

Manatee County Public Schools

R. Dan Nolan Middle School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 8/23/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (67%) 2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: 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	ATSI
* 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	28%
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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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 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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cooper, Scott	Principal	
Jones, Lori	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Minetha	Assistant Principal	
Boculac, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Lowe, Jaimi	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Rubal, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair
Troop, Jason	Teacher, K-12	ELA/Reading Department Chair
Guerra, Kim	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/23/2022, Scott Cooper

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

8

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

745

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	218	287	268	0	0	0	0	773	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	25	0	0	0	0	40	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	39	36	0	0	0	0	97	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	29	31	0	0	0	0	73	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	21	17	0	0	0	0	57	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	21	17	0	0	0	0	57	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	19	21	25	0	0	0	65	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	1	0	0	0	0	1	
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

Tuesday 8/30/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	67%	49%	50%				73%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						61%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						51%	51%	47%
Math Achievement	78%	35%	36%				80%	59%	58%
Math Learning Gains	69%						74%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						63%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	57%	53%				70%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	92%	54%	58%				87%	77%	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	2022					
	2019	76%	52%	24%	54%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	72%	48%	24%	52%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
08	2022					
	2019	70%	54%	16%	56%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	79%	57%	22%	55%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	77%	57%	20%	54%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
08	2022					
	2019	52%	41%	11%	46%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	69%	45%	24%	48%	21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	87%	77%	10%	71%	16%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	71%	-71%	70%	-70%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	65%	30%	61%	34%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	99%	61%	38%	57%	42%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	20	27	21	37	41	35	37	50	55		
ELL	22	36	28	45	46	42	37		64		
ASN	68	62		71	75			67			
BLK	38	42		36	45	18					
HSP	47	44	31	63	56	37	51	86	73		
MUL	77	61		82	61		86	90	69		
WHT	73	52	42	83	73	57	82	96	86		
FRL	44	39	35	55	50	35	52	86	67		
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			

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
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		
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	672
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	69
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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	75
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	72
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

ELA Gains went down from 73% to 67% this has declined for more than one year

MATH Gains went down from 80% to 78%

SCI Gains went up from 69% to 76%

CIVICS Gains went up from 87% to 92%

Nolan remains above district and state in all areas

SWD 36% Fed Index 41%

BLK 36% Fed Index 41%

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA Gains went down from 73% to 67% this has declined for more than one year

SWD 36% Fed Index 41%

BLK 36% Fed Index 41%

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

Only 3 students in SWD and 1 student in BLK were behind. We need to focus on those students with more support in their areas of need.

ELA Gains are dropping. We had a high percentage of our ELA teachers out with absences last year. Instruction time was lost due to absences.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

SCI Gains went up from 69% to 76%

CIVICS Gains went up from 87% to 92%

Nolan remains above district and state in all areas

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

SCI Gains teachers working together and understanding the curriculum standards being tested on the 8th Grade NGSSS. Boot camps supported by millage dollars.

CIVICS Gains teachers working together and Level 1 and 2 students placed in 8th grade taking US History to give some foundation for CIVICS before taking CIVICS.

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

Reading strategies across the curriculum. Support in reading to our Level 2s who are close to moving to the next level. Less reading waivers which is a challenge not allowing us to support in our Intensive Reading courses the Level 1's and 2's who need it.

Identifying the SWD population and the BLK population needing support to meet the FED INDEX.

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.

Training for teachers using programs for Int Reading and Fund of Reading will be utilized. Training involving data review, PBIS, Behavior management, MTSS will be incorporated.

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

Math will provide tutoring, Migrant students will have tutoring. Boot camps for science and math will be implemented. ELL support and ESE support will be provided for the sub populations not meeting the Index.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Scores have been dropping each year. This year ELA proficiency dropped again from 73% to 67%. Areas of ELA populations not meeting proficiency were identified because these were the school's data components showing the greatest potential for improvement.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	At the end of the current school year, ESSA Subgroups including Students with Disabilities and Black/African American Students meeting proficiency on the FAST ELA Reading assessment will increase from 36% to 50%; FAST testing (PM1, PM2) will be measured on growth using the PM3.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	FAST PM1 and PM2 will be used to measure growth. Benchmark tests and School City data will be used for monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Cooper (coopers@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Close Reading, supported by the Nolan text structures, will again be a focus across departments, with Social Studies specifically focusing on main idea, summarizing, and vocabulary in context and Science focusing on recognition of relevant evidence and data in passages.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Close Reading is a proven strategy and used by all departments at Nolan Middle.
Action Steps to Implement List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All students will participate in Close Reads in language arts, science, and social studies classes each quarter, dependent on curriculum. 2. The Intensive Reading teacher and aide will continue to provide grade level, small group reading instruction. 3. The Intensive Reading teacher and aide will monitor students' Lexia 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. 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. 8. Science specifically focusing on vocabulary, cause and effect and summarizing. 9. Social Studies specifically focusing on main idea, summarizing, and vocabulary in context and Science. focusing on recognition of relevant evidence and data in passages 	
Person Responsible	Scott Cooper (coopers@manateeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

SWD 36% FED INDEX 41
BLK 36% FED INDEX 41

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Identifying deficiencies in these students early and providing support through MATH FUND course, INT READING and/or LEARNING STRATEGIES. Also Support from ESE teacher pushing into core courses.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring and benchmarks in place for monitoring growth in the courses supporting these students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Identifying deficiencies in these students early and providing support through MATH FUND course, INT READING and/or LEARNING STRATEGIES. Also Support from ESE teacher pushing into Core Courses.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

SWD 36% FED INDEX 41
BLK 36% FED INDEX 41

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Students identified as ELL will have support from an ELL support staff weekly.
2. Students identified as ESE will have support from the support facilitation teacher weekly.
3. Tutoring to students will be offered in math and through math and science boot camps.
4. Students needing support in Reading will be using Lexia.
5. Students needing support in Mathematics will be using Dream Box and Acaletics.
6. The MTSS team will focus on improvements for these students.

Person Responsible

Minetha Brown (brown4m@manateeschools.net)

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

MATH proficiency went from 80% to 78%

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

At the end of the current school year, the Math Learning Gains will increase from 69% to 75% as measured by the F.A.S.T guidelines.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

FAST PM1, PM2, benchmark data, Algebra and Geometry data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Jones (jonesl@manateeschool.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Support for students via tutoring, Fundamentals of Math and Algebra Success will be used to support growth. Intensive math instruction using Dream Box and Acaletics will continue to support struggling math students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Nolan's test scores remain the highest in the district and above the state average. Past practices of the strategies have supported our gains to increase math scores.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Math teachers will provide monitoring, before school, with tutoring to students
2. All math teachers will use error analysis daily in their classrooms
3. Algebra Success teachers will provide small group math instruction
4. Students will use Khan Academy during the Algebra Success class to reinforce and support
5. Students will use Acaletics in the Pre-Algebra classes
6. Students will use Dreambox in the 6th and 7th Foundational Mathematics classes
7. Students identified as ESE or ELL will be provided extra support through the support facilitation teacher directly or with the classroom teacher

Person Responsible

Lori Jones (jonesl@manateeschool.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 throughout 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. All stakeholders are involved in the positive culture and supporting COLT events.

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

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 STAMPEDE who head up the activities and culture for the school.