

Manatee County Public Schools

R. Dan Nolan Middle School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

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: 8/16/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	27%
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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cooper, Scott	Principal	
Brown, Minetha	Assistant Principal	
Lowe, Jaimi	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Leader of Social Studies
Troop, Jason	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Leader ELA
Rubal, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Leader Mathematics
Parajon, Ana	School Counselor	SEL
Guerra, Kim	Teacher, ESE	Instructional Leader ESE
Boculac, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Leader Science
Jones, Lori	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/16/2020, 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

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

768

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

13

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	212	279	260	0	0	0	0	751
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	8	7	9	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	22	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	15	24	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	19	15	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	19	15	0	0	0	0	57

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	26	9	11	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	8	0	0	0	0	8
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 8/25/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				73%	52%	54%	69%	50%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	56%	54%	56%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	51%	47%	45%	45%	47%
Math Achievement				80%	59%	58%	77%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains				74%	61%	57%	65%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	54%	51%	43%	49%	51%
Science Achievement				70%	47%	51%	67%	46%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				87%	77%	72%	82%	84%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	76%	52%	24%	54%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	72%	48%	24%	52%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
08	2021					
	2019	70%	54%	16%	56%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	79%	57%	22%	55%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	77%	57%	20%	54%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
08	2021					
	2019	52%	41%	11%	46%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	69%	45%	24%	48%	21%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	87%	77%	10%	71%	16%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	71%	-71%	70%	-70%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	95%	65%	30%	61%	34%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	99%	61%	38%	57%	42%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

District Benchmark quarter 1 and quarter 2 scores

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	168	195	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	6	7	
	English Language Learners	5	7	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	166	204	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5	6	
	English Language Learners	8	10	

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	162	177	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	14	10	
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	199	201	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4	6	
	English Language Learners	14	16	
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	193	222	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	9	11	
	English Language Learners	10	14	

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	194	229	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	9	10	
	English Language Learners	7	6	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	235	242	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	14	7	
	English Language Learners	10	4	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	222	192	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	11	7	
	English Language Learners	15	2	

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	30	45	49	43	47	43	20	45	70		
ELL	31	39	38	48	47	40	37	55			
ASN	85	77		85	64		92		93		
BLK	46	44	31	48	48	33	36	73			
HSP	60	63	48	68	61	47	59	74	71		
MUL	91	68		86	67						
WHT	77	60	48	85	73	63	71	91	79		
FRL	52	54	43	64	55	44	55	73	66		
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	674
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	78
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

current prior year
 SWD are below 40%
 ELA Learning Gains 61% 61% remain the same
 ELA Lowest 25th Percentile 47% 48% consistently decreasing

Math Learning Gains 60% 74% decreased
 Math Lowest 25th Percentile 55% 66% decreased

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Subgroups ELA Ach. ELA LG ELA LG L25% Math Ach. Math LG Math LGL25% Sci Ach. SS Ach.
 SWD 32 40 36 39 51 41 27 58
 Our SWD population needs to continue to be a focus.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Continued professional learning to improve strategies and accommodations that are best practices need to be a focus to help these teachers push their students towards growth.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Achievement 73% to 73%
 Math Achievement 80% to 86%
 Math Learning Gains 65% to 74%
 Social Studies Achievement 87% to 87%

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Reading Plus was being implemented in LA courses to help students progress with Reading. Reading Plus was also used in Reading Courses.

Current Mathematics teachers are completing Math Remediation for Level 1's and 2's. Students with Level 3 and above are being placed in upper level mathematics courses.

Teachers are consistent and are teaching the standards.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Core Content Areas need to implement strategies and organizers to help students with reading strategies. Reading courses will be using Reading Plus. Our current language arts teachers will not be using Reading Plus as the district has stated we should not be using this program except in Reading Courses.

Math remediation will be provided by current grade level teacher teaching those students. IReady, Acaletics will be continued in these classes. We have an Algebra Success class for students in Algebra 1 that might need additional support.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Social Studies and Science teachers will be using strategies to support content reading across the curriculum. Language Arts and Reading teachers will review and share the highest growth potential strategies. Close Reading will be a focus.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

SWD will be a focus. Reading strategies will help these students in core classes. Push In to content classes where SWD need additional support will occur.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	ELA Gains went from 64% to 61% and L25 Gains went from 48% 47%, both areas declined. These areas were the school's data components showing the greatest potential for improvement.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	At the end of the current school year, the ELA lowest 25 percentile will increase from 51% to 56% and ELA Learning Gains will increase from 61% to 66%, as measured by FSA gains guidelines.
Monitoring:	Benchmark data and review of benchmarks with support by content area teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Cooper (coopers@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Reading Plus will be continued in Reading Courses for Level 1 students. Language Arts teachers will implement reading strategies to support growth. Close Reading, supported by the Nolan text structures, will be a focus across departments, with Social Studies specifically focusing on main idea and summarizing and Science focusing on recognition of relevant evidence and data in passages.</p> <p>Reading Plus is an individualized, district supported, research-based strategy. Summarizing achieves one of the largest gains based on Marzano's Nine High Yield Instructional Strategies.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Summarizing and note taking (Yields a 34 percentile gain)</p> <p>Students should learn to eliminate unnecessary information, substitute some information, keep important information, write / rewrite, and analyze information. Students should be encouraged to put some information into own words.</p> <p>Teacher models summarization techniques, identify key concepts, bullets, outlines, clusters, narrative organizers, journal summaries, break down assignments, create simple reports, quick writes, graphic organizers, column notes, affinity diagrams, etc.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. All students will participate in Close Reads in language arts, science and social studies classes each quarter dependent on curriculum.
2. Intensive Reading teachers will continue to provide grade level, small group reading instruction.
3. Intensive Reading teachers will continue to monitor students' Reading Plus performance and conference with students including data.
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.
6. Students identified as ELL will have support from the ELL aide weekly.
7. Students identified as ESE will have support from the support facilitation teacher weekly.

Person Responsible Jason Troop (troopj@manateeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA Data showed students with disabilities at 40% which is under the federal index of 41%.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, students with disabilities will increase from 40% to 50% in learning gains as measured by the FSA ELA.
Monitoring:	Benchmark testing, Reading Plus Data, SIPP and STAR
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusive educations supports, testing accommodations and classroom accommodations to fidelity, learning strategies within an ESE classroom and tiered interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research based strategies that have shown growth in SWD students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be provided support facilitation in ELA and Math depending on needs.
2. Provide opportunities for professional learning communities amongst core and ESE teachers.
3. Provide training on testing accommodations and classroom accommodations for core and ESE teachers.
4. Monitor and implementation and fidelity of teachers providing services.
5. Monitor student response to interventions and revise as needed.

Person Responsible Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of****Focus****Description
and****Rationale:**

Math Learning Gains 60% 74% decreased
Math Lowest 25th Percentile 55% 66% decreased

**Measurable
Outcome:**

At the end of the current school year, the Math L25 will increase from 55% to 62%, as measured by FSA learning gains.

Monitoring:

Quarterly benchmark data. Data from IReady, Acaletics and Aleks and a new course Algebra Success will be provided for students who were recommended or are struggling due to a level 3 on the FSA and struggling with grades. Small group instruction and Aleks will be used to support Algebra Success.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Lori Jones (jonesl@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

IReady, Acaletics and Aleks are district supported, evidence-based, individualized programs. Aleks will be used in our Algebra Success courses.

**Rationale
for****Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Scores using FSA L25 for past two years.

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 Intensive Mathematics classes
2. Students will use Accaletics in Intensive Mathematics in 8th grade
3. Students will use Aleks during Algebra Success classes
4. Intensive math teachers will provide grade level, small group math instruction
5. Algebra Success teacher will provide small group math instruction.
6. Math teachers will provide monitoring, before school, tutoring to students
7. All math teachers will use error analysis daily in their classrooms.

Person**Responsible**

Lisa Rubal (rubal@manateeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus	Using the CASEL SEL student survey, 40% of the students surveyed rated the school climate as positive. Positive culture and environment is a foundation of the school safety and overall student achievement.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Using the CASEL SEL student survey, the positivity rate will increase from 40% to 70% at the end of the year by implementing the Character Strong program daily during homeroom.
Monitoring:	Data collected from the CASEL SEL. Administrator monitoring the instruction of the Character Strong program.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will provide Character Strong lessons daily. 2. Teachers will facilitate an academic and behavior data discussion each quarter with their homeroom students. 3. Promote positive messages on bulleting boards and school news.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With each student being assigned a homeroom teachers this provide the student the opportunity to make a connection each day with the same caring adult that they can speak to about concerns that are not attached to them due to academic reasons. This will promote students sharing concerns and issues that can be proactively addressed. Character Strong provides the environment for students to create and build a sense of community, while creating a caring relationship with the adult.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide Character Strong training - Rubal
2. Provide SEL training- Brown
3. Deliver Character Strong daily in homeroom - teachers
4. Facilitate data discussions - teachers

Person Responsible Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

1.6 incidents per 100, low category

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.

Nolan Middle School uses PBIS. Our students receive Colt Cash when exhibiting a school-wide culture. Our school-wide components of positive behavior are COLTS Conscientious, Optimistic, Leadership, Trustworthy and Safety. We have many options through out the year for students to earn COLT Cash for exhibiting these traits. We have reward activities, a school store, the opportunity to buy Colt Gear and other incentives in every classroom for students to spend their well earned COLT Cash on items that support our schools positive culture.

Every quarter we have a reward activity with faculty and students to keep our school culture positive. All stakeholders are involved in some form.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our business partners donate money for rewards and other items to be provided to students. Our faculty, staff and even the bus drivers reward students for positive behavior with COLT Cash which they can use for items of interest at school that promote our school. Our PTO and SAC help with volunteers for our activities and partner with us to have rewarding quarterly activities for the students. We have a large PBIS committee called COLTS in ACTION who head up the activities and culture for the school.

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	2021-22
	5000	140-Substitute Teachers	0752 - R. Dan Nolan Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22

	5000		0752 - R. Dan Nolan Middle School	Other		\$0.00
			Notes: Teacher assigned to support students			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5000	140-Substitute Teachers	0752 - R. Dan Nolan Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
Total:						\$1,000.00