R. Dan Nolan Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

R. Dan Nolan Middle School

6615 GREENBROOK BLVD, Bradenton, FL 34202

https://www.manateeschools.net/nolan

Demographics

Principal: Scott Cooper

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	28%
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: A (72%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (65%)
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

R. Dan Nolan Middle School

6615 GREENBROOK BLVD, Bradenton, FL 34202

https://www.manateeschools.net/nolan

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	23%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

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

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.

Nolan Middle School Mission Statement: Nolan Middle School Vision Statement: Nolan Middle School will inspire students with a passion for learning, empowered to pursue their dreams confidently and creatively while contributing to the community, nation, and world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Nolan is a highly effective school that celebrates learning.

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
Cooper, Scott	Principal	
Jones, Lori	Assistant Principal	
Lowe, Jaimi	Teacher, K-12	
Troop, Jason	Teacher, K-12	
Rubal, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Guerra, Kim	Teacher, ESE	
Parajon, Ana	School Counselor	
Brown, Minetha	Assistant Principal	
Boculac, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Scott Cooper

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.*
6

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	28%
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: A (72%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (65%)
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	284	260	343	0	0	0	0	887
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	14	37	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	8	15	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	14	24	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	20	31	0	0	0	0	71

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	0	0	0	0	

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	11	12	0	0	0	0	23
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 9/9/2020

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	268	329	366	0	0	0	0	963
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	18	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	38	54	0	0	0	0	118

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	7	18	21	0	0	0	0	46

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	268	329	366	0	0	0	0	963
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	18	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	38	54	0	0	0	0	118

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	7	18	21	0	0	0	0	46

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	73%	52%	54%	69%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	56%	54%	58%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	51%	47%	51%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	80%	59%	58%	78%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	74%	61%	57%	70%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	54%	51%	55%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	70%	47%	51%	61%	39%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	77%	72%	89%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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**
06	2019	76%	52%	24%	54%	22%
	2018	66%	47%	19%	52%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	72%	48%	24%	52%	20%
	2018	71%	48%	23%	51%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	70%	54%	16%	56%	14%
	2018	70%	55%	15%	58%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	79%	57%	22%	55%	24%
	2018	70%	52%	18%	52%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	77%	57%	20%	54%	23%
	2018	72%	54%	18%	54%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	52%	41%	11%	46%	6%
	2018	61%	41%	20%	45%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	69%	45%	24%	48%	21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	45%	21%	50%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	77%	10%	71%	16%
2018	80%	78%	2%	71%	9%
Compare		7%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	70%	-70%
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	65%	30%	61%	34%
2018	98%	65%	33%	62%	36%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	61%	38%	57%	42%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
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	32	40	36	39	51	41	27	58			
ELL	36	57	57	50	69	58	35	41	100		

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
ASN	74	73		88	83		75	70	95		
BLK	55	55	50	55	71						
HSP	56	52	47	63	72	63	49	74	81		
MUL	85	69		82	67		82	100	100		
WHT	76	62	52	84	74	62	73	90	88		
FRL	52	51	45	60	64	57	43	74	72		

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	29	41	35	38	47	39	23	47	33		
ELL	23	40	33	39	44	30	27	39			
ASN	76	68		78	63		88	88	91		
BLK	55	53		60	47						
HSP	50	48	39	62	53	32	54	72	80		
MUL	71	65		77	71		73	83	92		
WHT	73	57	48	80	68	50	69	83	81		
FRL	46	44	31	56	52	32	48	61	61		

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	29	40	32	36	54	47	30	69			
ELL	16	57	58	23	51	51	11	45			
ASN	82	78		82	74			100	73		
BLK	53	47		73	87						
HSP	50	48	48	60	63	54	43	78	49		
MUL	91	84		91	68			100			
WHT	72	59	50	81	71	55	65	91	60		
FRL	42	51	49	56	62	52	26	74	35		

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	72
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	716
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	57
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	80
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	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	84
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	73
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	58
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 the lowest 25%tile at 51% showed the lowest preformance. There is a trend of movement upward since the implementation of Reading Plus schoolwide. 7th grade mathematics students scores dropped from 6th to 7th even though there was a cohort gain. Our past 8th grade scores were the lowest. We tended to have a downward trend from 6th to 7th to 8th, but still higher than the district component.

The subgroup data component was students with disabilities (SWD) in ELA categories. Support facilitation model has been added for ESE students.

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

All Nolan Middle School data components showed an increase. ESSA data showed SWD at 40%, which is under the federal index of 41%. Most teachers are involved in support facilitation are new to the position and support needs to be monitored.

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.

The component with the greatest gap is mathematics achievement in comparison to the state average. Nolan Middle School was 22% higher. Change of teachers in certain grade levels.

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

All Nolan Middle School data components showed an increase from 2018 to 2019 data. Reading Plus was used across grade levels to support reading growth. Writing across the content area was implemented using the writing rubric. iReady was used to supplement mathematics. Science continues to focus on root words and interactive notebooks. Engagement of PBIS activities were added for positive culture.

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

An area of concern would be the students scoring an Achievement Level of 1 on the FSA Math and/or FSA Reading

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

1. ELA Lowest 25%tile
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. Math Lowest 25%tile
4. Students with Disabilities SWD

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA Lowest 25%tile and ELA Learning Gains identified because it was the scools lowest data component.
Measurable Outcome:	At the end of the current school year, the ELA Lowest 25%tile will increase from 51% to 56% and ELA Learning Gains will increase from 61% to 66%, as measured by FSA gains guidelines.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Cooper (coopers@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading Plus will be used school-wide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading Plus is an individualized, district supported, research-based strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All students will complete at least 2 lessons per week in Reading Plus. All Intensive Reading students will complete at least 4 lessons per week in Reading Plus.
2. Intensive Reading teachers will provide grade level, small group reading instruction.
3. Intensive Reading teachers will monitor students' Reading Plus performance and conference with students.
4. All teachers will continue the use of text structure support to assist in reading comprehension.
5. All teachers will provide grade level text and reading comprehension activities weekly.

Person Responsible   Scott Cooper (coopers@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math Lowest 25%tile Math Lowest 25%tile is a state graded component
Measurable Outcome:	At the end of the current school year, the Math Lowest 25%tile will increase from 63% to 68%, as measured by FSA learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lori Jones (jonesl@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady will be used through 6th and 7th grade intensive math courses. Accaletics will be used through 8th grade intensive math courses.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady and Accaletics are district supported, evidence-based, individualized programs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will complete at least 45 minutes of individualized lesson time in iReady per week in 6th and 7th grade.
2. Students will use Accaletics during Intensive Mathematics in 8th grade.
3. Intensive math teachers will provide grade level, small group math instruction.
4. All math teachers will continue to teach error analysis.

Person Responsible	Lori Jones (jonesl@manateeschool.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities (SWD) Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup was below 41%.
Measurable Outcome:	At the end of the school year, students with disabilities will increase from 40% learning gains to 45% learning gains, as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusive education supports, testing accommodations, and classroom accommodations
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusive education supports, testing accommodations, and classroom accommodations are research-based, district supported strategies teachers need to implement for a greater impact on student growth.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be provided support facilitation depending on the highest need.
2. Provide increased professional development on support facilitation for core and ESE teachers.
3. Provide professional development on testing accommodations and classroom accommodations for core and ESE teachers.
4. Monitor implementation and fidelity of teachers providing services.

Person Responsible	Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Additional areas of focus will be identified after Q1 benchmark assessments.

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.

Teacher communication with parents through various avenues (Remind, FOCUS, email, Schoology, phone calls and written notes. Parent conferences can be requested by a staff member, student, or parent to support students. Parent information sessions are held to communicate academic programs and clarify expectations. ConnectEd calls are made frequently to families to communicate calendar dates, testing dates, or timely inoformation. Information is placed on Nolan Middle School's Facebook and Nolan Middle School's Website for communication. A newsletter is provided each semester to provide information to parents.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	140-Substitute Teachers	0752 - R. Dan Nolan Middle School			$500.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	140-Substitute Teachers	0752 - R. Dan Nolan Middle School	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning				$500.00

Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
5000	140-Substitute Teachers	0752 - R. Dan Nolan Middle School	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
				Total:	$1,500.00