

Brevard Public Schools

# Ronald McNair Magnet Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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: 9/17/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Ronald McNair Magnet Middle School

1 CHALLENGER DR, Rockledge, FL 32955

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 7-8</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>54%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>61%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	A	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Thursday 9/17/2020, Stephen Richardson D

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

24

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

31

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	214	198	0	0	0	0	412
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	26	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	25	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	25	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	25	0	0	0	0	62

**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	35	30	0	0	0	0	65

**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	1	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	7

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 9/15/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	
Number of students enrolled	0	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	0

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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%

<b>EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey</b>			
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Grade Level (prior year reported)</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	
	(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.**

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
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%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
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%				

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

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					
<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	68%	74%	-6%	71%	-3%
2018	74%	73%	1%	71%	3%
Compare		-6%			
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					
<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	89%	61%	28%	61%	28%
2018	91%	62%	29%	62%	29%
Compare		-2%			
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	94%	60%	34%	57%	37%
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		-6%			

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b>
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
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%	0

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%	1
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	62
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	69
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## 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 our 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?

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.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>One of McNair's Area of Focus this year is ELA (specifically fluency and comprehension while reading non-fiction). Our first reading plus benchmark shared some extremely abysmal results. They are included below:                  Grade Tested 7th 8th                  Above Grade Level 31% 33%                  At Grade Level 8% 8%                  1 Year Below Grade Level 7% 9%                  2 Years Below Grade Level 9% 10%                  3 Years Below Grade Level 8% 11%                  4 Years Below Grade Level 12% 7%                  5 Years Below Grade Level 25% 22%</p> <p>A deeper dive into this data shares that all of our students' (even the ones on grade level) fluency rates are lower than the previous three years. Our comprehension levels have always been a struggle, but low fluency rates have only compounded this issue.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>5% of the students who populate each of the "below grade level categories" of the Reading Plus Benchmark Test will move to the next "below grade level category" towards the At Grade Level Category. This would mean that all categories would increase EXCEPT the "5 Years Below Grade Level Category" (it would significantly decrease).</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>Jasmine DeLaughter (delaughter.jasmine@brevardschools.org)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Small Group instruction weekly in English Language Arts courses and Intensive Language Arts courses will be used to assist in filling literacy gaps with students. Independent reading and individualized book talks with students will also be a major focus of time with teachers.</p> <p>LAUNCH (McNair's RTI model) will be used to give additional assistance to struggling readers with explicit instruction on comprehension strategies and writing.</p> <p>Explicit Fluency Instruction: Elective teachers have been tasked with ensuring fluency practice in each of their disciplines. They were trained on two different fluency teaching strategies and asked to commit to one in their classroom weekly.</p> <p>Monthly Literacy Comprehension Strategy School Wide Focus: Each month McNair's literacy team will choose a literacy themed area of focus to teach to teachers as well as work with students on during LAUNCH (RTI).</p> <p>Words of the Week: McNair's literacy team has identified frequently used FSA vocabulary. Those words have been transformed into a program called Words of the Week. Student will be celebrated when they use and define the words.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>-Electives are using running records and Common Lit/ Novel study Read Alouds.                  -Comprehension Reading Strategies from Visible Learning for Literacy and Teaching Reading To Black Adolescent Males.</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

Explicit Fluency Strategies through electives and Monthly Literacy Strategies: McNair Literacy Team  
Words of the Week: McNair Literacy Strategies

**Person Responsible** Jasmine DeLaughter (delaughter.jasmine@brevardschools.org)

**#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Measurable Outcome:**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Due to COVID-19 our state wide test scores have not changed. None of the students in our school grade of 'C' attend McNair. It is imperative that we accurately use progress monitoring to determine our current students' standards based abilities and deficiencies. Reading Plus will be used to track literacy skills and the MAP assessment tool will be used to track math skills. The Reading Plus data shares that only 41% of 7th graders are reading at or above grade level. It shares that 43% of our 8th graders are reading at or above grade level. This low percentage will be a huge area**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

McNair's Youth Truth Survey Results and our Parent Survey results share that our efforts to cultivate a positive learning environment. Our greetings every morning, and at every classroom door assist in with that culture. Our Positive Behavior Support Plan assists our teachers and administrators in celebrating positive

behavior and creating relationships to change negative behavior. Our Youth Truth Survey results shared that our students feel 81% of their teachers believe that they can get a good grade if they try. 52% of their teachers are not just satisfied if they pass, they care if they are really learning. Our parent survey also shared that while our teachers are making contact with them regarding student academic needs, our parents would like more. Only 7% of them have had weekly contact about their students progress. 26% of them have had monthly contact. McNair's administration understands the importance phone calls play in cultivating a positive culture and ensuring academic success. Each teacher is given extended lunch period to allow for "official phone call" time outside of their planning period.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.