Ronald Mcnair Magnet Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ronald Mcnair Magnet Middle School

1 CHALLENGER DR, Rockledge, FL 32955

http://www.mcnair.ms.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Stephen Richardson D

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2018-19 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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

Ronald Mcnair Magnet Middle School

1 CHALLENGER DR, Rockledge, FL 32955

http://www.mcnair.ms.brevard.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 7-8	No	56%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	A	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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.

McNair Magnet School will provide opportunities for all students to excel through a standards-based, continuous
improvement model and by delivering an innovative STEAM curriculum.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensure ALL McNair students are given opportunities, exposure, awareness and competency skills to be HIGH
SCHOOL PREPARED, COLLEGE READY and CAREER DRIVEN.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brock, Tammy	Assistant Principal	Ensures that when new curricular materials are obtained, implementers are adequately trained to use the materials; facilitates Action Research Teams, which are the means for regularly-scheduled faculty data analysis and collaboration for student support. The Assistant Principal serves as an academic mentor to students with low standardize testing scores to assist them in managing their academics and meets with a set of mentees each week to discuss missing assignments as well as to teach strategies on how to organize and communicate with their teachers to improve their grades.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	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	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

37

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/9/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	60%	59%	54%	61%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	54%	55%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	48%	47%	53%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	59%	66%	58%	63%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	41%	55%	57%	46%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	45%	51%	32%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	51%	52%	51%	58%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	75%	72%	71%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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	2019	53%	58%	-5%	52%	1%
	2018	62%	56%	6%	51%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	64%	63%	1%	56%	8%
	2018	62%	65%	-3%	58%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	50%	62%	-12%	54%	-4%
	2018	64%	62%	2%	54%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	20%	43%	-23%	46%	-26%
	2018	31%	41%	-10%	45%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	50%	53%	-3%	48%	2%
	2018	53%	55%	-2%	50%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	68%	74%	-6%	71%	-3%
2018	74%	73%	1%	71%	3%
Compare		-6%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	61%	28%	61%	28%
2018	91%	62%	29%	62%	29%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	60%	34%	57%	37%
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		-6%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	42	35	23	37	34	29	42	45		
ELL	20	38	32	36	21	8		35			
BLK	43	44	36	37	36	22	21	49	64		
HSP	53	59	41	53	29	9	53	56	68		
MUL	63	42		72	35		58	81	82		
WHT	75	63	50	75	50	62	75	85	82		
FRL	46	48	39	47	35	22	32	54	68		

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	27	61	67	33	44	40	13	48			
ELL	18	64	70	55	91						
BLK	48	61	57	48	47	47	31	61	76		
HSP	64	61	73	68	61	77	52	74	71		
MUL	69	60		86	65		79	73	93		
WHT	77	66	59	82	65	71	73	88	77		
FRL	53	63	62	57	53	58	45	65	68		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	26	40	39	31	33	33	33	48	50		
ASN	70	50		100	80						
BLK	39	48	53	40	33	28	28	54	63		
HSP	61	60	54	71	60	43	50	70	78		
MUL	72	64		72	48		64	91			
WHT	77	59	48	78	50	36	78	87	78		
FRL	45	48	49	51	46	38	40	63	68		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	540
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
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	69
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

McNair's lowest performing component is Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% of students. Two major factors contributed to the lack of performance. The first was a lack of a system for progress monitoring mastery of grade level content. The second was a late hire of a first year alternative certification teacher. Placed juxtapose in the same classroom, these factors created an environment for decline.

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

McNair's area of greatest decline was Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% of students. Two major factors contributed to the lack of performance. The first was a lack of a system for progress monitoring mastery of grade level content. The second was a late hire of a first year alternative

certification teacher. Placed juxtapose in the same classroom, these factors created an environment for decline.

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.

McNair's greatest gap when compared to the state average is Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% of students. Two major factors contributed to the lack of performance. The first was a lack of a system for progress monitoring mastery of grade level content. The second was a late hire of a first year alternative certification teacher. Placed juxtapose in the same classroom, these factors created an environment for decline.

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

A deeper look at out subgroup data shows a 2 point increase in ELA achievement levels of our English Language Learners. Last year, McNair hired an ESOL IA who assisted the teachers and ELL students in grasping all content with a focus on literacy.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Discipline and suspension of African American males continues to be an area of concern.

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

1. Lowest 25% Learning Gains in Math
2. Lowest 25% Learning Gains in ELA
3. Ensuring students who remain in the ELA Achievement Category and FSA Math Achievement Category ALSO achieve a learning gain.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase in Math Learning Gains for ALL
Rationale	McNair Math students rarely showed "one year's growth in one year's time" in the 2019 school year. Only 28% of the students in the Lowest 25% made a learning gain. While this number is staggering and discouraging the number of proficient math students who did not make a learning gain is equally shocking. McNair had 262 students who counted in our Math Achievement Percentage for school grade calculation. Of those 262 only 170 of them made a learning gain. This translates to 92 students (35%) who came to McNair proficient in math and stayed proficient but did not make one year's growth in one year's time. On the contrary, they made less than a year's growth.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase: 38% of students in the Lowest 25% of McNair's math students will make a learning gain. Decrease: McNair's percentage of proficient math students who did not make a learning gain will decrease from 35% to 15%. Increase: Percentage of ALL students who achieve a learning gain at McNair will increase from 41% to 57%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jasmine DeLaughter (delaughter.jasmine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Increased Progress Monitoring in ALL levels of math (MAPS and IXL) for students. 2. Increased Classroom Observations with feedback for all math teachers. 3. Increased math MTSS through daily student LAUNCH groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Knowing what standards students are weak will assist teachers and MTSS teams in targeting and differentiating their instruction. Additional observation feedback for teachers will assist them in ensuring they are using best practices with students.

Action Step	
Description	1. Use dimension feedback NCR forms to ensure feedback steeped in rubric language with an immediate component. 2. Meet monthly with math teachers to discuss progress monitoring results and next steps. 3. Use MTSS team to identify struggling students for remediation during student LAUNCH groups. 4. Ensure Launch Groups have grade-level curriculum and supplies needed to enhance grade-level standards. 5. Provide before and after school opportunities (tutoring) for further student support.
Person Responsible	Jasmine DeLaughter (delaughter.jasmine@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	ELA Learning Gains for ALL
Rationale	McNair's ELA Learning Gains decreased from 63% to 55%. The students in the Lowest 25% for reading decreased from 62% to 41%. Exposing students to grade-level fiction and non-fiction literature is of utmost importance.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase: ELA Acheivment increase from 55% to 65% Increase: Lowest 25% of students in ELA learning gains will increase from 41% to 51%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jasmine DeLaughter (delaughter.jasmine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Addition of formal independent reading program in ALL ELA classes (20 book challenge) 2. Addition of grade-level specific reading teachers that are teamed with ELA teachers (with common planning) 3. Increased AVID WICOR strategies throughout ILA classrooms
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1. Independent reading is a research-based "best practice" for increasing student comprehension. At McNair, our ELA teachers are trained to do weekly conferences with students about their book as well as running records. We will use this data to track student growth and remediate. 2. Putting an emphasis on reading while engaging in hiring practices this summer

Action Step	
Description	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

school safety, external stakeholder relationships, teacher recruitment and development, or other schoolwide initiatives.
McNair is focusing on SEL through the use of a daily program called Launch. Student groups are placed on a rotation to attend focus groups for 15 minutes daily for a three week rotation targeting a growth mindset, mindfulness, and Zones of Regulation. The Social Worker works with students during In-School Suspension once a week on an individual growth mindset.

McNair has shown the need for better teacher/parent communication and is addressing this by providing teachers a set amount of time over and above their normal planning time each day to make the necessary phone calls to keep parents better informed of their student's academic progress. Along with better communication, teachers are also sharing their weekly classroom agendas with parents through

FOCUS.

To reach out to parents/families, McNair has implemented several evenings to focus on student academic success and future plans for academic endeavors. All 8th grade students take the PSAT at McNair. McNair holds a PSAT Score review night with parents and students to explain the individual student PSAT scores and what possible further academic support can be found to assist students in meeting their individual goals for future college entrance assessments such as the SAT. There is also a night for all parents with students who take Algebra to support parent concerns and knowledge of how to help their students be successful in Algebra. To support families, McNair has implemented a night for Parent Bus Conferences. Teachers, Social Worker, Guidance Counselor, and all Administrators go on a school bus into the neighborhoods and hold individual conferences with families who might not be able to physically make it to the school for the conference night. This time is used to go over the academic progress and possible plans for future success.

Family Fun Night is an evening for families put on by the McNair Elective Team to highlight and share what students are doing within the elective classes at McNair. The families enjoy a free dinner and a variety of performances. Families can also participate in hands-on activities through out the evening.

McNair is focusing on school-wide AVID strategies and sends teachers to the AVID Summer Institute for professional development. Teachers return and implement learned AVID strategies to support the school-wide AVID approach. AVID site team meets on a monthly basis to collaborate, assess, and improve implementation practices.

Zero Tolerance for Zero (ZTZ) has been implemented to accommodate students who might have missed school for a variety of reasons and need to catch up on individual class work. Another purpose for ZTZ is to assist students who may struggle academically and need a little more assistance during the day to be successful with a variety of assignments.

Evacuation and critical incident procedures training has taken place with students and staff at McNair. New teachers continue to be trained on the RAVE App. along with active assailant terminology. McNair prepared for volunteers differently this year for strengthened safety measures. Visitors are now escorted within the school during school hours. A color coding system has been enacted for volunteers as to the level of access to students during their time on campus or during specified school activities.