

Manatee County Public Schools

Manatee High 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Manatee High School

902 33RD STREET CT W, Bradenton, FL 34205

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

Demographics

Principal: Sharon Scarbrough

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Manatee County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Manatee High School

902 33RD STREET CT W, Bradenton, FL 34205

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

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)
High School 9-12	No	51%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Manatee High School is to increase student engagement by providing opportunities to think in every classroom, every period, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Manatee High School will be an exemplary student-centered environment that develops life long learners to be globally competitive.

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
Underhill, David	Principal	
Francis, Linda	Assistant Principal	
Hall, Shane	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Kathleen	Assistant Principal	
Murray, Stephen	Teacher, K-12	
Sollenberger, Laura	Teacher, K-12	
Pepper, Diana	Teacher, K-12	
Zoller, Daria	Teacher, K-12	
Kaminski-Beyer, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Chmielewski, Joanne	School Counselor	
Watkins, Jacqueline	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair, MTSS

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Sharon Scarbrough

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.*

2

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

117

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	548	559	557	547	2211
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	5	16	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	119	74	77	283
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	76	73	83	236
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	123	113	106	471
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	102	97	68	367
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	125	101	101	400

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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

Wednesday 8/19/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563	588	573	504	2228
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	22	46	33	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	119	219	428
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	86	109	118	0	318
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	167	164	104	594

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	74	76	74	239

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563	588	573	504	2228
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	22	46	33	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	119	219	428
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	86	109	118	0	318
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	167	164	104	594

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	74	76	74	239

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	52%	49%	56%	51%	48%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	47%	51%	47%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	37%	42%	36%	35%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	59%	51%	51%	56%	52%	49%
Math Learning Gains	49%	47%	48%	46%	46%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	45%	45%	42%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	73%	67%	68%	80%	73%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	69%	73%	70%	63%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	54%	53%	1%	55%	-1%
	2018	51%	52%	-1%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	49%	49%	0%	53%	-4%
	2018	52%	52%	0%	53%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	69%	4%	67%	6%
2018	76%	72%	4%	65%	11%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-3%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	71%	-1%	70%	0%
2018	73%	71%	2%	68%	5%
Compare		-3%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	65%	-8%	61%	-4%
2018	55%	65%	-10%	62%	-7%
Compare		2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	61%	-3%	57%	1%
2018	57%	56%	1%	56%	1%
Compare		1%			

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	13	34	31	37	42	40	34	43		71	23
ELL	20	30	22	48	50	53	52	33		59	31
ASN	100	80									
BLK	28	39	29	43	44	42	52	51		76	31
HSP	41	38	22	55	47	36	74	69		84	46
MUL	59	35		56	61		94	83		92	82
WHT	65	57	53	67	50	49	77	78		87	60
FRL	42	43	30	55	49	44	68	69		80	43

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	20	44	39	19	43	40	42	53		71	17
ELL	19	47	47	41	44	35				63	40
ASN	75	92									
BLK	20	42	42	40	44	34	46	49		87	24
HSP	44	54	50	52	48	43	74	65		85	43
MUL	59	45		74	57		70	67		93	50
WHT	67	55	38	67	45	35	86	86		92	60
FRL	42	51	46	52	46	43	70	65		86	37
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	14	29	25	24	39	42	49	54		61	28
ELL	9	22	20	33	58		29	15		61	27
BLK	24	28	26	39	46	50	59	47		80	16
HSP	38	42	34	52	47	52	69	59		82	43
MUL	41	32		43	48			91		92	55
WHT	66	55	47	61	45	35	90	79		94	65
FRL	38	40	32	48	46	43	72	60		82	42

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	58
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	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	639
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
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	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
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	53
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	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	64
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	54
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.

ELA Lowest 25th percentile showed the lowest performance. Instability in the English department as well as an increasing percentage of students entering high school reading and writing below grade level are affecting proficiency results. As a result students often need remediation during their junior year to achieve proficiency.

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

ELA Lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Instability in the English department among 9th and 10th grade English teachers as well as an increasing percentage of students entering high school reading and writing below grade level are affecting proficiency results. As a result students often need remediation during their junior year to achieve proficiency.

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.

ELA Lowest 25th percentile showed a 10 percentage point gap with the state results.

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

Math Lowest 25th percentile showed a 4 percentage point improvement from the previous year. In 2018-2019 Manatee High School reduced average class size in Algebra I-A, Algebra I-B, and Algebra classes to 18-20 students. Remediation strategies were embedded in Algebra, Liberal Arts Math 1 and Liberal Arts Math 2 in lieu of offering Intensive Math courses.

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

Twenty-eight percent of our students score level one on statewide assessments in grades nine through eleven. That subgroup represents 65-72 percent of the course failures in math and english. Which of course effects our graduation rate. By the time those students are seniors, the percentage that score level one percentage drops to twenty percent but that may reflect that those students are opting out of the traditional high school experience and pursuing GED.

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

1. ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains.
2. SWD ELA Achievement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	Based on 18-19 data, our lowest quartile has under-performed on learning gains in three sub-categories of the FSA-ELA Assessment: Key Ideas and Details, Craft and Structure, Integration and Knowledge.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA learning gains among lowest quartile students and students with disabilities by 2-5 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shane Hall (halls@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading Plus ACT/SAT test preparation Quarterly Benchmark Data Chats
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of Reading Plus and ACT/SAT/Khan Academy/USA Test Prep will allow us to target instruction to support students in the three ELA sub-categories to which we under-performed. The quarterly data chats will allow instructional staff to progress monitor and adjust instruction as needed to support student growth.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-wide professional development focusing on three FSA-ELA sub-categories
2. Co-facilitation model for additional ESE support in grades 9, 10.
3. Quarterly writing conferences based on Write Score results.
4. Fidelity to Reading Plus--exceed 100.
5. Monthly department meetings centered on school data, progress monitoring, and instructional strategies.

Person Responsible Shane Hall (halls@manateeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on 18-19 data, our Students with Disabilities have under-performed on learning gains in three sub-categories of the FSA-ELA Assessment: Key Ideas and Details, Craft and Structure, Integration and Knowledge.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA learning gains among the lowest quartile students and students with disabilities by 2-5 percent.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shane Hall (halls@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Reading Plus
ACT/SAT test preparation
Quarterly Benchmark Data Chats

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Use of Reading Plus and ACT/SAT/Khan Academy/USA Test Prep will allow us to target instruction to support students in the three ELA sub-categories to which we under-performed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-wide professional development focusing on three FSA-ELA sub-categories
2. Co-facilitation model for additional ESE support in grades 9, 10.
3. Quarterly writing conferences based on Write Score results.
4. Fidelity to Reading Plus--exceed 100.
5. Monthly department meetings centered on school data, progress monitoring, and instructional strategies.

Person Responsible: Shane Hall (halls@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School Safety/Culture Additional areas of focus:

1. Faculty participation in professional conferences in support of our College and Career Preparatory, Medical and STEM Academies as well as movement towards being an AVID school.
2. School safety enhancements to provide additional supervision to vulnerable areas of the campus (perimeters, after school activities, and student parking).
3. Enhance school-wide attendance through community outreach.

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.

Manatee High has robust systems to involve stakeholders in providing a supportive and fulfilling learning environment. It offers over 30 clubs and extracurricular activities such as ballroom dancing to the competition step team. The school has a rich tradition of success in sports. Twenty-four varsity men's and women's sports are offered from our five-time state champion football team, perennially nationally ranked competitive dance squad--The Sugar Canes or our newest sports, men's and women's lacrosse.

Over 100 local businesses are official partners in education and sponsors for our athletics department. Our partners assist in mentorship programs; providing instruction in civics; law studies and the Holocaust. They provide job opportunities both paid and volunteer. Others support our student incentive programs for scholarship and citizenship.

We are proud of our academic success; at least one of our seniors has earned National Merit Scholar/Semi-Finalist honors the past five years. We provide students numerous pathways to rigorous preparation for the world of work or advanced studies through our College Preparatory Academy, the Medical Academy, and STEM Academy. Students accepted into the Medical Academy may earn Industry Certifications in CMAA, EMR, EKG Aide, and Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA). Students in the College Preparatory Academy may pursue advanced work through the State College of Florida or the University of South Florida Manatee/Sarasota. Other advanced scholars opt for Advanced Placement courses. Those interested in the practical application of science, technology, engineering, and math find a home in our STEM Academy. Finally, our newest academy, the Freshman Academy, puts our 9th graders into cohorts to provide small-group learning communities where teams of teachers share students. The goal is to strengthen our supports by infusing AVID strategies and rapid response to struggling students to improve our graduation rate. Sixty colleges and universities visit our campus annually. The highlight of the year is our annual college fair attended by 60 colleges and universities which is attended by the entire student body. Another popular program for seniors is the Big Bank Theory in which seniors get a crash course in managing personal finances, teaching them the reality of managing their money in life after high school.

The School has an aggressive program to support socio-emotional learning. We make use of our early warning system to identify at-risk students based on attendance, office discipline referrals, and quarterly grades. Those students are part of our weekly progress monitoring program, "Thursday Club". Those students meet individually on Thursdays with a Dean or AP to review grades, attendance, and set goals for the upcoming week. Our exceptional student department uses the co-facilitation model where our case managers visit core classes several times weekly in addition to running a resource room for students to use for tutoring or extended time testing. Our English-Language Learning team performs outreach to second-language learners, visiting classrooms, visiting homes, and providing an ELL resource room. Manatee High is a strong proponent of character education and we invest in weekly sessions--either Character Strong or state-directed training on mental health.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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