

Manatee County Public Schools

# Manatee Elementary School



## 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Manatee Elementary School

1609 6TH AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34208

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

## School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2018-19 Title I School</b> | <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                               | Yes                           | 100%  |

|  |                       |   |
|--|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>Charter School</b> | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education                         | No                    | 91%   |

## School Grades History

| Year Grade | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|            | C       | C       | D       | D*      |

## 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.

Manatee Elementary School seeks to create and maintain a challenging and safe learning environment that encourages high expectations through engaging instruction. We strive to have our parents, teachers, and community members actively involved in our students' learning.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Manatee Elementary School's vision is to create a school that produces major gains in student achievement and proficiency every year until we are consistently a B.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name                      | Title                  |
|---------------------------|------------------------|
| VanOverbeke, Tami         | Principal              |
| Hemingway-Primous, Samara | Assistant Principal    |
| Hodge, Doni               | Instructional Coach    |
| Williams, Renita          | Attendance/Social Work |
| Cuffaro, Maria            | Instructional Coach    |

#### Duties

#### Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The members of the Instructional Leadership Team will meet weekly to look at curriculum implementation and data. As a team we will figure out how to respond to the data using best practices and differentiation. Each team member will be assigned to oversee a different grade level and help with teaching and learning to ensure our students are making learning gains and increasing in achievement.

### Early Warning Systems

#### Year 2017-18

#### 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     | 50          | 44 | 30 | 32 | 40 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 211 |
| One or more suspensions         | 4           | 14 | 8  | 7  | 12 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 52  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 5  | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 37  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 56 | 65 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 175 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators |             | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 18 |

**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 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 7  |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0           | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 11 |

**Date this data was collected**

Thursday 8/2/2018

**Year 2016-17 - 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     | 20          | 15 | 10 | 27 | 9  | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 97  |
| One or more suspensions         | 29          | 23 | 20 | 52 | 17 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 166 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 15 | 7  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 30  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 59 | 40 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 144 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |    |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |     |
|--|-------------|----|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|  | K           | 1  | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 16          | 11 | 9 | 31 | 14 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 102 |

**Year 2016-17 - 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     | 20          | 15 | 10 | 27 | 9  | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 97  |
| One or more suspensions         | 29          | 23 | 20 | 52 | 17 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 166 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 15 | 7  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 30  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 59 | 40 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 144 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |    |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |     |
|--|-------------|----|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|  | K           | 1  | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 16          | 11 | 9 | 31 | 14 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 102 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

ELA learning proficiency (27%). It is a trend. It was 26% the previous year.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

ELA learning gains of the lowest quartile (25%)

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

ELA achievement was 29% below the state average.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

Science (24% to 39%). It was not a trend.

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.**

We added science everywhere we could. We had science Vocabulary and questions on the morning announcements, we used Acaletics science for the first time, and we took quarterly science assessments and tracked the data and progression of the students.

### 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 | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                        | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement        | 27%    | 50%      | 56%   | 25%    | 47%      | 52%   |

| School Grade Component      | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 39%    | 54%      | 55%   | 44%    | 51%      | 52%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 44%    | 47%      | 48%   | 57%    | 47%      | 46%   |
| Math Achievement            | 40%    | 60%      | 62%   | 23%    | 52%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 56%    | 61%      | 59%   | 34%    | 54%      | 58%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 54%    | 47%      | 47%   | 34%    | 45%      | 46%   |
| Science Achievement         | 39%    | 49%      | 55%   | 42%    | 45%      | 51%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         |         |         |         | Total     |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       |           |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 50 (20)                           | 44 (15) | 30 (10) | 32 (27) | 40 (9)  | 15 (16) | 211 (97)  |
| One or more suspensions         | 4 (29)                            | 14 (23) | 8 (20)  | 7 (52)  | 12 (17) | 7 (25)  | 52 (166)  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 1 (15)  | 5 (7)   | 31 (8)  | 37 (30)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 56 (59) | 65 (40) | 54 (45) | 175 (144) |

#### 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                    | 2018 | 20%    | 49%      | -29%                       | 57%   | -37%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 29%    | 50%      | -21%                       | 58%   | -29%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 29%    | 51%      | -22%                       | 56%   | -27%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 23%    | 52%      | -29%                       | 56%   | -33%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 21%    | 52%      | -31%                       | 55%   | -34%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 21%    | 48%      | -27%                       | 53%   | -32%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2018 | 34%    | 56%      | -22%                       | 62%   | -28%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 32%    | 51%      | -19%                       | 62%   | -30%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 46%    | 61%      | -15%                       | 62%   | -16%                    |



| <b>MATH</b>           |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
|                       | 2017        | 36%           | 59%             | -23%                              | 64%          | -28%                           |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 10%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | 14%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 05                    | 2018        | 33%           | 58%             | -25%                              | 61%          | -28%                           |
|                       | 2017        | 28%           | 53%             | -25%                              | 57%          | -29%                           |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 5%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | -3%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>SCIENCE</b>    |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>      | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 05                | 2018        | 34%           | 49%             | -15%                              | 55%          | -21%                           |
|                   | 2017        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |

### Subgroup Data

| <b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b> |
| 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              |                |                  |                          |                                |

  

| <b>2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b> |
| 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              |                |                  |                          |                                |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

**Areas of Focus:**

**Activity #1**

**Title** ELA

**Rationale** Trend data is demonstrating that ELA proficiency is low.

**Intended Outcome** Student achievement will improve in ELA on the FSA when teachers are provided targeted support to plan and deliver instruction aligned with Florida Standards, district power standards, and district curriculum maps.

ELA Achievement on FSA: 29%  
ELA Gains: 53%  
ELA L25: 69%

**Point Person** Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

**Action Step**

**Description** Teachers will plan weekly using the Learning Focus framework Monitor and adjust surrounding the data

**Person Responsible** Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

**Plan to Monitor Effectiveness**

**Description** Bi-monthly data meetings  
Quarterly assessments  
Standards Mastery  
Formative assessments

**Person Responsible** Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

**Activity #2**

**Title** Attendance

**Rationale** Trend data is demonstrating that students who are chronically absent is a significantly large percentile.

**Intended Outcome** We will decrease the number of continuously enrolled students with 10 or more absences by at least 8%.  
2017-18 Data by grade level for students who were absent 10 or more days of school:  
PreK = 53%  
K = 66%  
1 = 58%  
2 = 42%  
3 = 50%  
4 = 49%  
5 = 25%

**Point Person** Renita Williams (williams8r@manteeschools.net)

**Action Step**

**Description** The GET will track attendance daily for all of the chronically absent students. Phone calls will be made to parents when students are absent. A check-in check-out system will be used and we will have awards for students who increase their attendance rate from the previous year.

**Person Responsible** Renita Williams (williams8r@manteeschools.net)

**Plan to Monitor Effectiveness**

**Description** Weekly meeting to disaggregate the data. Look at additional interventions as necessary.

**Person Responsible** Renita Williams (williams8r@manteeschools.net)

**Activity #3**

**Title** Math

**Rationale** Trend data is demonstrating that Math proficiency is low.

**Intended Outcome** Student achievement will improve in Math when teachers are provided targeted support to plan and deliver instruction aligned with Florida Standards, district power standards, and district curriculum maps.  
 Math Achievement on FSA: 36%  
 Math Gains: 72%  
 Math L25: 78%

**Point Person** Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

Action Step

**Description** Teachers will plan weekly using the Learning Focus framework  
 Monitor and adjust surrounding the data

**Person Responsible** Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description** Bi-monthly data meetings  
 Quarterly assessments  
 Standards Mastery  
 Formative assessments

**Person Responsible** Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

**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.**

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:

- Open House
- Newsletters
- Family Events
- Conferences
- Progress Reports
- Phone calls
- Meetings (SAC, PTO...)

**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.**

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 Second Step 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.

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

5th Grade End of Year Celebration Ceremony

Welcoming new students to the school through classroom welcome packets and meetings with the counselor

Middle School Transition Night

Vertical alignment through grade levels

School administration discussions of the middle school expectations with middle school personnel

Middle School Connections letter for 5th grade parents

RISE program (VPK to Kindergarten)

**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.**

Our goal is to maximize student learning within the given resource constraints from the county. We need to develop a process based on evidence and look at possible effects of where resources are placed and where they are not. We also must ensure that the budget is fully integrated surrounding teaching and learning for our school's specific population and the needs within it.

The Administration will put a process in place to gather input from staff surrounding our specific data and comprehensive needs assessment. Teams will then submit their

information to their Team Leader and it will then be presented and discussed at the SAC meeting(s). After that, parents will have input during our Title I and school-wide events. Once all of that data has been disaggregated, the budget will be aligned to meet the needs of the students.

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

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, Applebees's 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:

- Little Caesar's Pizza
- Kona Ice
- Astro Skate
- Elements Massage
- Laugh and Learn Academy
- Texas Roadhouse
- Applebees
- Subway
- Geckos
- Smugglers Cove
- Ultimate Tiger Martial Arts
- Big Brothers Big Sisters of the Sun C