

Brevard Public Schools

Stone Magnet Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Stone Magnet Middle School

1101 E UNIVERSITY BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32901

<http://www.stone.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Courtney Lundy B

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2019

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: C (50%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Stone Magnet Middle School

1101 E UNIVERSITY BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32901

<http://www.stone.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	73%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

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.

To create active citizens of the 21st century through commitment, dedication, teamwork and scholarship.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Facilitating innovation and leadership through AVID and STEAM best practices.

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
Mederos, Vicky	Teacher, K-12	
Wilkerson, Tia	Dean	
Poole, Hilary	Principal	
Bombriant, Kelly	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	397	394	0	0	0	0	791	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	124	0	0	0	0	258	
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	23	86	0	0	0	0	109	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	83	0	0	0	0	217	

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	36	78	0	0	0	0	114

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	6	10	0	0	0	0	16	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	0	0	0	0	23	

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

269

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/30/2019

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	115	135	0	0	0	0	250	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	99	0	0	0	0	133	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	99	0	0	0	0	112	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	99	0	0	0	0	210	

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	54	109	0	0	0	0	163

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	50%	59%	54%	51%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	54%	53%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	48%	47%	43%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	50%	66%	58%	49%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	48%	55%	57%	42%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	45%	51%	30%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	40%	52%	51%	38%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	75%	72%	64%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	397 (0)	394 (0)	791 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	134 ()	124 ()	258 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	23 (0)	86 (0)	109 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	134 (0)	83 (0)	217 (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	46%	58%	-12%	52%	-6%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	51%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	50%	63%	-13%	56%	-6%
	2018	48%	65%	-17%	58%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	43%	62%	-19%	54%	-11%
	2018	38%	62%	-24%	54%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	29%	43%	-14%	46%	-17%
	2018	15%	41%	-26%	45%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	38%	53%	-15%	48%	-10%
	2018	37%	55%	-18%	50%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	65%	74%	-9%	71%	-6%
2018	59%	73%	-14%	71%	-12%
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	80%	61%	19%	61%	19%
2018	80%	62%	18%	62%	18%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	60%	38%	57%	41%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		-2%			

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	21	40	37	22	44	34	19	36	33		
ELL	22	36	36	31	28	21	10	57			
ASN	90	80		90	60						
BLK	31	46	36	28	34	29	26	55	60		
HSP	45	48	45	49	45	26	30	69	53		
MUL	57	57		60	55		31	65	74		
WHT	61	58	52	61	56	49	53	72	68		
FRL	41	48	43	42	41	35	32	60	55		
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	12	27	29	17	29	27	7	27	80		
ELL	7	29	29	23	50	50		32			
ASN	82	64		90	60				80		
BLK	26	39	36	22	33	31	16	41	63		
HSP	48	39	17	48	48	39	38	61	71		
MUL	60	48		56	50		44	77	79		
WHT	60	47	31	59	45	41	52	69	76		
FRL	39	39	32	38	40	35	29	53	65		
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	10	32	30	7	30	24	13	25			
ELL	9	36	35	9	35	31	10	27			
ASN	79	64		86	79				90		
BLK	30	45	38	27	31	24	14	43	29		
HSP	54	57	43	46	44	32	39	66	55		
MUL	58	52		60	38	46	45	67	67		
WHT	61	55	49	60	47	31	51	74	60		
FRL	43	50	43	39	37	27	30	55	41		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	512
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	33
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	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
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	47

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
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	58
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.

2018's lowest performance is Math Lowest 25th Percentile, this group stayed the same as the previous year at 37%

In 2019 all areas showed improvement except the lowest 25th percentile in math. This category stayed stagnant at 37% scoring at grade level on the Florida Standards Assessment.

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

The cohort group for 8th grade was -9, School-District comparison was -26% for 2018 and -14% for 2019

Stone Magnet Middle School didn't have any area of decline; however the lowest 25th percentile in math did not show growth while all others had growth.

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

The data component with the largest gap between school and state is Math 25th Percentile, the school percentage was 37% compared to the state average of 51% (-14%).

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

The data component with the most improvement is ELA Learning Gains from 44% in 2018 to 53% in 2019 (+9%)

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

High Impact Learning that directly impacts any and all academic subjects.

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

1. Middle School Acceleration
2. Improve attendance rate
3. Course Failure in ELA or Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improve student achievement in all academic areas for learners of all subgroups.
Rationale	All students should receive an engaging, rigorous lesson which is aligned with the standards. If all students are held to the same expectations, all students will rise to those expectations. This will lead to an improvement in academics.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome will be an increase in student academic and achievement levels on the FSA. Students will have clear expectations of the standards they are learning as well as be involved in thought provoking questioning and discussion.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>According to Tony Wagner, author of The Global Achievement Gap (2008), students are not being prepared in the basic survival skills for the 21st Century. These skills include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Critical Thinking and Problem Solving 2. Collaboration and Leadership 3. Agility and Adaptability 4. Initiative and Entrepreneurialism 5. Effective Oral and Written Communication 6. Accessing and Analyzing Information 7. Curiosity and Imagination <p>From: Wagner, T. (2008). The Global Achievement Gap. New York: Basic Books.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale behind this strategy is to prepare students for the world after graduation. Rigorous curriculum, collaboration groups as well as productive struggle are all strategies that all students need to not only learn but be able to apply to their daily schedules both inside and outside the classroom. A rigorous, standards based lesson will have all students learning with the same expectations. We need to challenge our students and teach them how to productively struggle without giving up.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make sure all standards are at grade level. 2. Use AVID Focus Notes to teach students to ask questions and learn from their mistakes. 3. Use AVID Focus Notes to focus on language and vocabulary to improve comprehension and writing skills. 4. Use AVID strategies such as Socratic Seminars or Collaborative Learning Groups to encourage discussion on lessons. 5. Incorporate AVID Focus Notes to summarize and have authentic student feedback.
Person Responsible	Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Create an environment which utilizes Positive Behavioral Support strategies that will increase student attendance and engagement while decreasing incidents which necessitates disciplinary consequences.
Rationale	Studies have shown that creating a positive environment will increase a student's critical thinking skills, motivation and success. Positive Behavioral Support will motivate students to discuss their decisions and seek goals.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome will be increased student attendance in classes and providing them a different outlet. Positive behavioral strategies enforce positive elements. Once the focus is on the positive, it will help to single out the toxic behaviors and allow for those to be addressed and corrected.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tia Wilkerson (wilkerson.tia@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	According to Anthony Muhhamad, increasing a positive culture will encourage students to celebrate their achievements instead of focusing on their failures. Teachers who lead by modeling positive behaviors, have students who positively react in the same way. Encourage mistakes and allow students to positively work through their mistakes. When students productively struggle, they incorporate and improve social emotional skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Middle school students need guidance in how to make self-helping, positive decisions that lead to essential social skills. Students need to learn how to define the situation, examine options that are available to deal with the problem at hand. Not only do they need to know how to examine the options but how to determine the disadvantages and advantages of each option. Once students can successfully make the determination of a problem, students need to decide on a solution and practice.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consistent discipline, a discipline ladder to be followed by all teachers, staff and administrators. 2. Build a discipline committee to support the Positive Behavior initiative. 3. Encourage parental involvement. 3. Increase positive communication with students and parents. 4. Tangible, consistent rewards 5. Build meaningful relationships.
Person Responsible	Tia Wilkerson (wilkerson.tia@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Instructional Planning for High-Impact Instruction to drive student growth and standards based achievement using real-world experiences.
Rationale	High Impact Instruction is research-validated, high-leverage instructional practices that have a significant, positive impact on the way teachers teach and students learn.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Teachers collaborate and discuss the standards and lessons students are struggling with. Discussion includes searching for patterns of student difficulty and success. Teachers collaborate and form standards based lesson plans that include pre and post assessments, equitable learning and strategies to improve all learners.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Jim Knight's research provides a simple but powerful framework and set of tools for improving classroom management, content planning, instruction, and assessment. Important parts of "Big Four" teaching practices include instructional coaching, partnership learning, and intensive learning teams as part of High-Impact Instruction. Teachers collaborate and discuss teaching practices that make a difference. High-Impact Instruction focuses on the content area, assessment, instruction and community building. This focus improves the student-teacher learning goals, relationships and classroom management.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to studies from the Colorado and Wisconsin departments of education, teachers should collaborate and discuss the standards and lessons students are struggling with. Discussion includes searching for patterns of student difficulty and success. Teachers collaborate and form standards based lesson plans that include pre and post assessments, equitable learning and strategies to improve all learners. The goal is for the teachers to produce planned instructional lessons which meet the needs of students, honor individual styles and training of teachers, consider requirements of local school systems, and understand the nuances of the disciplines.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan out curriculum planning days among content area teachers. 2. Focus on producing engaging lessons. 3. Collaborate on how the content will be delivered, assessed and reflected on. 4. Teachers follow up with discussion on the successes and challenges. 5. Successes are shared and adjustments are made to reteach the struggling students.
Person Responsible	Hilary Poole (poole.hilary@brevardschools.org)

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).

Stone Magnet Middle School's main focus is improving student achievement, behavior and high impact instruction for all students. Tutoring sessions will be out into place to assist students who need assistance in their subject areas both before and after school.

Students are taught AVID strategies that improve their organizational skills, improve study habits by encouraging a school wide note taking style and allow students to learn about their future opportunities. All students are exposed to different note taking strategies which improve their study habits and success in their academics. Students school wide are taught the five steps to AVID Focus Note taking and are encouraged to use this a study tool to improve their academics.

Parental involvement opportunities are scheduled throughout the year. These events include but are not limited to evening events scheduled by the Stone Magnet coordinator, AVID Site Team, Science Research and others. These nights not only improve parental involvement but invites future parents and students to visit the school. Student Advisory Council holds monthly meetings open to parents and community. These meetings focus on discussing ways to improve Stone Magnet Middle School. Members of the SAC committee vote on the important matters, changes, or items requested to improve student achievement and safety.