

Volusia County Schools

Manatee Cove Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Manatee Cove Elementary School

734 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/manateecove/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Alicia Douglas D

Start Date for this Principal: 12/1/2016

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Manatee Cove Elementary School

734 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/manateecove/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">73%</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;">38%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

Each one of us in the Manatee Cove family will work together to create a safe haven for learning where all can reach their personal best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We at Manatee Cove Elementary believe:

- in committing to high expectations which embrace progress and change while providing the opportunities for continuous physical, emotional, social and intellectual development.
- it is the responsibility of the school community to create a safe haven physically and emotionally for all.
- developing a love for learning and the discovery of new concepts will set the stage for all future educational endeavors.
- that a school community should embrace cultural diversity, a spirit of learning, mutual caring and respect.
- that all success and achievement should be recognized and celebrated.
- open communication and the involvement of students staff, families and community are vital to the school.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sojka, Michelle	Principal	The Manatee Cove Elementary School Leadership Team (SLT) includes administration, our instructional coach, and K-12 and ESE teachers. We are a collaborative team which reviews data identifying strengths and weaknesses in order to create attainable goals for our school improvement plan. In addition, the SLT discusses strategies and action steps for implementation of said plan.
Cook-Grant, Tiffanee	Assistant Principal	
Benson-Culver, Michele	Teacher, K-12	
Crane, Katherine	SAC Member	
Eunice, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
LUEBBERT, RACHEAL	Teacher, K-12	
Robertson, Jeffrey	Teacher, ESE	
Blix, Katherine	SAC Member	
Martin, April	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	111	107	101	116	126	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	687
Attendance below 90 percent	9	13	7	6	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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		17	23	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	3	8	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

73

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/25/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	24	15	15	13	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	17	23	19	16	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	4	47	39	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	3	2	3	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	61%	56%	57%	62%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	58%	58%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	46%	53%	52%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	66%	59%	63%	69%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	56%	62%	57%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	43%	51%	47%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	57%	53%	68%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	111 (0)	107 (0)	101 (0)	116 (0)	126 (0)	126 (0)	687 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 ()	13 ()	7 ()	6 ()	4 ()	9 ()	48 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	4 ()	27 ()	27 ()	58 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	58%	5%	58%	5%
	2018	66%	56%	10%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	54%	6%	58%	2%
	2018	62%	54%	8%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
	2018	54%	51%	3%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%
	2018	66%	58%	8%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	59%	16%	64%	11%
	2018	71%	60%	11%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	56%	54%	2%	60%	-4%
	2018	70%	57%	13%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	65%	56%	9%	53%	12%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	28	24	30	36	26	26				
ELL	33	62	69	36	35	18	57				
BLK	53	39		70	52		40				
HSP	51	60	50	54	44	14	59				
MUL	68	58		80	75						
WHT	64	51	32	67	56	45	70				
FRL	54	48	36	58	49	32	56				

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	18	29	33	30	44	44	31				
ELL	29	50	46	46	73	83					
BLK	42	50		52	36	36	50				
HSP	54	40	25	65	72	77	58				
MUL	57	58		62	46						
WHT	66	60	43	75	68	48	70				
FRL	53	49	42	64	60	49	59				

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	23	51	53	42	49	41	35				
ELL	42	40		55	50	43	23				
BLK	43	76	67	46	57		60				
HSP	63	60	67	68	48	44	56				
MUL	58			77							
WHT	65	55	42	71	60	44	76				
FRL	58	56	54	66	56	48	63				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
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	51
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	48
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	70
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	55
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Manatee Cove Elementary's lowest performing data component is our lowest 25th percentile in math (36%), which dropped from prior school years. Data from the past three years showed our students in this group making gains, (29% in 2016; 47% in 2017; 50% in 2018). The SLT believes that the decline in fifth grade mathematics proficiency (-14%/ cohort -15%) was contributing factor to last year's lower performance. The SLT determined that specific factors contributing to this decline included a new 5th grade team (two of whom were new to the grade level). Another contributing factor was behavior related; the 5th grade class had a high level of discipline referrals and suspensions (37 unique offenders; 102 total incidents; 24 suspensions). The 2019 fifth grade class also had the highest number of students with two or more counts on EWS (11 students).

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

Manatee Cove Elementary's greatest decline from the prior year was our lowest 25th percentile in mathematics (-14), however our lowest 25th percentile in ELA is also troublesome. While there was only a slight decline from 2018 (-3), the decline from 2017 is stark (52% in 2017; -15). The SLT determined that the factors mentioned in 1a above were the same contributing factors here.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

While our ELA and Math achievements surpass both district and state averages, our learning gains and lowest 25th percentile averages for both subjects are below the district and state averages. The SLT determined that the factors mentioned in 1a above were the same contributing factors here.

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

Our achievement in math with African americans math same as below tier 1 instruction + targeted small group instruction with classroom/ESE teachers.

ELA: ESOL subgroups ESOL: +12%; lowest 25% targeted small group instruction by ESOL teachers
Tier 1 instruction by classroom teacher

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The SLT determined that attendance is an area of concern. Manatee Cove Elementary is implementing a new initiative with our social worker and our kindergarten families to increase attendance. We hope that improved attendance in kindergarten will improve students' attendance in later years. If the program is successful, we will expand to more grade levels next year.

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

1. Increase the learning gains (including learning gains for the lowest 25% percentile) in math
2. Increase the learning gains (including learning gains for the lowest 25% percentile) in ELA.
3. Increase proficiency in science at all levels, but increase focus on our Students with Disabilities (SWD)

4. SWD achievement in ELA, math, and science was lower overall (-12%); increased focus is needed
5. attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Lowest Quartile
Rationale	Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 61%, ELA Learning Gains was 53%, and the Lowest Quartile performed at 37% which is below the district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile students in order to improve ELA Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that students in our Lowest Quartile were also in our targeted ESSA Subgroup, Students with Disabilities (SWD).

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA Lowest Quartile from 37% to 41%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher-led Small Group Instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review Lowest Quartile Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE, and ESOL support. 2. Facilitate PL on Small Group Instruction 3. Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data 4. Conduct PLCs monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions 5. Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings with ESE, ELL, and Intervention Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction. 6. Conduct Collaborative Planning sessions focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction. 7. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in implementing standards-aligned instruction and effective implementation of best practice 8. Conduct learning walks with coaches and teachers during small group instruction 9. Monitor small group instruction through ongoing administrative walk-throughs and feedback
Person Responsible	Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Mathematics Lowest Quartile
Rationale	Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our Mathematics Proficiency was at 66%, our Learning Gains percentage was 55%, and our Lowest Quartile performed at 36%, which was below the district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on Mathematics Lowest Quartile in order to improve Math Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that students in our Lowest Quartile were also in our targeted ESSA Subgroup, Students with Disabilities (SWD).

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Measurable outcome: Increase Mathematics Lowest Quartile from 36% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher facilitated Number Talks and Problem-Solving Tasks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Number Talks encourage the students to engage in discussion and self-questioning which have effect sizes of 0.82 and 0.64 respectively. Effect Sizes for Concentration/Persistence/Engagement and Cooperative vs. Individualistic Learning are 0.48 and 0.59 respectively.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review Lowest Quartile Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, ESE, and ESOL support 2. Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data 3. Conduct data chats at PLCs focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions 4. Conduct monitoring meetings with ESE, ELL, and Intervention Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction 5. Conduct Collaborative Planning sessions focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction 6. Conduct learning walks with coaches and teachers 7. Monitor implementation of differentiated instruction for identified students through ongoing Administrative Walk-throughs & feedback
Person Responsible	Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our Science Proficiency was at 64%, a -2% change from the prior year. However, the number of students meeting proficiency in some subgroups dropped. Black/African American proficiency was 40% (-10%). Further analysis revealed that proficiency for students in our targeted ESSA Subgroup, Students with Disabilities, was 26% (-5%).

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase targeted subgroups (Black/African American and ESSA) to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	VE-mild student inclusion in the general education classroom for science.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The average effect sizes range from 0.08 to 0.44 (ASCD), for special-needs students educated in regular classes.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. VE-Mild students will transition to general education science instruction when appropriate. 2. Using Title I funds, a science specialist will provide additional science instruction for all students via a special area rotation. In addition, the specialist will focus instruction and investigation on the third, fourth, and fifth fair game science benchmarks 3. Professional development for third and fourth grade classroom teachers on the third and fourth grade standards included in the fair game science benchmarks
Person Responsible	Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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.

Our PTA, SAC and school provide family involvement opportunities for the families of our students in the following ways: Meet the Teacher Day, Open House Night, several PTA family events, 5th grade Science Fair Info night, parent-teacher conferences, SAC Input night,

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.

Manatee Cove offers the following:

- *Student Mentoring Program
- *Crisis Training Program
- *Suicide Prevention Program
- *Bullying Program/Kindness Challenge
- *Small Guidance Groups on various socio-emotional needs
- *Various Student Clubs and Organizations
- *Problem Solving Team

Administration and the guidance counselor meet quarterly with the school psychologist to review discipline referrals and the personal development section of report cards for each teacher to determine those students needing further assistance. The school's School Improvement Leadership Team also reviews the quarterly discipline referrals and personal development status for students on first quarter report card and then provides findings and suggestions for improvement at a following faculty meeting for teachers to address within each team's PLC.

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

The District, in conjunction with the local Head Start agency, Early Learning Coalition, VPK Sites and other local pre-school facilities, coordinates efforts to promote continuity of services and effective transitions for children and their families. These include:

Providing the opportunity for ongoing communication between agencies to facilitate coordination of programs and shared expectations for children's learning and development as the children transition to elementary school.

Collaborating and participating in joint professional development, including transition-related training for school staff and pre-school staff when feasible.

Utilizing pre-school assessments to monitor readiness skills for students transitioning from pre-school to kindergarten.

Providing to the pre-school agencies local public school policies, kindergarten registration, kindergarten orientation and other relevant information to ease the transition of children and families.

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 school improvement plan is data driven and focuses on areas of school- based need for both specific content areas as well as specific student populations. Similarly, the School Improvement Leadership Team (SILT) is a data-driven framework that seeks to find solutions/resources matched in intensity to student need in academic and behavioral areas. The SILT framework follows the district's four-step problem solving process, with Rtl as an integral component of the process. As a result, the school improvement plan is based on a strategic analysis of data, and identified resources (as identified by the school based leadership team) are matched to the needs of the students/schools. Building the SIP within the context of the SILT results in the school determining the areas of most significant need and, as importantly, enables the school to develop a plan that can be addressed based on existing resources.

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

Manatee Cove Elementary will advance college and career awareness by hosting a college jersey day. Teachers and staff will be encouraged to wear the shirt/jersey of their college or university. The School Advisory Council will discuss other events to advance college and career awareness. Community members and business partners will be consulted as well. We will also invite graduating seniors to return to MCE at the end of the year for a senior clap-out. The seniors will wear their caps and gowns, encouraging our young students to keep working toward college or career.