

Manatee County Public Schools

James Tillman Elementary Magnet



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 7 |
| Planning for Improvement | 10 |
| Title I Requirements | 14 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 16 |

James Tillman Elementary Magnet School

1415 29TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

<http://www.edline.net/pages/sdmctillmanes>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p> |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>84%</p> |
|--|--|--|

School Grades History

| Year Grade | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | B | B | F | F* |

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.

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 and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Massi-Blackmore, Marla | Principal |
| Pletcher, Bernadette | Assistant Principal |
| Walsh, Traci | Dean |
| Bradley, Jill | Instructional Coach |
| Gonzalez, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 |
| Rivera, Tin | Teacher, ESE |
| Walls, Melissa | Dean |
| Williams, Tamekia | Teacher, K-12 |
| Pinheiro, Cristina | Teacher, K-12 |
| Baker, Maidie | Administrative Support |
| Cohenour, Tammy | Paraprofessional |
| English, Cristen | Teacher, K-12 |

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making

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.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| One or more suspensions | 13 | 16 | 15 | 10 | 19 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 50 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 7 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 26 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |

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 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

Date this data was collected

Sunday 8/12/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 8 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| One or more suspensions | 24 | 26 | 31 | 25 | 22 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 35 | 36 | 26 | 54 | 48 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 254 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 40 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 17 | 22 | 25 | 30 | 25 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 |

Year 2016-17 - 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 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 8 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| One or more suspensions | 24 | 26 | 31 | 25 | 22 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 35 | 36 | 26 | 54 | 48 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 254 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 40 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 17 | 22 | 25 | 30 | 25 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA Proficiency is the lowest. However, the ELA Proficiency has been increasing for all subgroups in the last two years.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The Lowest 25% Math Gains had a drop of 17%. However, Math proficiency went up 11%.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The largest gap compared to the state average was in ELA Proficiency with a -24% in Grades 3 and 4.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The most improved component was Science Proficiency, which was a gain of 23%.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area

The action taken to improve in the area of science was the purposeful planning for the integration of science standards within the ELA instruction. Also, purposeful hands on instruction along with student written responses was planned for specific concepts.

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 | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 32% | 50% | 56% | 24% | 50% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 53% | 54% | 55% | 53% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 64% | 47% | 48% | 69% | 53% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 64% | 60% | 62% | 53% | 55% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 73% | 61% | 59% | 84% | 59% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 62% | 47% | 47% | 79% | 47% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 31% | 49% | 55% | 14% | 42% | 51% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 (12) | 10 (8) | 6 (12) | 4 (6) | 9 (6) | 4 (5) | 38 (49) |
| One or more suspensions | 13 (24) | 16 (26) | 15 (31) | 10 (25) | 19 (22) | 35 (30) | 108 (158) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (35) | 0 (36) | 0 (26) | 55 (54) | 50 (48) | 60 (55) | 165 (254) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 30 (45) | 35 (40) | 35 (45) | 100 (130) |

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 | 2018 | 33% | 49% | -16% | 57% | -24% |
| | 2017 | 24% | 50% | -26% | 58% | -34% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 32% | 51% | -19% | 56% | -24% |
| | 2017 | 25% | 52% | -27% | 56% | -31% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 33% | 52% | -19% | 55% | -22% |
| | 2017 | 25% | 48% | -23% | 53% | -28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 64% | 56% | 8% | 62% | 2% |
| | 2017 | 54% | 51% | 3% | 62% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 60% | 61% | -1% | 62% | -2% |
| | 2017 | 49% | 59% | -10% | 64% | -15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 61% | 58% | 3% | 61% | 0% |
| | 2017 | 51% | 53% | -2% | 57% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 12% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2018 | 32% | 49% | -17% | 55% | -23% |
| | 2017 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 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 | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| 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 | | | | |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title Purposeful Standard-Based Instruction

Rationale Lack of school-wide instructional cohesiveness and effectiveness in Tier 1 instruction.

Intended Outcome Student achievement will improve in all core content areas by receiving a consistent effective standards-based instructional delivery.

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

Action Step

Description

- * Teachers will be provided planning before and after school.
- * Highly Effective/effective teachers will facilitate initial and on-going professional development for the instruction delivery framework (GRR) for all grades K-5, productive struggle, and student accountability to grade level work.
- * Highly Effective/effective teachers will facilitate the planning of the instruction delivery framework (GRR) for all grades K-5.
- * Provide research-based classroom materials and supplies that support the student learning in the instructional framework.
- * Provide consultant for professional development specifically Thinking Strategies for reading instruction.

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

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Teacher Evaluation System, PMRN (K), 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, Grade Level Planning Meeting Documentation and FSA data results.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Activity #2

Title Instructional Delivery Framework

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

Intended Outcome Student achievement will improve in all core content areas through targeted support in the planning and delivery of purposeful standard-based instruction.

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

Action Step

Description

- * Teachers will be provided planning for comprehensive lessons based on grade-level standards before and after school.
- * 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.
- * Provide research-based classroom materials and supplies that support the student learning in the instructional framework.

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

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Teacher Evaluation System, PMRN (K), 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, Grade Level Planning Meeting Documentation and FSA data results.

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

Activity #3

Title Strategic Small Group
Rationale Lack of Tier 2 purposeful standards-based instruction (data driven).
Intended Outcome 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 increase student achievement.
Point Person Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

Action Step

Description * Professional Development will be implemented for small group (strategic grouping/conferencing).
 * Provide Professional Development for analyzing various student data sources.
Person Responsible Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Teacher Evaluation System, PMRN (K), 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, Grade Level Planning Meeting Documentation and FSA data results.
Person Responsible Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

Activity #4

Title Application of the Positive Behavior System
Rationale Lack of consistency with application of the Positive Behavior Support system.
Intended Outcome Professional development and follow up activities addressing PBS goals and expectations, specific behavioral positive feedback, and motivational materials.
Point Person Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

Action Step

Description PBS training and school-based support framework to increase academic areas.
Person Responsible Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Teacher Evaluation System, FOCUS data for referrals, Data for PBS Assemblies, etc.
Person Responsible Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net)

| Activity #5 | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Title | Parent Engagement |
| Rationale | Lack of home support to reinforce researched-based best practices for all academic areas at home. |
| Intended Outcome | Increased numbers of parent participation (SAC, events, conferences, etc.), feedback (surveys) and communication (newsletter and phone/text/agenda) and student achievement. |
| Point Person | Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net) |

| Action Step | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Description | Standard-based parent workshops which include childcare, professional development for literacy, mathematics and science school/home resources and strategies, and translator for workshops. Newsletters, surveys and homework that outline standards in real world application for families. |
| Person Responsible | Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net) |

| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Description | Established parent workshop dates, parent attendance, Title I training for PI, numbers of parent surveys returns and parent signatures on student agendas/ homework and standard-based student data. |
| Person Responsible | Marla Massi-Blackmore (massim@manateeschools.net) |

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

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

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

The school creates, provides, and supports a learning community through PBS (Positive Behavior Support) and all teachers create positive classroom cultures. In addition, the school works to ensure the social-emotional needs of the students are being met by providing opportunities to work with the Guidance Counselor and Graduation Enhancement Technician.

The Guidance Counselor provides whole group social lessons, one-on-one meetings as well as small group counseling to meet the students' needs. The Guidance Counselor also accesses community agencies and resources when needed.

The Social Worker collaborates with Guidance Counselor, teachers, and school leaders to develop systematic strategies to identify and support those students who are frequently absent with social and emotional skills.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

The strategies utilized for students in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs are as follows:

The strategies employed to support new students entering Tillman are as follows:

1. Families are provided a Tillman brochure that describes fundamentals that are offered, Title I information and PBS news along with being given a Tillman agenda and basic supplies.
2. The Principal, Assistant Principal, or school counselor will provide a school tour for families on the first day.
3. The student will be designated a peer mentor for his/her first week of school to orient the student socially and provide guidance on student expectations in his/her new class if entering after the first month of school.

The strategies utilized for students in transition from elementary school programs to middle school programs are as follows:

Early Winter

1. Fifth Grade General Education and ESE Teachers schedule to meet with our feeder Middle School (Sixth Grade Teachers) to vertically plan and collaborate in order to meet the expectations required from our students when entering sixth grade.

Early Spring

1. Students and parents are provided with flyers of various local middle schools, which highlight offerings and dates to visit the various campuses.
2. Students are also presented information by various local middle school representatives through in-school informative presentations.
3. ESE students transition through a transition meeting where the ESE teacher along side with the parent create a middle school schedule for the local middle school the student is projected to attend.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

The Leadership Team is formed of various staff members who lead smaller teams such as LLT, MTSS/IST, Grade Level Teams, PBS, PI, etc. This team analyzes state, district, and school assessments and data that reflect the academic, social, and emotional needs of the students. Data that is also included in this analysis process is Parent Involvement data, the Title I Needs Assessment, and surveys that document input from all stakeholders. This team

then proceeds with the problem solving process. This process forces all stakeholders to look deeper and examine all the surrounding factors that may not be considered. From there, it is presented to various stakeholders to gather input.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

Tillman has a partnership with various community organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce who sponsors Junior Achievement, United Way Reading Pals, "Books are Fun", Boys and Girls Club, Horace Mann, Keller Williams Realty, Kona Ice, Little Caesars, Sarasota Jungle Gardens, Butterfly Brigade, and various surrounding churches.

| Part V: Budget | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Total: | \$0.00 |