

Brevard Public Schools

# Ronald McNair Magnet Middle School



## 2022-23 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>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</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>

## Demographics

**Principal: Stephen Richardson D**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>7-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 95%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: B (54%)<br>2018-19: C (53%)<br>2017-18: A (65%)   |
| <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>   | ATSI   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## 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>14</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

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>7-8                             | No                     | 95%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 65%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       |         | 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.

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

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

| Name                | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Richardson, Stephen | Principal           | The duties of the principal encompasses all the others on the school leadership team.  |
| Shockley, Jennifer  | Assistant Principal | Serves as an instructional leader by collaborating with the administrative team, teacher leaders, SAC committee and community members to implement research based instructional strategies to reach our SIP goals. |
| Rowe, Genesis       | Assistant Principal | Serves as an instructional leader that focuses on the safety and well-being of our students.   |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Stephen Richardson D

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

18

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

30

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

370

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

1

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

8

**Demographic Data****Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |   |    |    |    |     | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |     |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 209 | 158 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 367 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18  | 19  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 37  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4   | 4   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8   |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6   | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6   | 12  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18  |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55  | 43  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 98  |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61  | 39  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 100 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64  | 58  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 122 |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|-------|----|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 18 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 34 |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |    |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14 |       |



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

Tuesday 9/6/2022

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 185 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 336   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23  | 27  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19  | 17  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6   | 16  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4   | 21  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 28  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30  | 25  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 55    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 41  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 79    |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 33  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 71    |

**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 | 37 | 31 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 68    |

**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 | 3 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |

**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 | 151 | 185 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 336 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23  | 27  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19  | 17  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6   | 16  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4   | 21  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 28  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30  | 25  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 55  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 41  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 79  |       |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 33  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 71  |       |

#### 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 | 37 | 31 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 68 |

#### 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 | 3 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13 |       |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

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

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 44%    | 50%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 60%    | 59%      | 54%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 44%    |          |       |        |          |       | 55%    | 56%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 37%    |          |       |        |          |       | 41%    | 48%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            | 53%    | 33%      | 36%   |        |          |       | 59%    | 66%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 59%    |          |       |        |          |       | 41%    | 55%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 55%    |          |       |        |          |       | 28%    | 45%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 45%    | 53%      | 53%   |        |          |       | 51%    | 52%      | 51%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 66%    | 48%      | 58%   |        |          |       | 70%    | 75%      | 72%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

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

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 53%    | 58%      | -5%                        | 52%   | 1%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 64%    | 63%      | 1%                         | 56%   | 8%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -53%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 50%    | 62%      | -12%                       | 54%   | -4%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 20%    | 43%      | -23%                       | 46%   | -26%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -50%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 50%    | 53%      | -3%                        | 48%   | 2%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 68%    | 74%      | -6%                   | 71%   | -3%                |

| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 89%    | 61%      | 28%                   | 61%   | 28%                |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 94%    | 60%      | 34%                   | 57%   | 37%                |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 29       | 40     | 30          | 32        | 43      | 38           | 34       | 38      | 59        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 15       | 38     | 39          | 27        | 38      | 50           |          | 22      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 32       | 39     | 35          | 37        | 54      | 48           | 22       | 65      | 69        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 36       | 47     | 38          | 45        | 50      | 54           | 31       | 42      | 81        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 41       | 33     |             | 57        | 55      |              | 67       | 70      | 77        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 59       | 48     | 36          | 68        | 69      | 61           | 66       | 81      | 83        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 32       | 38     | 33          | 39        | 48      | 45           | 26       | 57      | 66        |                   |                     |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 23       | 44     | 35          | 35        | 38      | 36           | 17       | 52      | 33        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 16       | 6      | 10          | 20        | 28      |              |          | 10      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 35       | 41     | 35          | 36        | 33      | 40           | 26       | 46      | 47        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 43       | 40     | 31          | 55        | 50      | 60           | 50       | 61      | 73        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 55       | 55     |             | 59        | 30      |              | 42       | 70      | 71        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 67       | 59     | 60          | 78        | 46      | 53           | 62       | 93      | 82        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 37       | 40     | 24          | 41        | 36      | 48           | 30       | 53      | 57        |                   |                     |
| 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        |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| 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        |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 56   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 2    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 76   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 558  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 96%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 38   |
| 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                                       | 34   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| Native American Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |      |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%         | 0    |
| Asian Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  |      |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | N/A  |

| Asian Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 45  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 50  |
| 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   | 57  |
| 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   | 63  |
| 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   |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Our school made improvements in math learning gains both as a school and across subgroups. However we do need to work on increasing math proficiency. Our ELA proficiency and learning gains both decreased as a school and across subgroups.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is in ELA. For 2021-2022, our overall ELA Proficiency decreased 8% and our ELA Learning gains dropped 5%.

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

During the 2021-2022 school year, we were not able to offer Intensive Reading to all of our students needing the support. For the 2022-2023 school year, we have increased the number of sections of Intensive Reading, added a Learning Strategies class, and added an additional Launch (Tier 2 support) for reading.

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

Math Learning Gains showed the most improvement. For 2021-2022, our overall Math Learning Gains increased 18% and our Math Learning Gains for our Lowest 25% increased 9%.

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

All students participated in the Monitoring Academic Progress Test (MAP) for math in the fall, winter and spring. by monitoring student progress in math, we were able to identify which students were on track to being successful on the FSA and what students needed additional supports. The students needing additional support were pulled into a Launch (Tier 2 support) group during the day for math. In addition, we held Math Lab after school every Friday afternoon which provided free math tutoring to all students.

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

We will continue to provide frequent feedback to teachers based on classroom walkthroughs to ensure solid Tier 1 instruction is occurring with on grade level standards. We will identify students needing Tier 2/3 support or pre-instruction and provide that during our Launch system. These groups are flexible and fluid during the year so that students can receive the help they need when they need it.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Acceleration PD at Faculty Meetings  
AVID Summer Institute  
ELA Training on BEST Standards and newly adopted Curriculum Resources  
Intensive Reading Training for our IR Teachers and Literacy Coach  
Math Training on BEST Standards and newly adopted Curriculum Resources  
Learning Goals and Success Criteria

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

Additional services that are part of McNair Magnet Middle School are:  
-ZTZ (Zero Tolerance for Zeros)

- Social Work to bring down ALL barriers
- On-site Licensed Therapist
- Mindfulness Education
- PBIS Re-entry meetings with students, teachers and social worker/dean as part of our restorative practices
- Full grade review with EVERY parent conference no matter the reason

### **Areas of Focus**

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

:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

ELA is an area of focus due to the decrease in all three areas of ELA Achievement (ELA Proficiency, ELA Learning Gains, and ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%.) While our SWD did increase in ELA Proficiency, the decreased in ELA Learning Gains and ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. Also, our ELL students did increase in ELA Learning Gains and ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% however the Federal Index for our ELL students is only 34.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

All of our students will take the FAST Reading Assessment three times this year. During the first progress monitoring window, 30% of our students were proficient. By the third administration, we will increase to 55% proficient.

**Monitoring:**

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

ELA progress will be monitored schoolwide during PM1 and PM2 of the FAST Reading Assessment. In addition, all students in Intensive Reading will be monitored throughout the year in the student application of the Read 180 program. Students that are participating in our Reading Launch groups will also be monitored through their use of the Read 180 program.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The evidence-based strategy being used is the Read 180 program. Read 180 is a program for struggling readers and has been found to have positive effects on comprehension and general literacy achievement. Read 180 is delivered using whole group instruction and then three small group rotations. The small group rotations include individualized instruction with an adaptive computer application, small group instruction, and independent reading.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Read 180 is the program that our district has chosen to adopt to support reading and literacy across the district. Since ELA is our area of focus, we chose to use the curriculum resources that are available for our students.

**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.

Launch groups created and modified as needed

**Person Responsible** Genesis Rowe (rowe.genesis@brevardschools.org)

Launch group instruction daily by Literacy Coach, Media Specialist, and Teacher

**Person Responsible** Genesis Rowe (rowe.genesis@brevardschools.org)

Individual Student Data Chats to review FSA data and FAST progress monitoring throughout the year

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Classroom walkthroughs and feedback by administration and coaches

**Person Responsible** Stephen Richardson (richardson.stephen@brevardschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus  
Description and**

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

Math is an area of focus due to the decline in Math Proficiency. In 2020-2021, we had 59% of our students scoring a Level 3 or above in math. In 2021-2022, that number decreased to only 53% of our students scoring a Level 3 or above. This decrease in Math Proficiency also occurred for several of our subgroups-SWD, Hispanic, Multiracial, and FRL.

**Measurable**

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

All of our students will take the FAST Math Assessment or Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment three times this year. During the first FAST progress monitoring window, 19% of our students were proficient. By the third administration, we will increase to 50% proficient. During the first MAPs progress monitoring window, 72% of our students scored in the categories of Average, High Average, and High. By the third administration, we will increase to 85% of our students scoring Average or higher.

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

Math progress will be monitored schoolwide during PM1 and PM2 of the FAST Mathematics Assessment. In addition, students enrolled in Algebra and Geometry will be monitored using the Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment during the same testing windows.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

The evidence-based strategy being used is facilitating meaningful mathematical discourse. Mathematical discourse consists of teachers:  
 -engaging students in the sharing of mathematical ideas, reasoning and approaches  
 -selecting student approaches and solutions for whole-class analysis and discussion  
 -facilitating discourse among students by positioning them as authors of ideas who explain and defend their approaches  
 -ensuring progress toward mathematical goals by my making connections to student approaches and reasoning

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Mathematical discourse was selecting since it aligns well with AVID. We are an AVID school and focus on WICOR (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading.) Mathematical discourse aligns with WICOR. Two of our math teachers attend mathematical discourse professional development this summer at the AVID Summer Institute.

**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.

Mathematical Discourse Professional Development for teachers.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Monthly Department Meetings for collaboration

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Shockley (shockley.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Classroom walkthroughs and feedback by administration and coaches

**Person Responsible** Stephen Richardson (richardson.stephen@brevardschools.org)

Individual Student Data Chats to review FSA data and FAST/MAPs progress monitoring throughout the year

**Person Responsible** Genesis Rowe (rowe.genesis@brevardschools.org)

**Positive Culture & Environment**

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

**Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

We have provided additional supports to meet the needs of all students. An additional ESE teacher was hired to support our increasing population of students with IEPs. My APC heavily monitors the needs of all ESE students. Our media specialist is receiving training and works with our IA to monitor and support our growing ELL population. We also have added a part time counselor position to support students needed therapy for behaviors. PBIS is heavily implemented this year. We have concentrated on prevention of behaviors and restorative actions if or once they occur. A strong system of consequences and rewards are in place. Campus wide events are pushed as a means to engage students in appropriate behaviors. Some of the events include Spirit weeks, pep rallies, faculty vs. student games, dances, field trips and etc. Lastly, we have developed a strong attendance intervention team. We do home visits as needed, offer incentives, and support for students with situations beyond their control.

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

PBIS initiatives- Genesis Rowe, AP of discipline  
Tracking and support of ESE students- Jennifer Shockley, AP of curriculum  
Attendance Intervention Lead- Grenita Brooks, Social Worker

Implementation/Approver of reward activities- Steve Richardson, Principal  
ESOL support- Sharon Bowen, Media Specialist