

Manatee County Public Schools

Manatee High School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	15

Manatee High School

902 33RD STREET CT W, Bradenton, FL 34205

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

Demographics

Principal: David Underhill

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: B 2016-17: B 2015-16: C 2014-15: A 2013-14: B
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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.

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 and position title 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	
Melnick, Alan	Teacher, ESE	
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	Guidance Counselor	

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	0	563	588	573	504	2228
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	90	119	219	428
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

102

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/25/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	174	217	175	737
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	119	219	123	551
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	148	111	355
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	138	180	103	621

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	210	258	327	303	1098

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	174	217	175	737
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	119	219	123	551
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	148	111	355
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	138	180	103	621

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	210	258	327	303	1098

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%	52%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	47%	51%	53%	51%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	37%	42%	45%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	59%	51%	51%	58%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains	49%	47%	48%	46%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	45%	45%	40%	49%	45%
Science Achievement	73%	67%	68%	77%	71%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	69%	73%	74%	69%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	563 (0)	588 (0)	573 (0)	504 (0)	2228 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	25 (171)	22 (174)	46 (217)	33 (175)	126 (737)
One or more suspensions	0 (90)	90 (119)	119 (219)	219 (123)	428 (551)
Course failure in ELA or Math	86 (0)	109 (96)	118 (148)	0 (111)	313 (355)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	159 (200)	167 (138)	164 (180)	104 (103)	594 (621)

Grade Level Data

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	54%	53%	1%	55%	-1%
	2018	51%	52%	-1%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State 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%
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
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

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

ESSA Federal Index	
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
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
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

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? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

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	
Title	SWD Learning Gains
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.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	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.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
Title	Lowest Quartile ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	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.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase 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 Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 (optional)

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

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: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

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

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

n/a

PFEP Link

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

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: SWD Learning Gains				\$790.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0181 - Manatee High School			\$790.00

Manatee - 0181 - Manatee High School - 2019-20 SIP

			<i>Notes: Purchase USA Test Prep software for Biology, US History, SAT/ACT content areas.</i>			
			0181 - Manatee High School			\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Provide substitutes for 9th and 10th grade English teachers</i>			
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Lowest Quartile ELA Learning Gains				\$0.00
					Total:	\$790.00