Determining Importance) that were explicitly taught through teacher "think alouds". The Gradual Release of Responsibility model was also monitored for all lessons to ensure students were able to independently apply the strategies. Professional development is also implemented weekly by the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT), Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) and highly effective teachers. Consistent ELA and Math consultants aided in the instructional practices.

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

All grade levels, including ESE, will continue to collaboratively plan on a weekly basis, and implement lessons on additional specific thinking strategies such as synthesizing. Teachers will continue to discuss and write out teacher "think alouds" for their lessons. The Gradual Release of Responsibility model will continue to be monitored, with specific feedback given for teachers during the "we" portion of the GRR Model. Progress monitoring will be continuous and determine if additional staff push-in is needed to support students. The offering of ELA and Math consultants to aid in the instructional practices will also be implemented.

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.

Each week, Professional Development will be directly and/or indirectly teach best practices, which implement writing across the curriculum. Administration's professional development plan will continue to study the conversations needed to move instruction.

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

The areas of focus below will continue to be taught, applied and monitored as these focus areas have proven to move instruction to proficiency.
1. Purposeful Standard-Based Instruction
2. Instructional Delivery Framework
3. Responsive Student-Driven Instruction

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 Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Instructional Delivery Framework (The Instructional Delivery Framework is the Gradual Release of Responsibility with the conclusion using the Reading/Writing Workshop where they gather again for accountability of work and the answering of the LEQ. During planning, the delivery is discussed, and sticky notes or notes are made on pages of the text were suggestions of the "I", which is the teacher "think aloud" using the strategy to assist in answering the LEQ. It is then planned where the "we" could begin and so forth. This is very explicit planning and modeling from the ILT member in both weekly ELA and Math planning. An "I" of the delivery is modeled in planning if needed as well.) Lack of comprehensive understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards and grade level outcomes for the B.E.S.T standards.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By June 2023, 50% of the students will score proficient in ELA, Mathematics, and Science measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade-level of the B.E.S.T. Standards. Student achievement will improve in all core content areas through targeted support in the planning and delivery of purposeful standard-based instruction.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	An Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) member will provide instructional modeling and support within the classrooms at each grade level. Additionally, members of the ILT and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) 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. Standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The various data that will be continuously monitored to measure the effectiveness of said strategies: Teacher Evaluation System, FAST Data, District Benchmark Assessments, DRA 2.0, Next Steps, and Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with grade-level rubrics.
Rationale for Evidence-based	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

**Strategy:
Explain the
rationale for
selecting this
specific
strategy.
Describe the
resources/
criteria used
for selecting
this strategy.**

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.

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.

1. All teachers, which include ESE, ESOL and STEM teachers, will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions grounded in grade-level standards both before and after the students' school day with an ILT and/or LLI member. This will include the planning of writing across the curriculum for all grades.
2. Highly Effective/effective teachers, ILT and/or LLI members will facilitate weekly professional development for comprehensive knowledge of the B.E.S.T. 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 Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Purposeful Standard-Based Instruction (Purposeful Standard-Based Instruction is to ensure lessons are written on grade-level, the standards are understood through the collaborative planning, and strategies/resources are pathways to mastery, and outcomes are aligned.) Lack of school-wide instruction cohesiveness and effectiveness in Tier I instruction for the B.E.S.T. Standards.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By June 2023, 50% of the students will score proficient in ELA, Mathematics, and Science measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade-level of the B.E.S.T. Standards. Student achievement will improve in all core content areas through targeted support in the planning and delivery of purposeful standard-based instruction.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	An Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) 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. Standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Various data will be collected: Teacher Evaluation System, FAST, 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, SuccessMaker, Grade Level Planning Meeting documented by lesson plans.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	School-wide data, over the five years, has shown that purposeful and facilitated planning has made a positive impact on students' abilities in comprehending the grade level of the 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
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.

1. Teachers, which include ESE, ESOL and STEM teachers, will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions grounded in grade-level standards both before and after the students' school day with an ILT and/or LLI member. This will include the planning of writing across the curriculum for all grades.
2. Highly Effective/effective teachers, ILT and Literacy Leadership Team (LLI) will facilitate initial and on-

going weekly 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, ILT and LLT 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. standards with the inclusion of ESE and ELL.

4. Provide research-based classroom materials and supplies that support student learning.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	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: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By June 2023, 50% of the students will score proficient in ELA, Mathematics, and Science measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade-level of the B.E.S.T. Standards. Student achievement will improve in all core content areas through targeted support in the planning and delivery of purposeful standard-based instruction.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired 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, Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with grade-level rubrics, lesson plans, I-Ready, SuccessMaker and Grade-Level Planning Meeting Documented by lesson plans.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teacher response to student data in small and one-on-one instruction. Professional Development will be provided to explicitly teach instructors the words (teacher think aloud and/or language) and actions needed to guide students through strategic next steps for each academic area.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Student data indicated by FAST and District assessments resulted in small increases in all academic areas, which did not result in closing the gap.

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.

1. Professional Development will be implemented for data analysis for various assessments and writing responses from students.

2. Weekly grade-level collaborative meetings for teachers will be facilitated by an ILT and/or LLT member to develop and implement plans for the next steps for responsive data-driven teaching (strategic grouping/ conferencing). ESE, and Support Teachers (ESOL, STEM, etc.) are included in the weekly collaborative grade-level meetings.

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

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Academic and Behavioral Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Implementation of the academic and behavioral support from the District initiative SPARK (Classroom Management, Brain-Based Instruction; Student Engagement, and Relational/Responsive Practices), and the continuation of the school-wide Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS), Life Skills and Traits, and Restorative Practice. To begin SPARK and continue the fidelity of the school-wide continued strategies listed above.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By June 2023, 50% of the students will score proficient in ELA, Mathematics, and Science measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade-level of the B.E.S.T. Standards. Student achievement will improve in all core content areas through targeted support in the planning and delivery of purposeful standard-based instruction.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	By June 2023, 10% of student referrals will decrease from 2021-2022 referral data evidenced by district disciplinary reports. By June 2023, Tier data will meet student needs based on the measurable outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Quarterly review of report cards, ClassDoJo App data, School-wide agenda, Recognition Assembly data, and Tier data. FOCUS data will provide next steps and ensure the implementation of the academic and behavioral supports listed above.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The evidenced-based strategies implemented will be parent communication (Class Dojo App, ConnectEd calls and text, and agenda and invites), and staff PD of current academic and behavioral strategies and effective behavioral feedback. Teacher Evaluation System, FOCUS data for referrals and Tiers, Data for school-wide events, ClassDojo data, parent sign-ins, agenda, surveys, and parent evaluations, etc.

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.

Professional Development for the academic and behavioral support from the District initiative SPARK (Classroom Management, Brain-Based Instruction; Student Engagement, and Relational/Responsive Practices), and the continuation of the school-wide Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS), Life Skills and Traits, and Restorative Practice.

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

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Lack of home support to reinforce researched-based best practices for all academic areas at home.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By June 2023, 50% of the students will score proficient in ELA, Mathematics, and Science measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade-level of the B.E.S.T. Standards. Student achievement will improve in all core content areas through targeted support in the planning and delivery of purposeful standard-based instruction.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Quarterly review of Parent Involvement Events surveys, 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: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Established quarterly event dates, Title I training for PI, parent surveys for input, and ClassDoJo App communication.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

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.

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)

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

The instructional practice will be aligned to the areas of focus, specifically the Purposeful Standard-Based Instruction, Instructional Delivery Framework and Responsive Student-Driven Instruction. These focus areas will be supported by the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) and/or the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) through weekly collaborative planning, weekly professional development, coaching and co-teaching. During some of the collaborative planning and professional development meetings, dates will be dedicated to analyze student work (written responses) and outline next steps which include but not limited to: instructional language, timely feedback, direct and explicit instruction to increase student growth and proficiency.

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

The instructional practice will be aligned to the areas of focus, specifically the Purposeful Standard-Based Instruction, Instructional Delivery Framework and Responsive Student-Driven Instruction. These focus areas will be supported by the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) and/or the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) through weekly collaborative planning, weekly professional development, coaching and co-teaching. During some of the collaborative planning and professional development meetings will be dedicated to analyzing student work (written responses) to outline next steps which include but not limited to: instructional language, timely feedback, direct and explicit instruction to increase student growth and proficiency.

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)

By June 2023, 50% of the students will score proficient in ELA, Mathematics, and
Science measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences
aligned with grade-level of the B.E.S.T. Standards. Student achievement
will improve in all core content areas through targeted support in the planning and delivery
of purposeful standard-based instruction, instructional delivery framework and through the response of
student-driven instruction.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By June 2023, 50% of the students will score proficient in ELA, Mathematics, and
Science measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences
aligned with grade-level of the B.E.S.T. Standards. Student achievement
will improve in all core content areas through targeted support in the planning and delivery
of purposeful standard-based instruction, instructional delivery framework and through the response of
student-driven instruction.

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.

The various data that will be continuously monitored to measure the effectiveness are stated below:
Teacher Evaluation System, FAST Data, District Benchmark Assessments, DRA
2.0, Next Steps, and Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with
grade-level rubrics.

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

Massi-Blackmore, Marla, massim@manateeschools.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?

Grade-level and vertical collaborative planning will plan for explicit instruction from teacher and students
through the implementation of the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model. All tier supports will be aligned
to the B.E.S.T. standards and embed some of the practices outlined in the district's K-12 Comprehensive
Plan. The practices will be monitored through various sources such the Teacher Evaluation tool, classroom
and district assessments (Tier 1) and Star Early Literacy, Star Reading, Star Math, Daze and student
written responses from Tier 2 and 3 instructional implementation. The Instructional Leadership Team and/or
Literacy Leadership Team members will guide teachers through "think aloud" of the research-based

thinking strategies (such as inferencing, determining importance and synthesizing), model, co-teach and participate in data analyzation.

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?

The implementation of the Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) Model for purposeful standard-based instruction, instructional delivery framework and through the response of student-driven instruction has proven positive data for all grades over the years for Tier 1 and Tier 2 groups. Tier 3 group instructional implementation is determined by the specific data and then either addressed through SRA, LLI or Next Steps.

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
1. For all grades, all teachers will participate and implement the professional development provided by the State Regional Literacy Directors to improve literacy instruction. 2. The Literacy Leadership Team and Coach will attend RAISE and District professional development to strengthen knowledge and best practices that will be then be taught, modeled and provided feedback for students and teachers. 3. Various assessment sources will be analyzed and specific next steps for teachers and students will be implemented to address needs. 4. Weekly professional development for all teachers will directly and/or indirectly address aspects of literacy. An example is writing across the curriculum for all grades. 5. Partnership with United Way will be implemented for a cohort of first grade students by providing training for the paraprofessional to support literacy instruction.	Massi-Blackmore, Marla, massim@manateeschools.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.

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, community groups, 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 school culture and environment.

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