Manatee County Public Schools

R. Dan Nolan Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

R. Dan Nolan Middle School

6615 GREENBROOK BLVD, Bradenton, FL 34202

https://www.manateeschools.net/nolan

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;   2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;   3. Have a school grade of D or F; or   4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cooper, Scott	Principal	
Jones, Lori	Assistant Principal	
Sponsel, Jacob	Assistant Principal	
Rubal, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Mathematics Department Leader and Pre AP
Boculac, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Leader
Troop, Jason	Teacher, K-12	ELA, Writing, ESOL Department Leader
Lowe, Jaimi	Teacher, K-12	
Guerra, Kim	Teacher, ESE	MTSS, ESE

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Instructional Leadership Team
Instructional Support Team
School Advisory Council
MTSS Team
These teams will develop the goals and strategies needed for improvement. These teams meet with the Principal about once a month with this being one of the focuses of those meetings.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Review of goals and strategies in place for School Improvement will be discussed at the monthly meetings. The ILT and IST will have access to student scores on Progress Monitoring and Benchmarks to monitor growth within the academic areas and monitor students with the greatest achievement gaps.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	25	37	88
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	6	37
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	26	54	108
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	13	24	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	26	54	108

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	19	45

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	25	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	39	36	97
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	1	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	29	31	73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	21	17	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	21	17	57

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	21	65

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	25	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	39	36	97
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	1	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	29	31	73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	21	17	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	21	17	57

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	21	40

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	65	47	49	67	49	50	73		
ELA Learning Gains				51			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			47		
Math Achievement*	83	61	56	78	35	36	80		
Math Learning Gains				69			69		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			55		
Science Achievement*	75	48	49	76	57	53	69		
Social Studies Achievement*	87	70	68	92	54	58	87		
Middle School Acceleration	85	81	73	83	47	49	78		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	45	34	40	67	79	76	55		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	672
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	52			
HSP	61			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	83			
FRL	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	3	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	55			

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	52			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	65			83			75	87	85			45
SWD	25			48			23	46	71		5	
ELL	26			50			24	38			5	45
AMI												
ASN	65			87			67		83		4	
BLK	48			56							2	
HSP	51			65			62	69	79		6	38
MUL	69			88							2	
PAC												
WHT	70			88			80	92	86		5	
FRL	40			62			47	70	74		6	39

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	ELP Progress
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	67	51	39	78	69	50	76	92	83			67
SWD	20	27	21	37	41	35	37	50	55			
ELL	22	36	28	45	46	42	37		64			67
AMI												
ASN	68	62		71	75			67				

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	38	42		36	45	18						
HSP	47	44	31	63	56	37	51	86	73			62
MUL	77	61		82	61		86	90	69			
PAC												
WHT	73	52	42	83	73	57	82	96	86			
FRL	44	39	35	55	50	35	52	86	67			59

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	73	61	47	80	69	55	69	87	78			55
SWD	30	45	49	43	47	43	20	45	70			
ELL	31	39	38	48	47	40	37	55				55
AMI												
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			50
MUL	91	68		86	67							
PAC												
WHT	77	60	48	85	73	63	71	91	79			
FRL	52	54	43	64	55	44	55	73	66			48

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	61%	43%	18%	47%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	63%	45%	18%	47%	16%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	67%	45%	22%	47%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	85%	59%	26%	54%	31%
07	2023 - Spring	81%	58%	23%	48%	33%
08	2023 - Spring	57%	41%	16%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	76%	45%	31%	44%	32%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	58%	41%	50%	49%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	56%	44%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	69%	18%	66%	21%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 scores went down from 67% to 64% this has declined for more than one year
MATH scores went up from 78% to 84%
SCI scores remained the same but high 76% to 76%
CIVICS went down but remain high from 92% to 87%
Nolan remains above district and state in all areas

2022 Data
SWD 36% Fed Index 41%
BLK 36% Fed Index 41%

22-23 School Grade & Federal Index Projections by Subgroup
SWD ELA 24 MATH 52
BLK ELA 48 MATH 64

All data is listed above. Reading scores showed the lowest performance. We have a large number of students opting out of Intensive Reading for support. New textbooks, curriculum and tests.

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

ELA scores in 2022 scores were 67 in 2023 scores were 64. Currently we do not have the reading units to support Level 1 & Level 2 students for growth and Intensive Reading to help move students.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA scores in 2022 scores were 67 in 2023 scores were 64. Currently we do not have the number of reading units to support Level 1 & Level 2 students for growth and Intensive Reading to help move students.

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

Math scores showed the most improvement. Our mathematics teachers are teaching the Fundamentals of Math courses and understand math and students who are struggling with math skills.

1. Math teachers provided monitoring, before school, with tutoring to students
2. Math teachers used error analysis
3. Algebra Success teachers provided small group math instruction
4. Khan Academy was used during the Algebra Success class to reinforce and support
5. Students used Dreambox in the 6th and 7th Foundational Mathematics classes
6. Students identified as ESE or ELL were provided extra support through the support facilitation teacher/aid
directly or with the classroom teacher

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

ELA scores
Subgroups SWD

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

Focus and strategies for the lowest subgroups
ELA
Keeping Math, Civics and Science Scores Up

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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 84% to 88% as measured by the FAST 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@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Support for students via tutoring and Fundamental of Mathematics will be used to support growth.
2. Intensive mathematics instruction using Dream Box and Acaletics will continue to support struggling math students.
3. Mathematics instruction will also use visual representations, metacognitive strategies, and schema instruction as needed.
4. Lessons will be introduced with a short review of previous learned standards.
5. New material will be broken down into smaller lessons to ensure mastery.
6. Math teachers will continue to use Error Analysis as a strategy with students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 students.
2. All math teachers will use error analysis daily in their classrooms.
3. Math teachers will provide small group math instruction when necessary.
4. Students will use Acaletics 8th grade Fundamentals of Math if offered.
5. Students will use Dreambox in 6th & 7th Fundamentals of Math.
6. Math teachers will focus on following the curriculum map and improve performance tasks based on standards alignment.

7. Monitor independent work.

8. Implement appropriately challenging centers and meaningful independent activities.

9. Students will use Khan Academy during the class to reinforce and support skills.

10. Students identified as ESE, ELL and other Sub Populations not meeting the index will be provided extra support through the support facilitation teacher directly or with the classroom teacher.

Person Responsible: Lori Jones (jonesl@manateeschools.net)

By When: Throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Due to an annual drop in scores, dropping again from 73% to 67%, ELA populations not meeting proficiency were identified by the school's data components to have the greatest potential for improvement. This would include SWD and BLK subgroups.

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. An increase in the overall ELA FAST Reading assessments scores will increase as a result.

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

FAST PM1 and PM2 will be used to measure growth, with PM3 determining the overall result.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Scott Cooper (coopers@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Support and Intensive Reading

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Strong, high quality classroom instruction for all students.
2. Use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic progress.
3. Identification of at-risk students.
4. Targeted, evidence-based interventions.
5. Collaboration of different teams for needed improvement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. All students will participate in Close Reads in language arts, science, and social studies classes each quarter, dependent on curriculum. Electives will implement where applicable.
2. The Intensive Reading teachers and aide will continue to provide grade level, small group reading instruction via Lexia and other sources.
3. The Intensive Reading teachers 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.
6. Students identified as ESE will have support from the support facilitation teacher/s weekly.
7. Students identified as ELL will have support from the ELL aide daily/weekly.
8. Science will specifically focus on vocabulary, PEARL paragraph writing, cause and effect and summarizing.
9. Social Studies will specifically focus on main idea, summarizing, and vocabulary context, PEARL paragraph writing.

Person Responsible: Scott Cooper (coopers@manateeschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

#3. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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

Identifying deficiencies in BLK and SWD and increasing 7% in these subgroups to the percentage meeting the required FED INDEX level of 41% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Math Fundamentals, Intensive Reading and/or Learning Strategies courses will help improve these students scores as measured through FAST PM1 & FAST PM2. Support will be provided from the ESE teacher pushing into core classes and through Learning Strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Scott Cooper (coopers@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Identifying deficiencies in BLK and SWD and increasing scores of these subgroups to the percentage meeting the required FED INDEX level of 41% and implementing and placing students in the correct Intensive course/Learning Strategies course to help with deficiencies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Specific district approved programs are being used in some of these classrooms. Small group instruction is a focus of the listed courses.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Person Responsible: Jacob Sponsel (sponselj@manateeschools.net)

By When: Through out the year and by the end of the 2023-2024 school year scores will show improvement.

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Culture and environment will be addressed by PBIS.

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

100% of Nolan students will participate in PBIS at Nolan Middle School during the 2023-2024 school year. This includes the identified low performing subgroups.

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

All Teachers and our bus drivers will be involved in the program to support positive behavior. School-wide components are in place focused around COLTS Conscientious, Optimistic, Leadership, Trustworthy and Safety. Students have Colt Cards and receive rewards and incentives for positive behaviors focused around our PBIS goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Scott Cooper (coopers@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS has been in place at Nolan Middle School for several years. This program helps student's learn and understand positive behaviors as the entire school supports positive behavior in all areas of the school.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. COLT Cash as incentives for positive behavior.
2. Teaching and exhibiting positive behavior to students.
3. Acronym was developed using COLTS (Conscientious, Optimistic, Leadership, Trustworthy and Safety) Those are our core positive behaviors that affect the behavior in our school.
4. Reward activities, school store, COLT gear are provided.
5. Business partner donations to help assist.
6. PTO and SAC help with volunteers and monetary support for our positive rewards.

Person Responsible: Scott Cooper (coopers@manateeschools.net)

By When: Throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

1. COLT Cash as incentives for positive behavior.
2. Teaching and exhibiting positive behavior to students.
3. Acronym was developed using COLTS (Conscientious, Optimistic, Leadership, Trustworthy and Safety)
Those are our core positive behaviors that affect the behavior in our school
4. Reward activities, school store, COLT gear are provided
5. Business partner donations to help assist
6. PTO and SAC help with volunteers and monetary support for our positive rewards

Person Responsible: Scott Cooper (coopers@manateeschools.net)

By When: Throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$4,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0752 - R. Dan Nolan Middle School	Other		$4,500.00
			Notes: Math tutoring from Millage for Math tutoring, Alg/Geom Boot Camps Science Boot Camp			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0752 - R. Dan Nolan Middle School	Other		$1,000.00
			Notes: Millage money used for ELA and reading tutoring			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0752 - R. Dan Nolan Middle School	Other		$0.00
			Notes: Budget Amounts are included in ELA, MATH and PBIS Goals			
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:				$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24

			0752 - R. Dan Nolan Middle School	Other		$10,000.00
			Notes: Business Partners/PTO			
					Total:	**$15,500.00**

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No