

Volusia County Schools

Manatee Cove 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

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 |
| 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: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (51%) |
| 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Manatee Cove Elementary School

734 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

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

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 | No | 77% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 44% |

School Grades History

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

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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 | |
| Robertson, Jeffrey | Teacher, ESE | |
| Gaebel, Rebecca | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Doerhoff, Jessi | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Weaver, Cynthia | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 12/1/2016, Alicia Douglas D

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

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: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (51%) |
| 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 . | |

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 | 67 | 105 | 87 | 81 | 93 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 529 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 20 | 14 | 5 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 18 | 13 | 11 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 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 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/17/2020

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 | 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 | 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 | |

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 | 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 | 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 | |

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 | |
| | (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 | 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% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 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 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| 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% | 1 |
| 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% | 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 | 51 |
| 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 | 48 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 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 | 55 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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.

During the 2018-2019 school year, 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).

Trends: During the 2019-2020 school year, teacher and resource staff interventions had a positive effect on student growth. iReady Math data showed a decrease in Tier 3 students from the first

diagnostic in grades 1-4: 1st grade (-6%); 2nd grade (-7%); 3rd grade (-11%); 4th grade (-6%); however, there was an increase of Tier 3 students in 5th grade (+4%).

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 showed the most improvement (+18% achievement and +16% learning gains). New actions included tier 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?

The SLT determined that attendance is an area of concern for Manatee Cove Elementary. Another area of concern is students with one or more suspensions.

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and 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).

Measurable Outcome: 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 Steps to Implement

1. Review Lowest Quartile Data to create a 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 and ELL teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.
5. Monitor implementation of differentiated instruction for identified students through ongoing Administrative Walk-throughs & feedback

Person Responsible Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and 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).

Measurable Outcome: 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 Steps to Implement

1. Review Lowest Quartile Data to create 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 progress monitoring meetings with ESE and ELL Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.
6. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in implementing standards-aligned instruction and effective implementation of best practice
7. Monitor small group instruction through ongoing administrative walk-throughs and feedback

Person Responsible Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our Science Proficiency was at 64%, a -2% change from the prior year. Further analysis revealed that proficiency for students in our targeted ESSA Subgroup, Students with Disabilities, was 26% (-5%).

Measurable Outcome: Increase targeted subgroup Students with Disabilities from 26% proficiency 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 Steps to Implement

1. VE-Mild students will transition to general education science instruction when appropriate.
2. Professional development for classroom teachers from District Program Specialists on inclusion strategies and support for Students with Disabilities.
3. Professional development for classroom science teachers from District Content Specialists. PD should include focused training on the fair game benchmarks from the third and fourth grade standards.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance will continue to be a focus of our guidance counselor who will continue to collaborate with our social worker on students with excessive absences. In addition, due to the uncertainty of the pandemic and the potential for increased absences, Manatee Cove feels it will be important to build our school community through Social-Emotional Learning and through increased communication with families. All staff members will be vigilant in monitoring students with excessive absences and will be proactive in working with parents to reduce barriers to school attendance. We will be especially vigilant this year due to the unique situation presented by the pandemic.

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.

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, PTA family events, i.e. game night, Father, Daughter Dance, Winter Carnival, end of year celebration, Monster Mash,, Movie Nights, Chick-Fil-A night, Moe's and Texas Roadhouse Night.

We have Science night with The Museum of Arts and Sciences and Math Night. Multicultural Night, Social Studies Night, Science Fair Information Night. SAC Input night. Story Book Parade. Quarterly Celebration Assemblies. Weekly school messages would go out to inform stakeholders of weekly events. The Cove Chronicle is our newsletter.

We share information on Twitter and Facebook and Class Story via Class Dojo.

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