

Manatee County Public Schools

Manatee Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Manatee Elementary School

1609 6TH AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34208

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

Demographics

Principal: Lourdes Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 9/3/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: D (37%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| ESSA Status | N/A |

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Manatee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Manatee Elementary School

1609 6TH AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34208

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 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 | 92% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Manatee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Manatee Elementary School partners directly with the families and community to focus on consistent Attendance, appropriate Behavior, academic Competencies, whole-child Development, engaging Enrichment, and comprehensive Health.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Manatee Elementary strives to achieve: improved student learning, stronger families, and a healthier community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|------------------------|--|
| VanOverbeke, Tami | Principal | Overall operations of the school. |
| Hodge, Doni | Instructional Coach | disaggregate data; coaching cycles; monitor L25 groups seen by interventionist |
| | Administrative Support | Monitor L300 priorities (SRA/LAFS); monitor Acaletics priorities; provide collaborative planning support for teams |
| Stevens, Marsha | Instructional Coach | Help with teachers and oversee MindPlay and L25 kids. |
| Moore, Jennifer | Assistant Principal | Overall operations of the school. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 9/3/2020, Lourdes Gonzalez

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

30

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: D (37%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|-----|-----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 69 | 78 | 80 | 105 | 80 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 486 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 46 | 16 | 74 | 198 | 101 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 452 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 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

Friday 9/11/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 68 | 78 | 72 | 82 | 61 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 442 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 16 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 13 | 11 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 3 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |

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 | 12 | 8 | 16 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |

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 | 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 | 0 |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Number of students enrolled | 68 | 78 | 72 | 82 | 61 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 442 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 16 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 13 | 11 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 3 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |

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 | 12 | 8 | 16 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |

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 | 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 | 0 |

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 | 36% | 52% | 57% | 26% | 50% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 57% | 57% | 58% | 43% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 63% | 55% | 53% | 68% | 53% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 49% | 63% | 63% | 33% | 55% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 74% | 68% | 62% | 59% | 59% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 62% | 53% | 51% | 46% | 47% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 35% | 48% | 53% | 24% | 42% | 51% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 25% | 51% | -26% | 58% | -33% |
| | 2018 | 20% | 49% | -29% | 57% | -37% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 44% | 56% | -12% | 58% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 29% | 51% | -22% | 56% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 15% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 24% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 38% | 52% | -14% | 56% | -18% |
| | 2018 | 21% | 52% | -31% | 55% | -34% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 17% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 36% | 60% | -24% | 62% | -26% |
| | 2018 | 34% | 56% | -22% | 62% | -28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 62% | 65% | -3% | 64% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 61% | -15% | 62% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 28% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 46% | 60% | -14% | 60% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 33% | 58% | -25% | 61% | -28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 31% | 48% | -17% | 53% | -22% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 34% | 49% | -15% | 55% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 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 | 44 | 54 | 34 | 74 | 69 | 23 | | | | |
| ELL | 44 | 65 | 65 | 53 | 82 | 76 | 42 | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 53 | 69 | 35 | 65 | 46 | 22 | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | 61 | 63 | 56 | 80 | 86 | 43 | | | | |
| WHT | 36 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 56 | 60 | 50 | 76 | 65 | 36 | | | | |
| 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 | 6 | 31 | 33 | 23 | 37 | 29 | | | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 42 | 31 | 43 | 53 | 40 | 25 | | | | |
| BLK | 19 | 38 | 47 | 27 | 46 | 56 | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 45 | 47 | 52 | 61 | 53 | 46 | | | | |
| MUL | 20 | | | 40 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 40 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 40 | 45 | 40 | 56 | 56 | 39 | | | | |
| 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 | 8 | 49 | 67 | 13 | 45 | 36 | | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 43 | 64 | 38 | 60 | 40 | 6 | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 45 | 67 | 28 | 58 | 38 | 19 | | | | |
| HSP | 26 | 40 | 67 | 36 | 56 | 50 | 26 | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | | | 30 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 23 | 42 | 68 | 32 | 59 | 47 | 19 | | | | |

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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 54 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| 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 | 57 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 433 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

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

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

| | |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 46 |
| 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 | 61 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 50 |
| 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 | 55 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Science proficiency was the lowest performance. 35% down from 39%. It was a different group of students being assessed. Science is taught in grades K-5 but it is directly aligned to our ELA score (due to the amount of reading required).

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

Science showed the greatest decline from the prior year. It was a different group of students being assessed.

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.

Science was 20% below the state average. The trend stays in the mid-thirty range for our school. It is parallel to our ELA scores. We focused more last year on reading and math.

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

ELA Lowest 25% increased from 44%-63%. We really focused on those individual students continuously throughout the year. We also focused on attendance and decreasing the number of students who were chronically absent.

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

One or more out of school suspensions and students who score a level 1 on state assessments.

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

1. Science Proficiency
2. ELA Proficiency
3. Math Proficiency
4. ELA Learning Gains
5. Improve student behavior to ultimately decrease the number of students who have one or more out of school suspensions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>ELA</p> <p>We will improve student achievement by continuing to focus and support standards-based backwards planning, highly effective instructional delivery, and fidelity to District instructional programs, required curriculum documents and data-driven decision making.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>(1) Grades 3-5 overall learning gains in ELA and Math will increase to at least 75%. (2) Grades 3-5 overall bottom quartile learning gains in ELA and Math will increase to at least 75%. (3) Grades 3-5 Student proficiency in ELA will increase to at least 50%. (4) Grades 3-5 Student proficiency in Math will increase to at least 60%...as measured by the 2020-2020 Florida Standards Assessments in grades 3-5.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | <p>Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)</p> |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Standards Based Planning focused on both ELA accomplished through weekly collaborative planning sessions with grade level teams and a member of the Leadership Team.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>In a standards-based learning classroom student are expected to meet a defined measure of proficiency that is equivalent to the rigor of that grade level standard. Students must demonstrate evidence of this learning and how it reflects the grade level standard. It is up to the classroom teacher to scaffold student learning to help students achieve the highest levels of cognitive complexity. Research for standards-based learning comes from Marzano and his Essentials for Achieving Rigor Model (Moore, Toth & Marzano, 2017).</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Backwards planning surrounding the standards and the rigor of the standards.
2. Deliver instruction implementing the Learning Focused Framework.
3. Monitor the implementation of MindPlay and Imagine Learning.
4. Utilize Formative Assessment to monitor student progress.
5. Provide intervention and extensions based data.
6. Utilize the District ELA and Math Scope and Sequence and Curriculum Maps for collaborative-lesson planning.
7. Monitor students using iReady fall and winter Diagnostic Assessments, as well as the Quarterly benchmark assessments.

Person Responsible Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Math We will improve student achievement by continuing to focus and support standards-based backwards planning, highly effective instructional delivery, and fidelity to District instructional programs, required curriculum documents and data-driven decision making. |
| Measurable Outcome: | (1) Grades 3-5 overall learning gains in Math will increase to at least 75%. (2) Grades 3-5 overall bottom quartile learning gains in Math will increase to at least 75%. (3) Grades 3-5 Student proficiency in Math will increase to at least 60%...as measured by the 2020-2020 Florida Standards Assessments in grades 3-5. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Standards Based Planning focused on Math accomplished through weekly collaborative planning sessions with grade level teams and a member of the Leadership Team. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | In a standards-based learning classroom student are expected to meet a defined measure of proficiency that is equivalent to the rigor of that grade level standard. Students must demonstrate evidence of this learning and how it reflects the grade level standard. It is up to the classroom teacher to scaffold student learning to help students achieve the highest levels of cognitive complexity. Research for standards-based learning comes from Marzano and his Essentials for Achieving Rigor Model (Moore, Toth & Marzano, 2017). |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Backwards planning surrounding the standards and the rigor of the standards.
2. Deliver instruction implementing the Learning Focused Framework.
3. Utilize Formative Assessment to monitor student progress.
4. Provide intervention and extensions based data.
5. Utilize the District ELA and Math Scope and Sequence and Curriculum Maps for collaborative-lesson planning.
6. Monitor students using iReady fall and winter Diagnostic Assessments, as well as the Quarterly benchmark assessments.

Person Responsible Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Science Rationale If we implement a K-5 Science plan to include an emphasis on the K-5 learning ladders for the standards within the Big Ideas, along with continued emphasis on interactive science notebooks and writing to raise achievement. Also, Science content will be incorporated in the ELA block. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Proficiency on the 2020-2021 Next Generation Sunshine State Standards Assessment for 5th grade Science will increase from 31% to at least 50%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Writing Across Content Systematic Vocabulary Instruction Writing across content is substantiated by current research as one of the most important areas aligned to increase student academic achievement across disciplines. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Title I students come to school with a vocabulary word deficit as compared to non-Title I students. Building students' vocabulary knowledge and word meaning will assist with students being able to comprehend informational grade level text. |

Action Steps to Implement

(1) Increase academic vocabulary and language. (2) Utilize discovery/Inquiry-based learning. (3) Incorporate accountable talk in the lesson. (4) Incorporate hands-on learning. (5) Generate and test hypotheses (6) Utilize the formative assessment process

Person Responsible Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- (1) Promote collaborative learning;**
- (2) Use formative assessment to engage students in content and instruction;**
- (3) Develop culturally responsive practices that invite contributions from diverse students;**
- (4) Build students' scientific literacy and reasoning skills;**
- and (5) Utilize Graphic Organizers in Your Classroom;**
- (6) Challenge Your Students With Different Levels of Questioning;**
- (7) Engage Students Who Have a History of Poor School Achievement**

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We will build strong relationships from the beginning of the year and sustain those relationships throughout the year. Some of the things we will be doing:

Newsletters

Family Events (If permitted due to Covid-19)

Conferences

Progress Reports

Phone calls

Meetings (SAC, PTO...)

Meeting the social-emotional needs of the students at Manatee Elementary is a team effort. It starts with the core relationship building between the teacher and student. Manatee Elementary involves our parents in their child's education to the extent in which they wish to be involved. Manatee Elementary also has partnerships with community organizations to help mentor and support our students. Those community partnerships are one key to strengthening the school and community relationships. As a school, we are using the Character Strong curriculum to teach children about appropriate social skills. The school counselor provides services to all students in grades K-5 that may include but are not limited to:

- Individual counseling
- Small group counseling
- Classroom guidance lessons
- Crisis intervention
- Consultation with parents and teachers
- Coordination with outside agencies & therapists
- Referrals for community services
- The school social worker provides social skills lessons to classrooms or small groups as well.

Building partnerships within the community positively impacts schools and businesses. Through successful partnerships and a mutual exchange of resources, student learning is enhanced and community involvement is increased. Manatee Elementary has secured over twenty business partners to support student learning and student achievement. These partnerships include local food establishments, fun centers, financial institutions, martial arts facilities, etc. Many of these businesses connect with our school using the ePie Partners in Education system through the Manatee County district website.

Local organizations have collected school supplies for students and provided necessary tools for the classroom, including Manatee United Methodist. Historically, Palmetto Presbyterian Church has provided our students with winter jackets, provided school uniforms and funded school activities and/or field trips. Volunteers from both churches spend time in classrooms to support students with reading needs. These dedicated volunteers build relationships with students by providing small group and 1:1 support to

give specific attention to the most struggling readers.

Other business partners who provide meal cards as student achievement incentives throughout the year include Gecko's, KONA Ice and Subway. Our businesses support the staff and school community by making donations of items to the school. Manatee Elementary will continue to seek partnerships to support the academic, physical, and social needs of the students.

Our business partners include:

- USF - Sarasota Manatee
- MCR Health
- Children's Home Society
- Beall's
- American Legion Post 24
- Kona Ice
- Subway
- Geckos

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |